

# Pibid e Pnaic: institutional implementation arrangements with university and school partnerships\*<sup>1,2</sup>

Juliana Cristina Araujo do Nascimento Cock<sup>3</sup>

ORCID: 0000-0001-8267-7610

Maria Elizabete Neves Ramos<sup>4</sup>

ORCID: 0000-0002-8210-4449

## Abstract

This article presents a comparative study of two Brazilian public educational policies aimed at valuing the teaching profession and encouraging teacher training: the Institutional Teaching Initiation Scholarship Program (*Pibid*, in Portuguese), aimed at the initial training of undergraduates, and the National Pact for Literacy at the Right Age (*Pnaic*, in Portuguese), focusing on the continuing training of literacy teachers. Using the approach of institutional implementation arrangements and the concepts of the third space and the teacher training triangle as a theoretical and methodological reference, we investigated how their institutional implementation arrangements were configured, focusing on governance, state political capacities and their main instruments, and the teacher training models involved in these arrangements. This is a comparative study with a qualitative approach, based on case studies of these programs at two federal universities. The main results point to similarities between *Pibid* and *Pnaic* in their governance structures and the role of universities in their implementation. Between 2017 and 2018, these programs experienced important changes in terms of formulation associated with the political context within Education Ministry (*MEC*, in Portuguese) and Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Staff (*Capes*, in Portuguese). In their arrangements, the changes coincided in time frames and in the effects of political capacities. However, in the contexts investigated, we observed innovations for the continuity of the programs associated with previous experiences of the implementers at these universities, which pointed to more fruitful results when there were closer links between universities and schools.

\* The authors take full responsibility for the translation of the text, including titles of books/articles and the quotations originally published in Portuguese.

**1-** The studies that gave rise to this article were supported by the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (*CNPq*, in Portuguese) and the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Staff – Brazil (*Capes*, in Portuguese) – funding code 001.

**2-** The data cited in the article comes from theses that are publicly available in the institutional repository of the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio, in Portuguese) <https://www.maxwell.vrac.puc-rio.br/> and can be accessed via the links: <https://doi.org/10.17771/PUCRio.acad.48795> and <https://doi.org/10.17771/PUCRio.acad.60715>.

**3-** Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo (UFES), Vitória, Espírito Santo (ES) – Brazil.

Contact: [juliana.cock@ufes.br](mailto:juliana.cock@ufes.br); [juliana.nascimento.cock@gmail.com](mailto:juliana.nascimento.cock@gmail.com)

**4-** Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio), Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro (RJ) – Brazil. Contact: [mbete.ramos@gmail.com](mailto:mbete.ramos@gmail.com)



<https://doi.org/10.1590/S1678-4634202450268142en>

This content is licensed under a Creative Commons attribution-type BY 4.0.



## Keywords

Educational public policies – Implementing institutional arrangements – Teachers training – *Pibid* – *Pnaic*.

---

## Introduction

In this article, we present a comparative study in which we analyzed the institutional arrangements for implementing two Brazilian educational public policies created by the federal government and aimed at teacher training: the Institutional Teaching Initiation Scholarship Program (*Pibid*, in Portuguese) and the National Pact for Literacy at the Right Age (*Pnaic*, in Portuguese). This study was carried out by researchers from the Education Assessment Laboratory (*LAEd*<sup>5</sup>, in Portuguese), as part of the Network of Studies on the Implementation of Educational Public Policies (*Reippe*<sup>6</sup>, in Portuguese), and proposes an interface between the field of Educational Policy, with an emphasis on teacher training policies, and the thematic field of Public Policies. The object of the research is a comparative analysis of the different institutional arrangements for implementing *Pibid* and *Pnaic*, focusing on the actors/institutions, instruments and political state capacities proposed for partnerships between Higher Education Institutions (*IES*, in Portuguese) and public basic education networks in teacher training models. In this production, we consider part of the results of previous research (Nascimento Cock, 2018, 2022; Ramos, 2020) and advance in the comparative analysis of the institutional arrangements for implementing these programs.

Teacher training is one of the most prominent topics in the field of education, both in terms of initial training and continuing training, whether in the Brazilian or international educational context. There has been a significant development in the field of teacher training over the last 50 years, whose influence and growth in scientific production has become very relevant and numerous (Nóvoa, 2017). We believe that, in the case of Brazil, the debates around the subject of teacher training in recent decades, as well as the intense academic and scientific production, have been driven, among other reasons, by the laws and guidelines aimed at standardizing and presenting goals for teacher training, followed by specific public policies and programs created by the Federal Government during this period.

The current National Education Guidelines and Basis Law – *LDB* (in Portuguese) 9.394/1996 – in Art. 62 (Brasil, 1996), proposed the training of teachers for basic education at higher education level, in a Superior Degree course, although that offered at High School level, in the Normal modality is admitted as minimum training for teaching in kindergartens and elementary school, as well as those offered by Superior Normal courses (Title IX, Art. 87, § 4) (Tanuri, 2000; Shiroma; Moraes; Evangelista, 2011). Superior courses teacher formation was also affected, since Decree No. 3.276, of December 6, 1999 (Brasil, 1999) allows these to be offered by both universities and Higher Education Institutes, or by other forms of higher institutions (Shiroma; Moraes; Evangelista, 2011).

---

**5-** Education Assessment Laboratory (*LAEd*, in Portuguese), Graduate Program in Education (*PPGE*, in Portuguese) of Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio). See more information in: <https://www.laedpuc.net.br/inicio>

**6-** Network of Studies on the Implementation of Public Educational Policies. See more information in: <https://www.reippe.com/>



At the beginning of the 21st century, a new commitment to initial teacher training at university level was made through the National Education Plans (*PNE*, in Portuguese). The current *LDB* states in Art. 9, item I, that the Federal Government should draw up the *PNE* in collaboration with the states, the Federal District and the cities and, within a year, send it to the National Congress with its guidelines and targets for the next ten years, in line with the World Declaration on Education for All (Art. 87, § 1) (Brasil, 1996). The *PNE* is a planning instrument that guides the implementation and improvement of public education policies and was first instituted by Law No. 10.172, of January 9, 2001 (Brasil, 2001). The first *PNE* was valid between 2001 and 2010 and its aim was to meet the targets set out in the 1988 Federal Constitution (CF/88), recognized by law. As a result, legal responsibility was established and actions to achieve the goals became enforceable (Brasil, 2014).

Established by Law No. 13.005, of June 25, 2014, the second *PNE* took effect in 2014, running until 2024. In this new text, the result of debates between various social actors and the government, objectives and targets are set for education at all levels of basic education (Kindergarten, Primary Schools, Middle Schools and High Schools) and for higher education, to be achieved within ten years. It sets out ten guidelines, including eradicating illiteracy and improving the quality of education, as well as valuing education professionals, which is seen as one of the biggest challenges facing education policies. According to Article 7 of this new law, the Union, the states, the Federal District and the cities will work collaboratively to achieve the goals and implement the strategies set out in the text (Brasil, 2014).

The emphasis on teacher training for basic education is on Goals Fifteen and Sixteen. Goal Fifteen reinforces *LDB*'s proposal for initial teacher training at university level. It should be carried out in collaboration among the Union, the states, the Federal District and the cities within one year of its implementation and in conjunction with the national policy for training education professionals. Goal Sixteen will provide postgraduate training for fifty percent of teachers by its final year, as well as continuing training for all basic education professionals in their area of expertise, considering the needs, demands and contextualization of education systems (Brasil, 2014).

Regarding continuing education, in 2008 a process of coordination was implemented among management bodies, education systems and training institutions, reason why the National Network for the Continuing Education of Basic Education Teachers (*Renafor*, in Portuguese) was set up. Through this network, federal, state and community universities were legitimized as institutions responsible not only for initial training, but also for continuing teacher training in programs based on partnerships with federal government and state and municipal education departments (Brasil, 2008).

We can point out the creation of *Pibid* in 2007 and *Pnaic* in 2012 as a result of this context, as part of the specific programs in recent decades aimed at initial and continuing teacher training for basic education. In order to understand the formulation of *Pibid*, it is necessary to consider, in this context, the restructuring of the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Staff (*Capes*, in Portuguese), which since 2007 has started to induce and promote programs aimed at the teaching profession in basic



education, in collaborative regimes between the federative entities (Brasil, 2007a) and the creation of the Education Development Plan (*PDE*, in Portuguese) during the validity of the first *PNE*, which proposed a set of specific programs for its execution (Brasil, 2007b).

*Pnaic* is also related to Goal Five of the second *PNE*, which stipulates that all children should be completely literate by the age of eight, i.e. by the end of the third year of elementary school (Brasil, 2012, 2014), in accordance with the period between 2003 and 2012, declared the decade of literacy by the United Nations (UN). Considering this, some of the Brazilian government's actions for literacy emerged, including nine-year elementary education, *Provinha Brasil* and *PDE*, which had literacy as its central element.

*Pibid* focuses on initial teacher training through partnerships between higher education institutions and schools in the public elementary education system, involving teachers from both institutions to train undergraduate students. For these teacher trainers from higher education institutions and schools, *Pibid* has the character of continuing education. *Pnaic*, on the other hand, focuses on the continuing education of literacy teachers in these networks, mobilizing them through in-service, peer-to-peer training conducted by higher education institutions. Regardless of their differences, these programs have in common a complex institutional design that involves relations between the three federal entities – the federal government, state governments and municipal governments – through partnerships established between higher education institutions and public basic education networks, as well as the establishment of higher education institutions as teacher training institutions.

In common, these programs also presented significant changes in their institutional arrangements from 2017–2018. These changes were induced by calls for proposals that modified part of their initial purpose and consensus built up until then among the various actors/institutions involved (Ramos, 2020; Nascimento Cock, 2022), despite having presented fruitful results since they were launched (Nascimento Cock, 2018, 2022; Campelo; Cruz, 2019; Ramos, 2020). Based on this problem, the aim of this study has been to analyze comparatively the institutional arrangements for implementing these two programs, taking as an empirical cutout the actors/institutions involved, the instruments and the political state capacities brought about by their public notices over time, and then seeking to understand the teacher training models they present, according to the interdisciplinary theoretical-methodological perspective of Nascimento Cock (2022).

In addition to this Introduction and the Conclusion, the article has two sections. In the first one, we present the theoretical-methodological framework, based on the approach of institutional arrangements for implementing public policies (Gomide; Pires, 2014; Pires, 2016; Pires; Gomide, 2016, 2018, 2021) and the discussion of third space, teacher training triangle and teacher training models (Zeichner, 2010; Sarti, 2012, 2021). In the second section, we highlight the characteristics of *Pibid* and *Pnaic* that were taken as objects of study for the comparative analyses of the case studies on the implementation of these programs in two federal institutions in the state of Rio de Janeiro. In the Conclusion, we present the limits and advances made by this study.



## Theoretical-methodological framework

In Public Policy, among the recent studies dedicated to analyzing the implementation stage of public policies are those developed with the approach of institutional arrangements for implementation, which had as their object of study a set of recent policies of Brazilian Federal Government (Gomide; Pires, 2014; Pires, 2016; Pires; Gomide, 2016, 2018, 2021). The institutional arrangement for implementing a public policy can be defined as “the set of rules, mechanisms and processes that define the particular way in which actors and interests are coordinated in a specific public policy” (Gomide; Pires, 2014, p. 19) and, according to the authors, it involves not only the different bureaucratic levels of actors, but also the instruments that guide their interactions in the implementation process.

Studies on the design of public policies are scarce in the literature. For a long time, this variable was reduced to a minor importance by its formulators, as it has been considered solved by the organizational structures within public administration. However, the analysis of institutional arrangements makes it possible to observe key variables to understand the definition of the actors involved in a public policy, how governance is carried out, the decision-making processes, and the autonomy degrees of the actors involved (Lotta; Galvão; Favareto, 2016).

Analyzing the institutional arrangement of a policy means drawing attention to the governance model implicit in its conduct, since it constitutes the decisions and actions of government bureaucracies. These decisions and actions are intertwined with the decisions of political and social actors, and they have repercussions on impasses and obstacles or on learning and innovations in public policies. These arrangements are filled by the instruments of public action that support their implementation (Gomide; Pires, 2014, Pires, 2016; Pires; Gomide, 2016, 2018, 2021).

Institutional arrangements provide the state with the capacity to carry out its objectives when implementing a public policy. In a democratic context, this capacity can be understood as having two components: the technical-administrative component, which includes the skills of state agents to carry out its policies, producing coordinated actions geared towards producing results; and the political component, which refers to the executive bureaucracy’s ability to expand the channels for dialogue and negotiation with the various social actors, processing conflicts and preventing capture by specific interests. According to the model proposed by the authors, based on the objectives of a policy, program or project, the achievement of its results depends on the institutional arrangement that is set up for its implementation. It is a question of understanding how the conformation of the implementation process, its arrangement and the capacities promoted, condition (or will condition) the results obtained (Gomide; Pires, 2014; Pires, 2016; Pires; Gomide, 2016, 2018, 2021).

In the comparative analysis of *Pibid* and *Pnaic* developed in this study, we have used this approach at a meso level of analysis, i.e. the implementation in the institutions involved. We consider the formulation and implementation of these policies dynamically as ongoing decision-making processes, which is one of the assumptions of recent studies on the implementation of public policies (Lotta, 2019). We have identified the actors and





institutions, paying attention to governance, the instruments involved, and the political state capacities produced by their implementation arrangements in the context of two federal high education institutions (HEIs) in the state of Rio de Janeiro.

According to Nascimento Cock (2022), to analyze *Pibid* and *Pnaic*, we also need to understand what they mean and/or aim to answer in the context of undergraduate courses, especially in the field of teacher training, about programs that are carried out in partnerships among higher education institutions and schools in public basic education. With this purpose, in a second stage of analysis, we have dialogued with the concepts of third space (Zeichner, 2010), teacher training triangle, and teacher training models (Sarti, 2012, 2021), in order to understand the teacher training model proposed for *Pibid* and *Pnaic*, through the relationships established between the agents involved in these programs' initial and continuing teacher training.

According to Zeichner (2010, p. 486), the idea of a third space comes from H. Bhabba's theory of hybridity and 'recognizes that individuals draw from multiple discourses to make sense of the world', involving the rejection of binarities, such as between professional practical knowledge and academic knowledge and between theory and practice, integrating what is commonly seen as competing discourses. In teacher training, the third space concerns the creation of hybrid spaces in programs that bring together teachers from basic and higher education, practical professional knowledge, and academic knowledge, to enhance the learning of future teachers, encouraging a more egalitarian status among its participants.

Zeichner's proposal is in line with the perspectives of Nóvoa (1999, 2017) and Sarti (2012; 2021), who contribute to reflecting on teacher training models. Sarti (2012) analyses and discusses teacher training models for Elementary School based on the "universityization" of teaching brought about by the current *LDB*. The author uses an analytical resource that she calls teacher training triangle, in which each vertex is occupied by agents with different capitals: teachers and institutions that represent them; universities, foundations and research institutes, with their specialists; and the public authorities, represented by the Education Departments and administrative bodies.

Teacher training triangle is an analytical resource that can be used to illustrate that different configurations result from privileged relationships between two of the vertices/agents, which characterize different teacher training models. The relationships are established more strongly between two vertices, leaving the third one to play the role of the dead element, without the possibility of direct action, even though it is considered fundamental to deal the cards for establishment of the game (Sarti, 2012). This analytical resource is based on the three triangles brought up by Nóvoa (1999) – pedagogical, political, and the one of knowledge –, for whom, in all the triangles, there is a process of excluding teachers from schools, although they are present in all the discourses on education.

We agree with Sarti (2012) when she says that when the relationship is preferably between school and university teachers, there are better conditions for the professionalization of teaching, which corroborates the propositions of Nóvoa (1999, 2017) and Zeichner (2010). However, it is important to think about the agent who would occupy the dead one's place in this configuration, as well as the appropriate framing of its minor participation, in this case, public power. It could not interfere in the direct actions



among the other agents, which goes against the regulatory function assumed as a trend in teacher training programs (Sarti, 2012).

However, we believe that their participation is essential to deal the cards, i.e. to offer the necessary instruments for establishing initial and continuing teacher training programs in third spaces between higher education institutions and schools. This configuration would also favor a model of teacher training with intergenerational interactions, through the increased participation of staff working in the professional field (Sarti, 2021), building a new institutional place for teacher training (Nóvoa, 2017).

Based on these references, we have compared the institutional arrangements for implementing *Pibid* and *Pnaic*, and then tried to understand what models of initial and continuing teacher training they present when proposing partnerships between higher education institutions and schools, and how the configurations and preferred relationships among the participating actors/institutions may have fluctuated because of the changes in their arrangements. In this comparative study, the three vertices that make up *Pibid* and *Pnaic*'s teacher training triangle are: high education institutions (training institutions, policy implementers), Education Departments/schools (spaces for professional activity, policy implementers at school level) and *MEC/Capes* (public authorities, policy formulators).

The methodology used in the comparative analysis is based on Krawczyk (2019), who lists different types of approaches applied in the study of educational policies: descriptive, qualitative, program evaluation, and comparative research. For this analysis, we have opted for comparative research, which enables the "interpretation of convergences and specificities in the implementation of global policies based on the historicity of contemporary phenomena" (Krawczyk, 2019, p. 5). Therefore, understanding the historicity of educational policy processes is fundamental and refers to the relationship among political, economic, and social forces present in the process of formulating and implementing a public policy.

Quantitative and qualitative data set was produced between 2016 and 2022 in studies that analyzed these programs individually, using qualitative approaches through case study strategies, from the perspective of their institutional implementation arrangements (Nascimento Cock, 2018, 2022; Ramos, 2020). These studies analyzed documents, primary and secondary quantitative data, spatial data, and semi-structured interviews with participants of the formulation – *MEC* and *Capes* – and implementation stages. In this study, we have moved on from these previous studies by carrying out comparative analysis of their implementation arrangements. The empirical sample covered *Pibid* calls for proposals from 2007 to 2020, and *Pnaic* from 2012 to 2018.

## **Implementation arrangements and teacher training in *Pibid* and *Pnaic*: a comparative analysis**

*Pibid* was created to be a program to encourage and value teaching and also to improve the process of training teachers for basic education, connecting training institutions (HEIs) and public schools, which are the field schools. The *Pibid* participants are guided by area coordinators – teachers from higher education institutions – and



supervisors – teachers from public schools, who act as co-trainers. These undergraduates carry out teaching initiation activities at the HEIs and at the field schools of their respective supervisors. The institutional coordinator completes this group. He/she is a professor at the HEI, interlocutor with *Capes* and responsible for the Institutional Project, which includes subprojects of the areas/graduate courses participating in the program at each HEI.

*Pibid* was designed for federal HEIs when it was launched in December 2007 (Brasil, 2007c), and its institutionalization in the National Teacher Training Policy for Basic Education occurred later, through Decree No. 7,219, of June 24, 2010 (Brasil, 2010). Until 2020, eight *Pibid* calls for proposals were announced (2007, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2018 and 2020), which included HEIs from all public and private administrative categories. In 2010 and 2013, two specific calls for proposals were launched for public and private non-profit HEIs with degrees in Rural Education and Indigenous Intercultural Education, called the Institutional Scholarship Program for Teaching Initiation for Diversity (*Pibid* Diversity), which was a specific modality of the program.

Until 2013 calls for proposals, *Pibid* had a progressive expansion of participating HEIs and degree courses, encompassing all areas of knowledge, interdisciplinary sub-projects, *Pibid* Diversity, and a significant number of scholarship holders from all categories. According to data from 2013 Capes Information Dissemination System (*SDI*, in Portuguese), *Pibid* was the second largest scholarship program linked to Basic Education Teacher Training Department (*DEB*, in Portuguese). In 2014, there were 90,254 scholarship holders including all modalities, 284 *Pibid* Projects and 29 *Pibid* Diversity Projects at HEIs in the five regions of the country and of different administrative categories (CAPES, 2013; Gatti *et al.*, 2014; Nascimento Cock, 2018, 2022).

In the time frame of this research, we have divided *Pibid* into two major periods: the first one covers the calls for proposals from 2007 to 2013, which ran until March 2018. During that period, *Pibid* maintained its institutional implementation arrangement with incremental changes in its instruments and resources, which resulted in a considerable growth in scholarships in all modalities, in the number of HEIs and participating education networks. The priority degree areas/courses in 2007 – natural and exact sciences – as well as the levels of basic education – High Schools – were no longer compulsory throughout the period.

The schools were chosen by high education institutions through specific selection processes for supervising teachers whose, upon being approved, schools became part of the HEIs' institutional projects as field schools. The partnerships between the institutions were formalized by signing a term of adhesion, an instrument signed at local level between the HEI and the field schools, which formalized the system of collaboration between the federative entities through the Education Departments, but in a direct relationship between the HEIs and the field schools. In that arrangement, the participation proposed for the Education Departments was indirect, i.e. only authorizing the partnerships of schools whose supervisors had already been approved in the HEI selection processes. It was up to the HEIs to confirm the partnerships through their institutional coordinators, informing *DEB/Capes* about the field schools on a specific form.





The second phase of *Pibid* includes calls for proposals 07/2018 (Brasil, 2018a) and 02/2020 (Brasil, 2020), implemented between August 2018 and April 2022. During this period, *Pibid* suffered a considerable reduction in grants, with the participation of HEIs and degree courses, and *Pibid* Diversity modality ceased to exist. For this analysis, we first highlight the proposal of *DEB/Capes* to give greater decision-making power to the Education Departments for the selection and prior qualification of the field schools that would be part of the HEIs' institutional projects. With this change, we can see in the analysis a reconfiguration of the *Pibid* implementation arrangement.

New governance was proposed for the program, as well as new instruments in this second phase of *Pibid*, which constituted a new institutional implementation arrangement. In call 07/2018, non-state actors, such as the National Council of Education Secretaries (*Consed*, in Portuguese) and the National Union of Municipal Education Directors (*Undime*, in Portuguese), were considered co-participants with *Capes*. They were supposed to work with the Departments of Education to encourage them to join partnership programs with higher education institutions to train teachers within their networks. These institutions should also form, together with representatives of the State Education Councils (*CEE*, in Portuguese), the National Union of Municipal Education Councilors (*Uncme*, in Portuguese) and the federal and state HEIs, a Teacher Training Articulation Committee in each state to monitor the implementation of *Pibid* and other teacher training programs (CAPES, 2018). However, despite the proposal for new governance, according to the *Capes* managers interviewed, this Committee was not set up, and the participation of these non-state actors remained at the level of formulation.

In call 02/2020, the governance structure with the participation of non-state actors ceased to exist, and a technical cooperation agreement was signed only between *Capes* and the HEIs with approved institutional projects. The proposal for greater decision-making power for the Education Departments for the selection and prior qualification of field schools remained. On this point, we highlight the importance of *Capes* Basic Education Platform, initially called Freire Platform, since call 07/2018. The platform has become the *Pibid* management tool for *DEB/Capes*, which concentrates data from the HEIs, all scholarship holders, education networks, and participating schools.

In theory, all the supervisors selected by the HEIs should be from schools that had already been selected and qualified by the Education Departments. According to a report by one of the managers at *Capes*, the use of the Platform to register the schools by the Departments was designed as an instrument precisely for this purpose and nowadays it has become the program's main management and database production instrument.

In the context of implementing *Pibid*, according to the reports of the institutional coordinators interviewed, since *Capes* 07/2018 call for proposals, there has been greater bureaucratization of the implementation processes, sometimes impacting on its speed. The proposal for greater participation by the education networks in the institutionalization of teacher training policy for basic education was well accepted, which resulted in the restructuring of their General Degree Collegiate. However, the program continued to be conducted based on HEI decisions, even though the qualification of field schools was now carried out by Education Departments through the Platform. The final decision on



the choice of field schools remained linked to the selection processes for supervisors, conducted by the HEI through the area coordinators of the subprojects, with the Education Departments being responsible for making changes to the qualification of field schools when necessary.

*Pnaic* was created as a nationwide public policy in favor of children's literacy, with the main strategy of the continued training of literacy teachers. Launched as a pact among the federal government, states, cities, and the Federal District, it mobilized different actors and institutions around the commitment to literacy and had a sense of calling for participation and adherence by the states, which was a condition for the cities to adhere as well. This adhesion promoted by the federal government ensured a very significant reach and, according to information from *MEC*, corresponded to the adhesion of 5,276 cities in 2013, among the 5,570 cities in the country. The collaborative model involving the different federal spheres, provided for *Pnaic* implementation arrangement, also included the participation of *Undime* and Higher Education Institutions. Considering this, the Basic Education Department of the Education Ministry coordinated and dialogued with the universities so that they would join in and receive the resources to develop training activities for teachers.

*Pnaic's* training configuration used to provide the possibility of activities to happen in-service and closer to school. Based on a multiplier model, these training activities were carried out under the coordination of the HEIs that trained instructors. The instructors trained study advisors (or local trainers), who trained literacy teachers, creating collaborative networks for teacher training. In addition to face-to-face continuing education for literacy teachers, *Pnaic's* actions were organized around three other points: teaching materials, literary productions, and pedagogical support games; systematic evaluations; and management, mobilization, and social control. Among the legal instruments for regulation and control, *MEC* developed *Sispacto*, which was part of *MEC's* Integrated System for Monitoring, Execution and Control (*SIMEC*, in Portuguese), in order to follow up and monitor *Pnaic's* training actions. These mechanisms used to respond to different demands for transparency and accountability.

*Pnaic's* implementation arrangement involved a Management Committee made up of a state collegiate body with representatives from the Education State Department, higher education institutions and representatives from *Undime*, *Uncme* and *Consed*. In the case of Rio de Janeiro, the training activities took place in representative cities and at regional seminars, which brought the Management Committee closer to the Municipal Education Departments and established a more horizontal relationship between the university and basic education.

The management of the program within the municipal network was responsibility of the municipal coordination of *Pnaic*, under charge of Municipal Education Departments, and involved a preferential relationship with schools, as well as the monitoring of all actions and the communication with the state coordination. Among the control mechanisms, the city's formal adhesion to *Pnaic* also required the implementation of a large-scale assessment of literacy, which would provide data for its development. Although National Literacy Assessment (*ANA*, in Portuguese) was instituted in 2013 and integrated into the Basic Education Assessment System (*SAEB*, in Portuguese), it has not been regularly applied.



Universities played a leading role in the implementation of *Pnaic*, not only in training activities, but also in the management of resources, unlike the national literacy policies that preceded it. However, with decree number 826, of July 7, 2017 (Brasil, 2017), *Pnaic* underwent reformulations, so that continuing education began to cover not only literacy teachers, but also those who worked in pre-school, such as pedagogical coordinators, school leaders, and learning mediators from schools participating in the New More Education Program (*PNME*, in Portuguese). This decree also determined that the management of the program should be responsibly of the State Education Departments, as a way of inducing the state governments to take on the role of coordinating municipal policies. This change led to the discontinuation of *Pnaic* in many states and cities and, with the political change in the federal government, it ended up in 2018.

It is important to highlight that both *Pibid* and *Pnaic* articulate in their institutional arrangement the federal government's collaboration regime, with states, cities, and Federal District, for the creation and execution of educational policies related to the reforms brought about by 1988 Federal Constitution (FC/88). For example, the conception of the "new" *Capes* is part of one of the scenarios of this national legislation reform, which triggered a movement to recentralize educational policies, in parallel to the decentralization process affirmed as a federative principle by FC/88. In this new scenario, the federal executive became the policy maker, establishing the rules for redefining responsibilities among federative entities, expanding functions to control quality, evaluation, and financing of policies for the initial and continuing training of basic education teachers (Scheibe, 2011).

Although the design of these two educational policies foresaw the sharing of political responsibility among federal, state, and municipal actors, and HEI actors, *Pnaic* already had the participation of non-state actors, such as *Undime* and *Consed*, from the outset, which allowed greater capillarity, considering that it was a policy of continuing in-service training within public education networks. It is worth noting that although *Pnaic*'s institutional arrangement took place through this governance structure, the program was implemented through training activities being carried out by higher education institutions, which also had control of the financial resources. However, with the changes in legislation in 2017, *Pnaic*'s arrangement also changed, giving a leading role to the State Departments with an emphasis on management. Thus, continuing education could be carried out by the university or not, as long as it was at the invitation of the State Department, and no longer as a member of the Management Committee.

In the case of *Pibid*, when *Capes* proposed a greater role for the Education Departments in choosing and qualifying field schools, as well as a new governance structure including *Consed*, *Undime*, and other non-state actors/institutions, starting with 2018 call for proposals, there was a tendency for relations between *Capes* itself and the Departments to become closer. This has left the higher education institutions in a dead role, since they have not been called upon to participate in decisions about changes in the policy, even though they are the training institutions and those responsible for *Pibid*'s institutional projects. Despite this, in the *Pibid* case analyzed, we have seen actions taken by the program's managers at the institution to maintain the configuration of its relations with Education Departments and field schools, as the case at the beginning of *Pibid*'s



implementation at the institution in 2010, within the scope of call 02/2009 (Brasil, 2009). Therefore, in the case analyzed, the relationships among the agents participating in the *Pibid* teacher training triangle were maintained more directly between the HEI and the field schools within each subproject, being the supervising teachers the central actors in this articulation.

In the case of *Pnaic*, the replacement of universities by the State Education Departments (Brasil, 2017) in the general coordination meant a loss of the positional value that universities had in their first arrangement, causing political conflicts. In the case analyzed, however, the initial configuration of the first arrangement was maintained, in partnership with HEIs.

It is important to emphasize that the changes in the institutional arrangements for *Pibid* and *Pnaic* took place in the same political context and were affected by the consequences of political, social, and economic instability, among which we can mention the progressive contingency of resources that limited public spending on education and health for twenty years (Brasil, 2016). In fact, one of the changes resulting from *Pnaic* legislation in 2017 was the suspension of scholarships for literacy teachers (2017a). In *Pibid*, there have been changes in relation to funding and capital. During the 07/2018 call, only funding was maintained through a specific program called *ProF Licenciatura* (Brasil, 2018b), which finished during the 02/2020 call. Scholarships for undergraduates also decreased considerably during the period of *Pibid*'s reconfiguration, when compared to the previous period, until call for proposals 61/2013.

Despite the changes in the institutional arrangements of *Pibid* and *Pnaic* that were induced by the calls for proposals, we could also see innovations on the part of the implementers. In the case of *Pnaic*, for example, the active involvement of managers and teachers in the state of Rio de Janeiro resulted in the maintenance of training activities for literacy teachers even in 2019, when the program had already been discontinued by the federal government. This initiative came from the recognition that it was essential to strengthen the connections between school and university teachers, who were historically distant, in the teacher training game (Sarti, 2012). In addition, the initiative reinforces the understanding that the relationships established between school and university teachers meant a conquest of better conditions for teacher professionalization.

The teacher training model established with the implementation of *Pnaic* in Rio de Janeiro brought about an important and necessary dialogue, which mobilized the participants when the legislation changed. At that time, some innovative strategies emerged, including maintaining this partnership model through face-to-face or remote training activities via web conferences. In order to maintain the connection between university and everyday school life, *Pnaic/RJ* Virtual Learning Space was developed as an environment for discussion and exchange of experiences. It is also worth remembering that the training activities developed by *Pnaic* allowed the creation of specific areas in the Municipal Education Departments of many cities, which started developing their own literacy policies.



## Conclusion

The comparative analysis of *Pibid* and *Pnaic* show that both programs mobilized federative relations in their respective institutional implementation arrangements, involving actors/institutions from different public spheres. The collaboration system established was intended to encourage dialogue between them so that the training activities could reach the classroom according to the needs of students in the school networks and trainees. Regarding instruments used in both *Pibid* and *Pnaic*, the certification of training activities and the distribution of grants functioned as important material and symbolic incentives, playing a strong role in inducing the participation of HEIs and public education networks.

The comparative study showed that high education institutions played a central role in conducting training activities in both programs, despite changes proposed by the formulators of *Pnaic* in 2017, and of *Pibid* in 2018. The union of HEIs and schools seems to have been one of the great contributions of these programs, reducing the distance between academic knowledge produced in universities and teaching knowledge produced in classroom. It has established a more horizontal relationship based on a training model that connected HEI-schools vertices in a more direct and organic way, forming a third space, a place in between with effective partnerships among these institutions. The relationship with education departments was indirect, regardless of occupying the same vertex as schools.

Changes in the program regulations brought proposals for other configurations, inducing education departments to play a more significant role in their implementation decision-making processes. We can say that institutional arrangements were being proposed based on training models that tended to put HEIs in a “dead” role, favoring relations between education departments/schools-*MEC/Capes*. This situation is contrary to what research in the field of teacher training points out about the most fruitful teacher training models, both for initial and continuing training (Zeichner, 2010; Sarti, 2012, 2021; Nóvoa, 1999, 2017). As teacher training institutions, HEIs cannot occupy the “dead” role, because there is the risk of detaching trainings from research and theory combined with practice, resulting in an overvaluation of teaching practice to the detriment of specific knowledge necessary for teaching professionalization.

The comparative analysis has showed that these changes in the institutional arrangements of *Pibid* and *Pnaic* (with the years 2017-2018 as turning points) are related to the political dimension of educational policy, which can be seen in the changes proposed for their governance structures. In terms of implementation, initially there was an effort to induce greater adherence from HEIs and stakeholders, involving the distribution of resources as an incentive for participation and space for establishing partnerships between HEIs and schools, although the change in arrangements led to a suspension of resources and greater bureaucratization of processes. These changes also led to conflicts and consequent discontinuity in the case of *Pnaic*, even with efforts of the implementers to maintain the partnerships and previous activities that had produced positive results. In the case of *Pibid*, HEI tried to maintain its leading role in running the program as a way of avoiding the reconfiguration of the program within *Capes*.





This comparative study points to the importance of paying attention to the institutional arrangements for implementing educational policies by analyzing aspects of formulation and implementation in a dynamic way, especially teacher training programs with partnerships between universities and schools, without neglecting the political aspects and instruments of public action that are mobilized to carry out these programs. Based on *Pibid* and *Pnaic*, we highlight the effectiveness of teacher training programs when partnerships are established in a close and horizontal way between training institutions and teachers' professional activities, effectively valuing their agents' knowledge.

## References

BRASIL. **Aviso de Chamamento Público MEC/Capes/FNDE n.º 01, de 12 de dezembro de 2007.** Seleção pública de propostas de projetos de iniciação à docência voltados ao Programa Institucional de Iniciação à Docência. Brasília, DF: [s. n.], 2007c.

BRASIL. **Decreto nº 3.276, de 6 de dezembro de 1999.** Dispõe sobre a formação em nível superior de professores para atuar na educação básica, e dá outras providências. Brasília, DF: [s. n.], 1999.

BRASIL. **Decreto n.º 7.219, de 24 de junho de 2010.** Dispõe sobre o Programa Institucional de Bolsa de Iniciação à Docência e dá outras providências. Brasília, DF: [s. n.], 2010.

BRASIL. **Edital Capes n.º 061, de 02 de agosto de 2013.** Programa Institucional de Bolsa de Iniciação à Docência. Brasília, DF: [s. n.], 2013.

BRASIL. **Edital Capes n.º 02, de 06 de janeiro de 2020.** Programa Institucional de Bolsa de Iniciação à Docência – Pibid. SEI/Capes Processo n.º 23038.018672/2019-68. Brasília, DF: [s. n.], 2020.

BRASIL. **Edital Capes n.º 07, de 01 de março de 2018** – Retificado em 27 de março de 2018. Chamada Pública para Apresentação de Propostas para o Programa Institucional de Bolsa de Iniciação à Docência. Brasília, DF: [s. n.], 2018a.

BRASIL. **Edital Capes/DEB n.º 02, de 25 de setembro de 2009.** Chamada Pública Edital do Programa Institucional de Bolsa de Iniciação à Docência – Pibid. Brasília, DF: [s. n.], 2009.

BRASIL. Emenda Constitucional nº 95, de 15 de dezembro de 2016. Altera [...] Regime Fiscal e dá outras providências. **Diário Oficial da União**, Brasília, DF, 2016.

BRASIL. **Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996.** Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. Brasília, DF: [s. n.], 1996.

BRASIL. **Lei nº 10.172, de janeiro de 2001.** Institui o Plano Nacional de Educação para o decênio 2001-2010, e dá outras providências. Brasília, DF: [s. n.], 2001.

BRASIL. **Lei n. 11.502, de 11 de julho de 2007.** Modifica as competências e a estrutura organizacional da Fundação Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior – Capes. Brasília, DF: [s. n.], 2007a.



BRASIL. **Lei nº 13.005, de 25 de junho de 2014.** Dispõe e aprova sobre o Plano Nacional de Educação – PNE e dá outras providências. Brasília, DF: [s. n.], 2014.

BRASIL. **O Plano de Desenvolvimento da Educação:** razões, princípios e programas. Ministério da Educação (MEC). Brasília, DF: [s. n.], 2007b.

BRASIL. Orientações Gerais. Rede Nacional de Formação Continuada de Professores. **Catálogo 2008**, Brasília, DF, p. 1-35, 2008.

BRASIL. **Portaria nº 826, de 7 de julho de 2017.** Dispõe sobre o [...] PNAIC, suas ações, diretrizes gerais e a ação de formação no âmbito do Programa Novo Mais Educação – PNME. Brasília, DF: [s. n.], 2017.

BRASIL. **Portaria nº 867, de 04 de julho de 2012.** Institui o Pacto Nacional pela Alfabetização na Idade Certa e as ações do Pacto e define suas diretrizes gerais. Brasília, DF: [s. n.], 2012.

BRASIL. **Portaria Capes n.º 219, de 27 de setembro de 2018.** Institui e regulamenta o Programa de Fomento à Formação de Professores da Educação Básica (ProF Licenciatura). Brasília, DF: [s. n.], 2018b.

CAMPELO, Talita da Silva; CRUZ, Giseli Barreto. O Edital Capes nº 07/2018 e a reconfiguração do Pibid: sentidos de docência em disputa. **Revista Práxis Educacional**, Vitória da Conquista, v. 15, n. 33, p. 69-90, jul./set. 2019.

CAPES. Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior. **Acordo de Cooperação Técnica n.º 6/2018.** SEI/Capes Processo n.º 23038.007085/2018-62. Brasília, DF: Capes, 2018.

CAPES. Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior. **Relatório de Gestão Pibid 2009-2013.** Diretoria de Formação de Professores da Educação Básica – DEB. Brasília, DF: Capes, 2013.

GATTI, Bernadete Angelina; ANDRÉ, Marli Eliza Dalmazio; GIMENES, Nelson. Antonio Simão; FERRAGUT, Laurizete. **Um estudo avaliativo do Programa Institucional de Bolsa de Iniciação à Docência (Pibid).** São Paulo: FCC/SEP, 2014.

GOMIDE, Alexandre de Ávila; PIRES, Roberto Rocha Coelho. **Capacidades estatais e democracia:** arranjos de políticas públicas. Brasília, DF: IPEA, 2014.

KRAWCZYK, Nora. A política educacional e seus desafios na pesquisa: o caso do Brasil. **Revista de Estudos Teóricos y Epistemológicos en Política Educativa**, Ponta Grossa, v. 4, p. 1-9, 2019.

LOTTA, Gabriela Spanghero. A política pública como ela é: contribuições dos estudos sobre implementação para a análise de políticas públicas. In: LOTTA, Gabriela Spanghero. (org.) **Teorias e análises sobre implementação de políticas públicas no Brasil.** Brasília, DF: ENAP, 2019. p. 11-38.

LOTTA, Gabriela Spanghero; GALVÃO, Maria Cristina Costa Pinto; FAVARETO, Arilson da Silva. Análise do Programa Mais Médicos à luz dos arranjos institucionais: intersectorialidade, relações federativas, participação social e territorialidade. **Ciência & Saúde Coletiva**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 21, p. 2761-2772, 2016.



NASCIMENTO COCK, Juliana Cristina Araujo do. **Estudo de revisão do arranjo institucional de políticas: o caso do Programa Institucional de Bolsa de Iniciação à Docência (Pibid)**. 2018. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2018.

NASCIMENTO COCK, Juliana Cristina Araujo do. **Quem conduz e para onde vai o Pibid? Arranjos de implementação e modelos formativos de professores: um estudo de caso em uma instituição pública de ensino superior**. 2022. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2022.

NÓVOA, António. Firmar a posição como professor, afirmar a profissão docente. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 47, n. 166, p. 1106-1133, 2017.

NÓVOA, António. Prefácio à segunda edição. *In*: NÓVOA, António. **Profissão professor**. 2. ed. Porto: Porto Editora, 1999. p. 7-12.

PIRES, Roberto Rocha Coelho. Arranjos institucionais para implementação de políticas e ações em Direitos Humanos. *In*: DELGADO, Ana Luíza de Menezes; GATTO, Carmen Isabel; REIS, Maria Stela; ALVES, Pedro Assumpção (org.). **Gestão de políticas públicas de direitos humanos**. Brasília, DF: Enap, 2016. p. 189-210. Coletânea.

PIRES, Roberto Rocha Coelho; GOMIDE, Alexandre de Ávila. Arranjos de implementação e ativação de capacidades estatais para políticas públicas: o desenvolvimento de uma abordagem analítica e suas repercussões. **Boletim de Análise Político-Institucional**, Brasília, DF, n. 29, p. 49-59, jun. 2021.

PIRES, Roberto Rocha Coelho; GOMIDE, Alexandre de Ávila. Governança e capacidades estatais a partir da abordagem dos arranjos e instrumentos de políticas públicas. **Boletim de Análise Político-Institucional**, Brasília, DF, v. 19, p. 25-32, 2018.

PIRES, Roberto Rocha Coelho; GOMIDE, Alexandre de Ávila. Governança e capacidades estatais: uma análise comparativa de programas federais. **Revista de Sociologia e Política**, Curitiba, v. 24, p. 121-143, 2016.

RAMOS, Maria Elizabete Neves. **O Pacto Nacional pela Alfabetização na Idade Certa (PNAIC) no Rio de Janeiro: implementação e (re) formulação da política**. 2020. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2020.

SARTI, Flávia Medeiros. O triângulo da formação docente: seus jogadores e configurações. **Educação e Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 38, n. 2, p. 323-338, 2012.

SARTI, Flávia Medeiros. Relações intergeracionais no mercado brasileiro de formação docente: antigos e novos desafios a considerar. **Pro-Posições**, Campinas, v. 32, e20180082, p. 1-21, 2021.

SCHEIBE, Leda. O Conselho Técnico-Científico da Educação Básica da Capes e a formação docente. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 41, n. 144, 2011.

SHIROMA, Eneida Oto; MORAES, Maria Celia Marcondes de; EVANGELISTA, Olinda. **Política educacional**. 4. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Lamparina, 2011.



TANURI, Leonor Maria. História da formação de professores. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, Rio de Janeiro, n. 14, 2000.

ZEICHNER, Kenneth. Repensando as conexões entre a formação na universidade e as experiências de campo na formação de professores em faculdades e universidades. **Educação**, Santa Maria, v. 35, n. 3, p. 479-504, 2010.

*Received on September 22, 2022*

*Approved on June 12, 2023*

**Editor:** Profa. Dra. Marília Pinto Carvalho

**Juliana Cristina Araujo do Nascimento Cock** holds a PhD in education (PUC-Rio). She is Assistant Professor in the Department of Education, Politics and Society (DEPS/UFES). She is also leader of the study and research Group on Geographical Education and Educational Public Policies (GeoPEd – UFES/CNPq).

**Maria Elizabete Neves Ramos** holds a PhD in education (PUC-Rio) and she is a researcher at Education Assessment Laboratory (LAEd/PPGE/PUC-Rio). She does a post-doctoral internship as a grant recipient of FAPERJ Post-Doctorate Grade 10 Program in PUC-Rio's Department of Education.