

ARTIGO

PIBID: CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT THE ROLE OF TEACHERS OF BASIC EDUCATION IN THE PROCESS OF INITIATION TO TEACHING**NATALIA NEVES MACEDO DEIMLING**¹ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8394-3132>**ALINE MARIA DE MEDEIROS RODRIGUES REALI**²ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4915-8127>

ABSTRACT: In this article we aim to analyze how the guidelines of the Institutional Program of Teaching Initiation Scholarship have been developed and interpreted by different subjects in the training and professional performance of teachers supervising Basic Education. For that, we conducted semi-structured interviews with 18 teachers (coordinators, collaborators and supervisors) and 48 students from four PIBID subprojects of a Brazilian Federal University between 2013 and 2014. Among other aspects, the results indicate that, while there are teachers who take the PIBID as a space for training and collaborative work, contributing to their professional development and the learning of the undergraduates, there are also those who do not commit themselves to the objectives of the Program, do not consider it as a training space, and contribute little to the training of students.

Keywords: Teacher training, Teaching Initiation Program, School-University Integration.

PIBID: CONSIDERAÇÕES SOBRE O PAPEL DOS PROFESSORES DA EDUCAÇÃO BÁSICA NO PROCESSO DE INICIAÇÃO À DOCÊNCIA

RESUMO: Neste artigo temos por objetivo analisar de que maneira as orientações do Programa Institucional de Bolsa de Iniciação à Docência têm sido desenvolvidas e interpretadas por diferentes sujeitos na formação e atuação profissional de professores supervisores da educação básica. Para tanto, foram realizadas entrevistas semiestruturadas com 18 professores (coordenadores, colaboradores e supervisores) e 48 estudantes de quatro subprojetos do PIBID de uma universidade federal brasileira entre os anos de 2013 e 2014. Entre outros aspectos, os resultados indicam que enquanto existem professores que tomam o PIBID como espaço de formação e de realização de um trabalho colaborativo, contribuindo para o seu desenvolvimento profissional e para a aprendizagem dos licenciandos, existem também aqueles que não se comprometem com os objetivos do Programa, não o consideram como espaço formativo e pouco contribuem com a formação dos estudantes.

Palavras-chave: Formação de Professores, Programa de Iniciação à Docência, Integração Escola-Universidade.

¹ Federal Technological University of Paraná. Campo Mourão, PR, Brazil. <natanema@gmail.com>

² Federal University of São Carlos. São Carlos, SP, Brazil. <alinereali@gmail.com>

PIBID: CONSIDERACIONES SOBRE EL PAPEL DE LOS PROFESORES DE LA EDUCACIÓN BÁSICA EN EL PROCESO DE INICIACIÓN A LA DOCENCIA

RESUMEN: En este artículo tenemos como objetivo analizar de qué manera las orientaciones del Programa Institucional de Beca de Iniciación a la Docencia han sido desarrolladas e interpretadas por diferentes sujetos en la formación y actuación profesional de profesores supervisores de la educación básica. Para tanto, realizaron entrevistas semiestructuradas con 18 profesores (coordinadores, colaboradores y supervisores) y 48 estudiantes de cuatro subproyectos de PIBID de una universidad federal brasileña entre los años de 2013 y 2014. Entre otros aspectos, los resultados indican que mientras existen profesores que toman el PIBID como espacio de formación y de realización de un trabajo colaborativo, contribuyendo para su desarrollo profesional y para el aprendizaje de los licenciandos, existen también aquellos que no se comprometen con los objetivos del Programa, no lo consideran como espacio formativo y poco contribuyen con la formación de los estudiantes.

Palabras clave: Formación de Profesores, Programa de Iniciación a la Docencia, Integración Escuela-Universidad.

INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS

The Institutional Program of Teaching Initiation Scholarship (PIBID) was laid out by the Ministry of Education (MEC), the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES) and the National Fund for the Development of Education (FNDE), through Normative Ordinance No. 38 of December 12, 2007³ and regulated by Decree No. 7219 of June 24, 2010.⁴ PIBID grants scholarships both to students who are regularly enrolled in undergraduate courses and to coordinators and supervisors responsible for the development of the project, with aid for related expenses.

In 2014, 284 Higher Education Institutions from all over the country participated in the PIBID, developing 313 teaching initiation projects in over 5000 public Elementary Schools, and in 2016, the number of active scholarships in the Program reached 72057, distributed among undergraduate students, and teachers from Basic Education and Higher Education. Recently, PIBID has undergone a reformulation, having been regulated by Gab Ordinance No. 45, of March 12, 2018 (BRASIL, 2018), in collaboration with the Pedagogical Residency Program, another training complementation program proposed by MEC for undergraduate courses. As a result of this reformulation, the scholarships for teaching initiation offered to the whole Brazil were reduced to a maximum of 45000.

According to Decree 7219/2010, the objectives of the PIBID are, among other things, “to encourage public schools of Basic Education, mobilizing their teachers as co-trainers of future teachers and making them protagonists in the initial formation process for the teaching profession” (BRAZIL, 2010, p. 4). Although the Program is one of the emergency solutions put in place by the federal government to try to fill the shortage of Basic Education teachers and reduce evasion of students in undergraduate degrees, we cannot disregard the importance of some of its set goals and their feasibility in terms of teacher training. Considering these aspects, this article aims to present an analysis of the influences of PIBID on the formation and professional performance of teachers, in this particular case, the supervising teachers⁵ of Basic Education, as well as on the role of these professionals in the process

³ Available at: http://portal.mec.gov.br/arquivos/pdf/portaria_pibid.pdf. Access on: Oct 02, 2019.

⁴ Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2007-2010/2010/decreto/d7219.htm. Access on: Oct 02, 2019.

⁵ According to Decree 7219/2010 (BRAZIL, 2010), the supervising teacher is a public school teacher who is integrated in the work project and receives the undergraduate scholarship students, to accompany and supervise them in their activities in the school.

of teaching initiation, based on the legal devices that underlie the Program and some of the studies that have formulated ideas and analyses on teacher training and performance.

The chosen category of analysis has been discussed in a qualitative scientific research⁶, which had documentary analysis and semi-structured interviews as the main instruments of data construction, and in triangulation and category creation, the instruments of data analysis (LÜDKE; ANDRÉ, 2013). In order to understand how the different subjects involved understand and evaluate the PIBID in the context of training and professional performance of teachers of Basic Education, interviews were conducted: with an institutional coordinator; two area coordinators of educational processes management; four area coordinators; four collaborating teachers; seven supervising teachers; and forty-eight scholarship students from four PIBID subprojects from a Brazilian Federal University throughout 2013 and 2014. The subprojects in question are linked to four distinct undergraduate courses: Teaching Degree in Physics, Teaching Degree in Language and Literature – Portuguese/English, Teaching Degree in Mathematics and Teaching Degree in Chemistry⁷.

The analysis and discussion of the data are supported by studies carried out during relevant works that discuss teacher training, as well as the legal bases that regulate and relate to PIBID, and the interpretation that the subjects who participate in this Program have about their contributions, limitations, challenges and influences, in this specific case, on the formation and performance of teachers supervising Basic Education in the process of teaching initiation.

For ethical reasons, the four PIBID subprojects analyzed in this study were randomly named A, B, C, and D. In addition, the names of participants and individuals cited by them were hidden and, where necessary, replaced by fictitious names. Similarly, the names of specific undergraduate courses/subjects have been replaced in the extracts by the term *specific content*, followed by a letter indicating the subproject. As such, the following codes were used to differentiate the reports by the subjects: Area Coordinator of Educational Processes Management (CG), Area Coordinator (CA), Supervisors (S), Collaborators (C) and Teaching Initiation Scholarships (B). Thus, at the end of each report, the acronym corresponding to the subproject analyzed is presented in parentheses, followed by the acronym corresponding to the narrator subject.

THE ROLE OF BASIC EDUCATION TEACHERS IN THE TEACHING INITIATION PROCESS

Different studies that discuss teacher training (MIZUKAMI, et al., 2002; SHULMAN, 2005; GARCÍA; VAILLANT, 2009; ZEICHNER, 2010; TARDIF, 2012, among others) have argued that practical experiences, combined with academic and scientific knowledge, are important events for an effective teacher learning. This articulation between theory and practice in teacher training, so defended and emphasized by the literature, could also be favored by PIBID, which aims, among other aspects, to articulate the academic formation of undergraduates to the knowledge coming from the school and university teachers' practice and experience. It is a training space for both undergraduates and teachers of Basic and Higher Education.

One of the objectives set by PIBID refers to the participation of Basic Education teachers in the formation of undergraduates in teaching degree courses, future teachers. This participation can contribute to the formation of students as well as to the formation of supervising teachers, since, when acting in the formation of students, the supervising teachers have the opportunity to analyze and modify their conceptions and also their practices, becoming autonomous, sensitive and aware of the complexity of the space in which they are inserted. In this process, both teachers and students learn. Moreover, by acting as co-trainers of future teachers, these professionals are also recognized by the University, which may further favor the approximation between Higher and Basic Education and the articulation between scientific and practical knowledge.

⁶ In this study, the approaches and methodological instruments used followed the ethical procedures established for scientific research in Human Sciences and were approved by an Ethics Committee in Research with Human Beings.

⁷ The analysis of different PIBID subprojects was due to the need to know different formative contexts and the fact that the University in question is a *multicampi* institution.

According to García (2010), many educational insertion programs developed in different countries have included the figure of the experienced teacher in the formation of future or novice teachers. For the author, this professional plays a major role in these training programs, as they are the person who helps, gives guidance and integrates the undergraduate or early career teacher into the school culture.

In many situations, the Basic Education faculty is devalued in relation to its knowledge. However, these teachers have a social function strategically as important as that of the scientific community and the groups considered to produce knowledge. Thus, it would be expected that there would be some prestige and positive social recognition of the role also played by these professionals in the process of producing social knowledge (TARDIF, 2012), as well as the knowledge about the practice they build. With the objective set by PIBID to place Basic Education teachers as co-protagonists in the initial formation of undergraduates, the recognition of the role of this professional and their knowledge, some of which are acquired by experience, is acknowledged.

In addition, students' contact with the knowledge and practices of teachers of Basic Education may also favor an articulation between educational policies and the needs and demands presented by the school reality and its professionals, one of the aspects pointed out as necessary by associations of educators and researchers for the elaboration of a global teacher training policy. As Libâneo (2005) points out, it is not possible to solve the issue of training policies without facing the interests, needs and difficulties encountered within the school itself and, in a broader perspective, within society itself. Hence the importance of this contact of the university and undergraduates with the school reality for the process of teacher training.

Often, the needs and demands of the school reality are not considered when designing and regulating educational policies and programs, and especially for teacher training. In many cases, the teacher, especially from Basic Education, is seen as a “consumer of reforms”, designed by national elites or, in some cases, imported from other countries. Throughout the 1990s and early 2000s an intense educational reform was promoted by international and national administrations convinced that improving the quality of education depended heavily on the training of their professionals. From this perspective, it translated a view of the teacher as responsible for the problems of teaching and as an “automatic” applicator of innovations, which they often did not even understand, and in whose formulation they certainly had no participation. This view of the teacher and the processes of formation, while ignoring and disregarding the reality and the social and historical conditions that generate this reality, depreciates the professional practice of teaching and considers that changes in education are linear processes that are implanted in a simplistic manner, as long as we know how to “explain” well to the teachers what they consist of (GARCÍA, 2010).

However, as García (2010) points out, change processes in both individuals and organizations do not work purely rationally. For the author, complex systems generate their own self-regulation processes to accommodate or modify the proposals for change, which do not always have the results predicted by the promoting instances. Therefore, there is a need for programs that relate directly to school needs and demands and that recognize the teacher as the subject of this training. In this sense, PIBID, by giving teachers of Basic Education the status of co-trainers of future teachers – which suggests their active participation – could contribute to the overcoming of this model of formation that aims only to “update” the teachers of Basic Education and make them mere performers of a process of which they were completely alienated.

In a paper that discusses the importance of practice in teacher education, Nóvoa (2009) argues precisely that teacher training should assume a practical component that takes into account the study of concrete cases, also having as reference the school work and the knowledge of the most experienced professionals. For the author, teacher education should include, among other aspects, the contact with the school institution and the learning with its professionals, since it is also in contact with the school and in dialogue with other teachers that the teaching profession is constituted. With this, the professional practices, as well as the scientific formation, would be transformed into knowledge and instituted as elements of formation.

However, it is important that this inclusion of undergraduates in the midst of teaching practices as well as their contact with experienced teachers of basic and higher education do not only contribute to the understanding of didactic-pedagogical cases or to the “creation and participation in methodological, technological and innovative teaching practices” (BRAZIL, 2010, p. 4), as proposed by PIBID, but mainly for the discussions regarding the social issues that bring about the conditions under which these experiments take place. These are issues that directly affect teacher training and performance, such as those related to the relevance and social role of the teacher, to the recognition of the importance of the teaching career, to the concrete and objective working conditions, to the financing of education, to the public policies for Basic Education and their intentions, to the relationship between the school and the community and between the community and the state, to the conceptions and fundamentals of education that permeate the programs and the organization of teaching, to the role of school management, among other aspects.

Similarly, the incorporation of practical knowledge cannot take place in an uncritical and decontextualized manner. On the contrary, it is necessary to establish the real links between the practice and the socio-historical conditions in which it is situated. The insertion of undergraduate students into school culture and their contact with teachers already in practice contribute to their formation as they provide, not their adaptation to the system or practices of these teachers, but on the contrary, their ability to analyze what happens based on the knowledge acquired at the university; knowledge that has been produced throughout history by theorists and scholars from the different fields of knowledge that aim to discuss the power and interest relations that permeate and determine the educational actions. The absence of this analysis may lead to the pure and simple uncritical imitation of observed behaviors, the development of a technical conception of teaching, a partial understanding of the educational process and, consequently, an alienation about work. We agree with Nóvoa (2009) when he states the need for a formation that also contemplates the historical process of the teaching profession, its social and political determinants, as well as the analysis of knowledge and the educational process in its different dimensions. Undergraduates' contact with school reality can contribute significantly to this global and dimensional understanding of education and the teaching profession even at the time of initial training.

Integrating this process of future teachers training, it is a further recommendation of PIBID that the work be done collectively. This work would be developed, as it is proposed, between experienced teachers - from university and school - and scholarship students from teaching initiation of the same subproject, not in a hierarchical relationship (in which, for example, academic knowledge overlaps with school and practical knowledge), but in a collaborative one, which would favor, again, the approximation between the training centers and the schools, an objective set by the Program. This need for collective work is also reinforced by some authors who discuss the theme. One of them is Nóvoa (2009), who points out the need for reinforcement of the collective and collaborative dimensions in school work and of the joint intervention in educational projects for the accomplishment of school work as well as for the professional development of teachers. According to the author, the school should be configured as a space for shared analysis of teaching practices, transforming the collective experience into professional knowledge.

Considering such aspects, collective work can also contribute to overcoming or minimizing the isolation that characterizes the teacher's work at school. According to García (2010), there is a major paradox in the teaching profession: while literature exposes the need for teachers to collaborate and work together, we have a reality of teachers taking refuge in the solitude of their classrooms. For the author, there is a great individualism in the work of teachers, which is also caused by the organization and school architecture itself in its distribution of space and time, which puts the interactions between teachers on the fringes of their daily work. García (2010, p. 16) further argues that teacher isolation has certain advantages and some obvious drawbacks for teachers, because while it facilitates individual work and frees teachers from some of the difficulties associated with shared work, they also “deprives them of their work stimulation by their colleagues and the possibility of getting the support needed to make progress throughout their careers”. For this reason, the author defends the collective and collaborative work among teachers, so that they can, in this work, recognize their difficulties, ask for help when necessary and also learn from their peers, thus converting their own individual experience into a collective one.

Having done an internal analysis of some of the objectives and dimensions of PIBID from studies that deal with teacher training and performance and with the role of the experienced professional in teacher training, we turn to the analysis of whether they have been met not only in formal terms, but also in real terms, while nevertheless considering the fact that policies, when implemented, are modified by the conditions and contexts in which they develop. For this part, it is also necessary to know what the subjects involved in the process think about the Program and how they interpret and conceive it in its formative aspect.

PIBID AND ITS INFLUENCES ON THE PROFESSIONAL FORMATION AND PERFORMANCE OF TEACHERS OF BASIC EDUCATION

All supervising teachers interviewed in our study have more than 10 years of experience in Basic Education and degrees in the subject they teach, which certainly contributes more solidly to their role as co-trainers in the process of discussion, planning, development and evaluation of actions within the scope of PIBID. By the way, the presence and participation of these supervisors in the planning and development of the Program activities are essential not only for the training of the teaching initiation scholarship students, but also for their own formation and contact with the university space. According to interview data, PIBID has also contributed to bring some teachers of Basic Education closer to this context and encouraged them to continue their formation, as we can see in the narratives of the institutional coordinator and two area coordinators:

And there's more, you bring together the supervisor and school with the university, that's also an interesting thing, so they end up seeing that the university is not that Olympus up there, inaccessible. No, everyone is a fellow teacher, and they end up interacting and becoming interested in the university as well. An example I have [...] is that we have two PIBID coordinators [supervising teachers] who are doing Masters with us, you see? [...] Their projects are not necessarily from PIBID, which still hurts, because I think we need to have more of these things, but even so it came up because they were supervisors of PIBID and they saw the formative need, you see? So PIBID is like a big bridge (CI, our emphasis).

Another thing I notice, like, there's already a supervising teacher, she is thinking of doing a Master's degree and she wants to see which university, because the university has a Master's degree in Education. So this also sparked in them the desire to continue studying, to return to study. The other teacher, besides being very involved with PIBID, I realized that he was very pleased to be involved with PIBID, he has already proposed to see if he would have a better time to come here in the afternoon to help, to come here in the afternoon to help the group because he teaches in the mornings and at night, so he said "I have the afternoons to come here" (BCA, our emphasis).

As we can see in the reports, there is a common idea among the interviewees that the approximation that PIBID promotes between university and school not only influences the formation of undergraduate scholarship students, but, in similar importance, the formation of others involved in the Program, especially that of supervising teachers of Basic Education. Such an idea can also be identified in the narratives of two area coordinators, a collaborating teacher and a teacher initiation scholarship student:

I think it's important for the teacher to come to the university, so, to see what there is at the university that we can take to the school, what there is at the school that we can bring to the university, I think it's this matter of narrowing existing ties and demystifying this in-out of school, but I think this is one of the things that still needs to be better worked on and developed. Teacher training should take place in these two spaces. So, we train our future teacher as we work to train the one who is already a teacher... that is very important (BC, our emphasis).

Mainly one of them [supervising teacher] had a big change... He was the one I most felt a change in his practice... He, and second, [the other supervising teacher], who is also the fourth supervising teacher. He incorporated the PIBID activities that we developed into his class and even though the students are not there to develop that practice... He develops, he takes that practice, he modifies it and he keeps doing it. He does it, the [other supervising teacher] does it and the other two don't, but they came to do their Masters here. So, I mean, it's a change... The other two are also in a school that is already harder to change [central/model school]. The other schools are more open. There is also that, the school needs to have this receptivity (ACA, our emphasis).

It is also possible to observe the influence of PIBID on the formation of supervising teachers in their own narratives. When asked about the Program's contributions to their education and professional performance, some reported:

Total, total, because I have not distanced myself from Higher Education, from academic education, from research. I did not distance myself from learning techniques, teaching techniques, from the academic students themselves. I think I did not distance myself from them and they really bring these ideas [...]. So, through them, I keep the bridge to novelty too. And from novelty to necessity. And even more with the teens. And even more with the coordination, because she has even more experience and in a very academic level, a postdoc. So all this here for me is such a source of knowledge, knowledge, knowledge (CS, our emphasis).

Oh, absolutely. It had been so long since I had been busy with different things. And here we, wow, *at the beginning we did a lot of reading, texts, [the area coordinator] brought us texts, books, so, in a way, we end up learning all that.* So the texts he brought, for us to read from time to time, helped a lot (DS, our emphasis).

Like with the intern, we have been doing a lot, I believe all our... it has changed a lot. *I say from my practice last year to my practice this year in class, I said, this year I taught, I saw myself, you know?* (BS, our emphasis).

From the reports, we can affirm that the PIBID has positively influenced the training of the interviewed supervisors, enabling them to contact the university environment and its professionals, and, as a consequence, the analysis of their practice based on discussions and reflections of a theoretical and academic nature. This is also one of the aspects discussed in the study by Gatti et al. (2014) and the research by Paredes (2012), Stanzani (2012) and Moura (2013), according to which PIBID greatly favors the continuing education of supervisors through their approach to the university, their knowledge, professionals and students.

Thus, it is possible to infer that the actions that have been performed by supervisors in the training of scholarship students have triggered, to some extent, a change in their own professional performance. This statement is in line with the discussions held by Tardif (2012), who, based on some of the ideas defended by Marx, affirms that all social praxis is, in a way, a work whose realization process triggers a real transformation in the worker. . To work, therefore, does not mean exclusively to transform an object or situation into something else, but also to transform oneself into and through work. So, the moment the teachers of Basic Education act in the formation of undergraduate students, they are at the same time acting in their own formation and modifying their own practice.

Having their education and work enriched, some of the supervising teachers tend to become involved in the Program and to act effectively as co-trainers of undergraduate students through discussion and elaboration, with them and others involved in the project, of ideas and activities aimed at contributing to teacher training and practice. Although according to some of the interviewed participants there are moments of conflict in this process of discussion and planning of activities - overlapping, in some cases, the idea coming from the university (initiation scholarship students, area coordinators and collaborators) or the school (supervising teachers) - in general, this process occurs in a collaborative way, as can be observed in the reports of some scholarship students and area coordinators:

Now [the supervising teacher] is different, he helps, he gives opinions, he says he can bring things, you know, if you need it. He gives ideas, he helps the group a lot. And even at intervention times he is always there to help, because we usually have a group of three, we usually separate them [students from Basic Education] into smaller groups, so he is always together. "Look, let's do it like this". So really, our now supervisor, there's nothing for us to complain about, he gives ideas, helps (AB, our emphasis).

[The supervisor teacher] is totally different. After the first one she said, "oh girls, you can work", *she brought us books on the subject of genders, exactly what we intended to work on, and took other materials that we didn't have access to so we could improve the class* and I find that very interesting, because I've never seen a teacher do that (CB, our emphasis).

So sometimes she comes up with some content, like, "It would be nice to work something out of it". They always ask, as a matter of experience, something like that, they always ask. [...] *He is always available and always helps us* (BB, our emphasis).

They participate, we do it like, they take the teacher's activity time, and they go in that day, they follow the teacher's activity, and at the time of the activity they sit down to plan with the teacher. *And this moment of the teacher's activity time, they sit and think together* (ACA, our emphasis).

From the reports she [supervisor] does and the reports the students are doing, *she, sometimes she is explaining and then stops and says to the students, "look I'm doing this for this and this and that". She teaches students and PIBID students there. And sometimes, in the other classes she told me that she calls attention first and lets them conduct a certain activity there. Then she has a little time after class and she makes comments to them. So, I think it's working. [...] She also participates, she suggests materials, she has knowledge and has been giving suggestions* (CCA, our emphasis).

In fact, considering PIBID's objectives, the active participation of supervising teachers becomes essential for the formation of those involved and for the discussion and development of the activities and practices performed. Furthermore, it is important that this participation takes place in a collaborative perspective so that everyone, school teachers, university teachers and students in training, can jointly discuss the proposed activities and objectives. This is also one of the ideas advocated by some studies and research that focus on PIBID. We have for example the research by Dorneles (2011), Gaffuri (2012) and Afonso (2013) and the study by Gatti et al. (2014), which, based on their results, state that the collaborative work provided by PIBID enables, among other aspects, the dialogue, problematization and sharing of teaching knowledge and experiences among experienced Basic Education teachers, undergraduates and university teachers.

Many of the studies that focus on teacher training (MIZUKAMI et al., 2002; REALI et al., 2005; REALI; TANCREDI, 2005; DAMIANI, 2008; NÓVOA, 2009; GARCÍA, 2010; ZEICHNER, 2010) show that the partnership between universities and schools is a fertile space for collaborative work *with* teachers, not just *for* teachers. In this perspective, discussion groups and meetings are used as a privileged space to get in touch with the reality of those who work, think and teach at school, as well as for the exchange of ideas and experiences, knowledge and practices among the different subjects who participate in these moments of formation, in which all come together moved by the need of the other's vision and knowledge for the constitution of their own training.

According to Mizukami et al. (2002), in this work perspective, knowledge should not be built in isolation, but in partnership between people who are at different levels of professional development, as is the case, for example, of PIBID. In it, the subjects involved are at different moments of formation and professional performance, and it is precisely this difference that, in some cases, has enriched the collaborative work and the analysis of the work developed under the Project. For Tardif (2012), such relationships and interactions are also an opportunity for teachers, along with other actors, to elaborate and re-elaborate their theoretical and experiential knowledge in the field of their practice, which also contributes, as a consequence, for the constitution and development of their own formation.

However, even though the Program is recognized as a field of training possibilities by the interviewed supervisors, and even considering the fact that some of them are acting positively in the formation of undergraduate students and developing collaborative work with the university, most participants of the study – between coordinators and scholarship students – stated that there are supervisors who work or have worked in the Program that do not understand the objectives of PIBID and, as a result, do not get involved with the Project and do not take it as a space and opportunity for training and of analysis on the practice. This statement can be illustrated, for example, in reports from interviews with the coordinators (institutional, management and area) participating in this study:

But there are also reports, it's noteworthy, I have, to me, that the relationship with the supervisor is not very good. That supervisors who go with the traditional view and do not collaborate and do not have this profile, they end up not being able to stay in PIBID, you see? [...] *They end up clashing with the students, with the academics who go there and end up not establishing a relationship.* Then what happens, we have a lot of change of supervisors [...]. And how do I know that? I interact in the system, it's me who, at the request of the coordinators, types it in and then out, you see? And so I have to justify to CAPES, and the justifications are usually these, "*supervisor doesn't collaborate with PIBID goals*". There's a lot of supervisory rotation, you know? I had some cases, you wouldn't believe it. *I have seen a supervisor who wanted to have two scholarships, such absurd things*, but they are inherent to the human being. Just as there are extremely proactive human beings, there are some who are not. And there is an interesting thing, *the money is very good for the supervisor, it pays almost a state standard, so really sometimes they go for*

the wrong reasons, they go for the money and such, so when they see the task relation, if they're people who are more traditional in nature, then they don't contribute, you know? (CI, our emphasis).

So at the beginning the difficulty was this, *the teacher who said "no, I'll go, I'll do it", that's fine, and then they didn't come to any meetings here at the institution [...] they didn't want to attend, never could, never could, never could, and when the PIBID students went to school, they weren't, because there was this thing, "oh, but there's going to be an intern in my class, I don't need to come".* And that's not how it is, teachers have to be in the classroom, meet the students in the corridor and such, so there was that, and on the other hand, the R\$750.00 scholarship is little, but it's almost a standard, isn't it? [...] So while it draws attention, it demands a lot. So we had this, schools that no one wanted to attend, and then schools that some wanted to attend *but didn't commit to doing the minimum that would be needed (GC, our emphasis).*

I have a supervising teacher who thinks it was enough for him to just open the doors of the classroom and let the students in, do the activities and leave, he doesn't get involved. [...] I already tried, I went there, I attended his classes, I made the planning, but that is him, it is his nature, he does not accept interference with his pedagogical practice. He is a teacher who is not open to change, he cannot be a supervisor of PIBID, so unfortunately, because like, he was very willing to receive us. But unfortunately he doesn't cooperate, he doesn't collaborate, and the supervisor has to be open, doesn't he? [...] I see why I am there, I go along. I see, and he leaves, I go after him, "oh I was called, I'll be right back, I was called there in the Administration", he disappears. And then I stay with the students in his classroom, and that does not give students the confidence to develop the activity in class. So when he comes back the students have already applied the activity, he didn't see it, he didn't participate, so it really is very difficult. Look, I think the biggest problem with the PIBIDs I've seen, from what I've been talking to my fellow coordinators, is for you to find supervisors who are committed and really embrace the cause of that kind of work. It is rare for you to find it. [...] They stay, they see the scholarship, the scholarship, at their salary, it's very good, it helps a lot, so they want to earn the scholarship, but they don't want to commit to the basic terms of commitment that they took up. My great criticism still is the supervising teachers; it is a great opportunity of approximation for us and one that many do not take, unfortunately (ACA, our emphasis).

It was a person who was very open at first, but then seems to have misunderstood exactly what the project was. He had relationship difficulties with certain students. The school administration also seems to me to have prioritized work with [another subproject]. [...] So, that was also the reason for changing schools. [...] There are some supervising teachers that unfortunately think, it seems, that the student is there to make do. So, I cannot now, can you? The teacher also needed to have more responsibility, you know? It's so easy to earn R\$700, R\$750 just to, that's fine, it's little if you think it's a job well done. You have 10 people to coordinate, organize at school, call and all that. But when they only get paid and don't... then it's complicated (CCA, our emphasis).

What I realize is not good, but I'm trying to correct it too, is that *they don't feel very comfortable with students entering their classes.* So I ask them to allow students to attend classes as listeners or even as someone making participant observation. I know some do that, but *they also leave activities for them to do outside the classroom because they feel more comfortable, I believe.* So let's say, they're letting students in, but if I wanted 100%, they're doing 30%, 40% and the rest of the activities they are outside or helping some students with some activities or reading school documents, regiment, all these things, *they always have an activity for the students, but it's not always what I would like it to be (DCA, our emphasis).*

As we can see, many of the teachers of Basic Education who intend to accompany and guide the insertion of undergraduate students in schools have not assumed this responsibility in practice. According to the coordinators interviewed, in their context, many of these professionals have been joining PIBID just for the opportunity to receive financial aid and, for this reason, they fail to get involved in the project and develop collaborative work that actually contributes both for the formation of the scholarship students and for their own training and professional performance. With this, there has been great rotation of supervisors, which, in a way, ends up hampering the progress of activities and objectives proposed by the Program for the training of those involved.

These aspects can also be evidenced by many of the reports presented by the undergraduate scholarship students in their interviews, according to which some of the supervising teachers who work in the subprojects do not understand the objectives of PIBID and, therefore, do not change their practices and do not collaborate effectively in their insertion and training in schools. Among the reports presented, we can highlight:

So far that we changed areas, we were at [center school] with a supervisor, but we had a problem with him, I don't know if he was too busy, but *he didn't participate so much in the project, so, he ceded classes when we needed to make some intervention, but he did not give any suggestions, he did not participate, he did not opine*, because he did not come to meetings here (AB, our emphasis).

It's been a year there, and little has changed, you see? And then there had to be some way, or a conversation, something with this supervisor and tell him, "Look, are you willing to learn together with us and not just teach? Because if you think you know everything, it gets difficult". As she said, she's two years from retirement, so it won't make a difference to her. That's the problem (BB, our emphasis).

Some did not quite understand the idea, but never rejected or sent the project away or dismissed it (CB, our emphasis).

Sometimes she [supervisor] even feels like "oh, since I have them, the PIBIDians, I won't even try so hard, it's beautiful and productive, so I won't even try hard to do just like them, I'll leave them to themselves, I'll continue the way I am", sometimes it seems like this, you know, it's weird (DB, our emphasis).

According to Ordinance 96/2013,⁸ it is the duty of the supervisor, among other aspects, to elaborate, develop and monitor the activities of the teaching initiation scholarship students (BRASIL, 2013). However, as we can see in the reports of the participants, just as there are teachers committed to this goal, there are also those who do not care to meet it, thus not contributing to the work proposed and developed under the Program by their participants. The lack of openness, planning and involvement of supervisors for the development of activities are some of the aspects pointed as limiting by the initiation scholarship students of the subprojects analyzed, which work directly with these teachers in schools and depend on their monitoring and co-orientation – allied to the orientation of the area coordinators and university collaborators – for its insertion in the school context and for the comprehension of this context also in its practical dimension.

Also according to reports of some initiation scholarship students, some supervising teachers have not contributed to the direction of the activities that should be performed at school and, as a consequence, have demotivated some students in their insertion process in this context:

And there's the school that we go to once a week, but the most unstable thing I would say is going to school, that *you get there, I at least get to my school and never know what I'm going to do*, it's always something new, get there and the teacher says "today you will do this, today you will do that" or sometimes you have nothing to do. We seem to be in the way, I don't know. Sometimes the class has a test, then it happens that the teacher... there's no way we can be in class, so she just gives another one. // *The teacher does not know how she will attend both her classroom and the PIBID students. Sometimes you have this problem. [...] sometimes we get there and she still can't handle the situation of always having a north for us, sometimes we even have to make a suggestion, something like that. [...] I honestly don't want to go to that school anymore [...] We know that the teacher's goal was that we stay in the school, to keep pace with the school, but, like, for me that is not working* (DB, our emphasis).

Look, I think so, first, in my opinion, our high school, the teacher only goes on Tuesday morning. I think that ... okay, we see, we know the routine of the classroom, but *honestly, for me it has not added anything, I just get there, sit in my desk and watch him teach classes, understand?* We don't know how to fill in a diary, we don't know how to draw up a lesson plan... you don't know, you didn't learn from PIBID, only if you really go after it, you know? *You don't really have an effective participation, at least in our group, in our school.* The practical class we did was only one. And I also see that *it's not because the teacher doesn't want to, because he needs to teach a subject in two weekly classes.* I think it's too little ... So, imagine *entering another six students in a room a little bigger than this, which already has almost forty studying there, you know? It lacks physical space*, it's very crowded, because there is no other day to share. *It ends up being too many students doing nothing, honestly, because what we do there is to sit and watch him teach.* I think we should ... I don't know, you know, have more projects, have more stuff. *But then it is also unfeasible for the time he has there. Then it gets hard, I don't know* (BB, our emphasis).

⁸ For this analysis, we also based on the Ordinances that standardized and regulated the Program during the data collection period: Normative Ordinance No. 260/2010 and Normative Ordinance No. 096/2013. It is important to note, however, that the objectives and characteristics of PIBID present in these ordinances were based on Decree No. 7219/2010, which provides for PIBID, still in force. Many of the provisions of these documents are still present in the current Ordinance that provides for PIBID and the Pedagogical Residence program (Gab Ordinance No. 45, of March 12, 2018).

As we can see, the absence of more targeted guidance can at the same time affect the training of scholarship students, the practice of supervising teachers and the integration between university and school. However, as pointed out in the last report, the fact that some supervising teachers are not involved in the activities of PIBID and do not act effectively in their monitoring in schools may also be associated with the conditions under which such activities are developed. In fact, integrating six students – or even four – into a single classroom – where there are about 40 students – does not seem easy, or even sensible for supervising teachers and schools. Given that supervising teachers have more than one class – usually several classes – and more than one class per week at the same school, it would be interesting for the teaching initiation scholarships to be separated individually or in pairs for their access to the classroom and for the development of activities with teachers and their classes. This way, supervisors would have the opportunity to work with scholarship students in more than one class and, on the other hand, scholarships would have contact with more than one formative context, which could contribute to their training as well as to the formation and performance of the teachers in the classroom.

In addition to the limitations noted, another aspect seems to concern subproject participants, especially scholarship students: the fact that some schools and supervising teachers (who have worked or are still working in the Program) consider them as “auxiliaries” or “substitute teachers” when in the absence of the classroom teachers. According to the coordinator of subproject A, on one occasion it was necessary to remove scholarship students from one of the partner schools for this reason: “*We had PIBID students, in a school that I had to get them out of when I joined, that the principal was chasing students, wanting to use them as labor to do jobs within the school. And I had to interfere and get the students out of there*” (ACA). Reports from one of the interviewed management coordinators and teaching initiation scholarship students from the other subprojects analyzed also highlight this practice in some schools:

In schools, what do we see as a great difficulty? The schools, which, although the project has been in existence for a while, still see the PIBID student as an intern. The supervisor himself. [...] Once we went there to explain the project to the director, and such. But it was kind of unfortunate, the situation. Because, at the end of the conversation, the director said, “*So, it's good to know that you will have this project, because you are from the [specific content] area, and you can take the expired reagents there, so you can dispose of it in a suitable place*”. There's been people, there's been schools, which called us here, and said, “*Yeah, so, that teacher has two helpers in her room. Can't you send, like, two for me, to give me a hand, too? This week we're going to have training, we wanted some interns, can't you send some interns?*” I said, “*Look, listen, you called the wrong place. We have no interns. We are a program called PIBID, which is very different from an internship.*” “*Hey, but this and that teacher have!*” “*No, they have students from the program. It doesn't work that way*” (CG, our emphasis).

At [school] it happened, there was a teacher who was pregnant who was missing a lot of classes, sometimes she got sick and *it happened that we went to the classroom, just us* (CB, our emphasis).

We have taken over the class on our own twice. The first workshop we went to, the teacher had a meeting of Prova Brasil, then there was only the three of us in the room for five classes. And then the other week I missed, I was sick, something, it was just Joaquina. Again she ended up teaching instead of the teacher, because the teacher got ill (DB, our emphasis).

She went, gave me the book, like, 10 minutes later, I arrived, it was like 10 minutes before class started, so she just took it, gave the book in my hands, said, “oh, you will explain this subject”. I have never felt so bad in my whole life. Because, like, first that the student sees that you are nervous there, because you are not prepared, second that I find it ridiculous to have the student open the book and read. You know, reading there because I had no contact with that book, barely had, we did not have the book, had not prepared class. [...] Then, the other two classes were to solve [specific content B] exercises, and then we were solving them. But look, at that school *I had a problem having to apply a test on my own as well*, and the student cheating right in front of me and I said I was going to take his test and he says I have no proof that he was cheating. So, several times, two, three times I've been alone with Pedro, I've been alone with Gilberto, I've been alone, really alone. So it's hard. It is not a pleasant situation for the students or for you. But she [supervising teacher] left because of that ... Yeah, one of the reasons (BB, our emphasis).

In subproject B, the scholarship students were, for a brief period, also responsible for the “sixth period”, an extra class offered by the school to students who presented some kind of difficulty in the curriculum subjects: “There was the sixth period, which was just a tutoring class for students who didn't understand the subject very well in the classroom. *Who was responsible for the sixth period was us, from PIBID, so the teacher didn't need to be in the classroom*” (BB, emphasis added).

Thus, we see that in many situations teaching initiation students were treated as auxiliary or substitute teachers by some of the supervisors as well as by teachers, coordinators and school managers. In some situations, other students reported that they had already performed jobs and functions that would be the responsibility of the supervising teacher, as shown in the narratives below:

The supervising teachers can set it up with us so we can plan a class together, but not just say "It's up to you". They ask “look, do you have the availability to prepare a class for next week, for example, next month?” Cool, with the teacher in the classroom we go there and teach a class, but not in this style of “the next class is yours, do something there” and then leave... Elaborating a class is within the project, but always with the teacher helping, not passing the responsibility to our hands. This is a problem we faced with our last supervising teacher who, since she was so busy sometimes she said "oh, I'm going to sit here and you can take the class". So this is a tricky thing that sometimes we have to get back to our coordination here and talk about it, say, "oh, teacher, it's not working and we'd like you to talk to the teacher there." So these are things that can happen. So much so that it was decided to change places, schools (CB, our emphasis).

I've been in the library several times when I was supposed to be in the classroom, because she's given them an activity, the teacher went to the classroom for class, but I didn't finish correcting the activities she had asked me to, so I stay in the library correcting, "so when you're done, you're go to the classroom". I was there correcting a lot of work, and just as I was coming back to class, my PIBID colleague said, "Put away these activities, because if the principal sees you with the teacher's work in hand, he will scold her, because you shouldn't be correcting that. Keep it in your bag, hide it" (BB, our emphasis).

I haven't entered a classroom yet. *The only thing I did was grade a few works and this week I made an exercise list (DB, our emphasis).*

Certainly, the process of discussing activities and assessment methods is part, among many other aspects, of the process of teacher training, since it is related to the knowledge and practice of the profession. However, it is assumed that, as it is a program of training and initiation to teaching, students should receive, through contact with experienced teachers, oriented and directed training about this and the other knowledge that constitute the know-how to teach and that are linked to the knowledge they also receive at the university. And from the reports, we can consider that such guidance has not occurred in the development of some activities.

When these students, after an orientation and planning process, develop some kind of supervised classroom intervention, they are expected to use some assessment method to know how much and how the students who participated in this intervention appropriated themselves of the knowledge discussed and worked on. In this case, it seems to make sense that the scholarship students, in a prior discussion with the mentoring teachers, evaluate the activity so that they can also analyze their own practice. Such direction, in fact, is contemplated in the text of the Institutional Project of PIBID of the University, according to which the initiation to teaching scholarship students, in discussion with the area coordinator and supervisor, should participate in the preparation of questions and/or diverse types of evaluation, to know and analyze the different forms of assessment that can be employed, their strengths and weaknesses, the cares that should be taken in preparing the questions, and the importance of using different evaluation mechanisms and offer feedback on student learning. These are, therefore, activities inherent to teaching and, as such, that should be part of the professional learning process of teaching.

However, it does not seem coherent that these same scholarship students alone evaluate the activities performed in the classroom by the supervising teachers, especially in cases where there is no previous orientation. In this case, the undergraduates, while exercising duties and responsibilities of a conducting teacher, become only “helpers”. And this does not seem to be the goal of the Program, at least in formal terms. According to Ordinance 96/2013, article 43, sole paragraph (BRAZIL, 2013b, s/p):

“It is forbidden for the teaching initiation scholarship students to assume the routine of assignments of school teachers, or administrative or operational support activities”.^{9,10}

It is therefore necessary that all those involved in PIBID consider the contact of scholarship students with the practice of the profession as a moment of formation, and not as an early entry into the teaching career, with all its responsibilities and attributions. With the latter approach, the idea of teaching initiation and “third space training” (ZEICHNER, 2010) will lose its meaning. We agree with Tardif (2012) when arguing about the need to recognize the practice of the profession as a professional learning process, which should include the development of a partnership with teachers, so that they also take part in the training of future teachers. Taking part, however, does not mean assigning them the responsibilities of an acting teacher, but giving them the support they need so that they can gradually and progressively – through the exchange of ideas, by contrasting views, and working collaboratively – understand and analyze the school reality in its different dimensions, as well as the social and historical conditions that generate and are generated by this reality. After all, as stated by França (2006), without the effective participation of teachers in the process of insertion of undergraduates into the context and in school practices, there is a risk of leaving them to, on their own, establish relationships and connections between knowledge and future professional practice, which, as we have already discussed, goes against the formal principles presented by PIBID.

This is not reproducing the idea which, according to Freitas (2007), has been perhaps unconsciously adopted by universities that education systems can be responsible for the initial formation of their teachers, with the involvement of their “specialists”, who are, first of all, teachers. On the contrary, we defend the role and importance of the university as a *locus* of teacher education and, with the same intensity, the need for a partnership between these institutions and the schools of Basic Education for the development of this training, in order to overcome the dichotomy still existing in many initial training courses between the theoretical and practical knowledge of the profession. Thus, as we discussed earlier, it is not a matter of placing greater emphasis on theory or practice in teacher training as dissociable elements. First of all, it is a matter of recognizing that the academic-scientific knowledge and the knowledge of experience are presented as different stages of the same teaching learning process and are, therefore, equally important and necessary for the educator's formation.

However, such practical training should take place in an oriented manner. It is precisely with this thought that some of the undergraduates reported accepting to participate in PIBID. When asked why they joined the Program, the interviewed scholarships presented different reasons, among which we can highlight: for the financial aid; to enrich the curriculum; for the opportunity to develop research; for helping in the preparation for the internship; for providing contact with the school, among other aspects. Among the reasons given is the fact that the Program provides the accompaniment of already experienced professionals (from the university and the school) for the contact with the school reality:

For me it was more, like, this idea that I wanted, at one stage of the course, at some point of the course to make a classroom intervention, but accompanied by the teachers here at the university and with a school teacher too. Because for those who teach in the PSS [simplified selection process] or take a class in the cram school, you teach your class, but you don't... many times you don't have that planning before thinking about the intervention you will make, to elaborate, discuss with colleagues. Sometimes it's just your idea there and that's it. And at PIBID there's the idea of having a group of three or two... three people with you. It's nice for you to discuss, exchange ideas, look for what is the interesting point (AB, our emphasis).

⁹ In the original: “É vedado ao bolsista de iniciação à docência assumir a rotina de atribuições dos docentes da escola ou atividades de suporte administrativo ou operacional”.

¹⁰ Such provision is formalized only in Ordinance No. 96/2013, not being present in the text of Ordinance No. 260/2010. However, Ordinance No. 260/2010 also establishes, on item 8.3.1., Item III, that it is up to supervisors “to monitor the present activities of the initiation scholarship students under their guidance, in accordance with the PIBID”. In addition, the Teaching Initiation Scholarship Commitment Term, based on the same Ordinance, establishes in its third clause, item XIV: “the teaching initiation scholarship student is prohibited from conducting classes as part of the program activities”. However, despite these guidelines, there were some cases of students who took over in the PIBID partner schools conducting activities and responsibilities, which led CAPES to include this determination explicitly in the new Ordinance No. 96/2013. This same requirement is present in Gab Ordinance No. 45/2018, Art. 20.

You don't have to take on a class now, we may be acting together with the teacher, but you don't have to be handling the class alone there... we'll get there one day! We are learning, because there are people who have to end college and just be there, or even before finishing college, they are going to get a class! It's a shock! (CB, our emphasis).

This same concern was pointed out by Carvalho (2013), Moura (2013) and Gatti et al. (2014), in which participating teaching initiation scholarship students reported feeling safer in their insertion in schools when having the guidance of education and university teachers. According to Moura (2013), from an oriented action students feel more confident to perform their duties and face the challenges that arise during their trajectory in the Program.

As it can be observed in these researches and in the reports presented here, the fact that PIBID aims at inserting the training student in the school context through the mediation, observation, supervision and guidance of acting teachers provides greater security to the undergraduates and, likewise, it favors the performance of these teachers as co-trainers of students in their process of insertion into school routine. In this process, the accompaniment and guidance of experienced teachers become fundamental in complementing the professional training process.

As stated by Tardif (2012), the relationship of young teachers – or, in this particular case, undergraduate students – with experienced teachers is a situation that allows objectifying the knowledge of experience. In such a situation, the experienced teacher is made aware of his own experiential knowledge so that he becomes not only a practitioner but also a trainer. That is why there is a need for the objective related to the supervisor's role as the undergraduates' co-trainer at the time of their contact with the school to be present in all projects and subprojects, not only in formal terms – as was observed in the text of the institutional project and of the subprojects analyzed – but equally in practice.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

From the study it was possible to observe that the training and practice of some of the supervising teachers of Basic Education have been favored and enriched by their participation in PIBID. Through it, these teachers have the opportunity to analyze, expand and modify the practices they develop in Basic Education from what they observe, experience and discuss in the planning moments of theoretical-practical activities at the university and school. Such contribution also favors the approximation of these teachers with the university, and of the latter, in turn, with the school and its professionals, in a perspective of reciprocal, collaborative and continuous formation that can enable, as a consequence, interventions in the educational practice itself.

However, if on one hand there are teachers who take PIBID as a space for training and collaborative work that contribute, at the same time, to their professional development and to the learning of undergraduate students, on the other there are also those who do not commit to the objectives of the Program, who do not consider it as a space for training and analysis of the practices performed, nor contribute to the development of a collaborative work with the university or to the formation of the scholarship students supervised by them in the schools.

Such aspect could be evidenced in the narratives of many of the participants of this study, according to which, in some of the supervising professors – who have worked or still work in PIBID –, there is no intentionality and direction in the actions performed in the Program, which, in some level, compromises the planning and development of activities, the analysis of practices and, more specifically, the training of the initiation scholarship students. According to these participants, some supervising teachers and partner schools consider scholarship students only as auxiliary and, in some cases, as substitute teachers, which goes against the training model proposed by the Program – oriented, monitored, supervised training, which provide, gradually and continuously, the integration and insertion of undergraduate students into Basic Education schools.

However, while it is true that PIBID depends on the role of supervising teachers as co-trainers and co-protagonists – alongside coordinating teachers and collaborators – when planning, developing and evaluating the initiation and training teaching activities, it's also true that most of these teachers often find themselves in unfavorable work situations that get in the way of a satisfactory performance. In this regard, the data analysis allowed us to observe that many of the supervisors,

including those who, according to the interviewed participants, are committed to the PIBID formation objectives, work full time – often in more than one school – with little time for planning their activities, which in a way may hinder their participation in a more direct way in the orientation of undergraduate students and activities related to PIBID. Therefore, it is necessary that these questions be considered at the moment of evaluation of the Program and the participation of those involved in it, lest we commit the foolishness of assigning responsibility or blame only to the teachers of Basic Education for the success or failure of the integration process of the initiation scholarship students into the school context.

In addition, it is necessary, first of all, to highlight the relationship that acting teachers establish with the orientation action of undergraduate students in schools (França, 2006). We need to ask ourselves: What is the role of supervising teachers in the process of training these students? What is their limit of action in this process? Are teachers prepared to do one more task in the midst of so many other daily tasks? Do these teachers have satisfactory conditions to receive teaching initiation scholarships in their classrooms? And to act as co-trainers in the latter's process of initiation to teaching? Do they have training to perform this function? Is there encouragement, appreciation and officialization by the education networks so that these teachers can accept and incorporate this responsibility within their professional career? These questions clearly indicate the need for further discussion, also with reference to the performance of acting teachers, who receive, accompany and guide students in their insertion activities in schools, often facing challenges and limitations for the accomplishment of this task.

Furthermore, it is necessary to consider the fact that schools and their teachers have been held responsible for the practical training of future teachers without having had the opportunity to discuss this issue comprehensively. Up until now, teachers of Basic Education had no recognition of their effective participation in this training process; in most cases, their role was restricted to giving the space of their classroom to the trainees so that they could make their observations and conduct their classes in compliance with the requirements of the training course. With PIBID, they are asked to share the formative process of future teachers without even being heard in this process, and without, in some cases, due training and further clarification on this subject.

For this reason, training actions are necessary for teachers to understand and effectively act as co-trainers of future teachers in their first insertions into schools. That goes through, therefore, the need to consolidate, within the scope of the Program and through the partnership between schools and universities, “trainer training” actions, in which internal and external members of the Program – supervisors, area coordinators, collaborators, management and institutional coordinators, regional nuclei, teaching departments and school management teams – were involved. Such actions would contribute not only to a better definition of the role of supervisors and other subjects in the Program, but also to a better performance of these professionals in the graduation process.

Equally, it is necessary that the education networks and, more specifically, the public power adopt the PIBID not only as a punctual government program, but as a comprehensive state policy, focused on teacher training, ensuring the necessary conditions for work and career opportunities that enable these professionals to devote part of their professional activity to this particularly important task in the practical training of future teachers. We need to take all these aspects into account; after all, thinking of a training policy implies thinking, with the same seriousness, of the objective conditions for such training to materialize in practice. Transferring responsibilities for the training of future teachers to the school and its professionals without guaranteeing these conditions, and without establishing the relationship between Higher and Basic Education, can be a further limiting factor to be addressed in the formative process.

REFERENCES

AFONSO, Andréia Francisco. *Os professores da escola de educação básica e suas contribuições na formação dos bolsistas de iniciação à docência da área de Química*. 161f. Thesis (PhD in Sciences) - Programa de Pós-Graduação em Química. Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Carlos, 2013.

- BRASIL. Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior. *Portaria nº 096, de 18 de julho de 2013*. Regulates the Institutional Program of Teaching Initiation Scholarship (PIBID). Brasília, DF, 2013.
- BRASIL. *Decreto nº 7.219, de 24 de junho de 2010*. On the Institutional Program of Teaching Initiation - PIBID and other measures. Brasília, DF, 2010.
- BRASIL. *Portaria Gab nº 45, de 12 de março de 2018*. On the granting of scholarships and the regime of collaboration in the Pedagogical Residency Program and in the Institutional Program of Teaching Initiation Scholarship. SEI/CAPES, 2018.
- CARVALHO, M. A de. *Um modelo para a interpretação da supervisão no contexto de um subprojeto de Física do PIBID*. Thesis (PhD) - Universidade Estadual de Londrina, Londrina, 2013.
- DAMIANI, M. F. Entendendo o trabalho colaborativo em educação e revelando seus benefícios. *Educar*, Curitiba, n. 31, p. 213-230, 2008. Editora UFPR. Available at: <<http://www.scielo.br/pdf/er/n31/n31a13>>. Access on: jul. 29, 2013.
- DORNELES, A. M. *A Roda dos Bordados da Formação: o que bordam as professoras de Química nas histórias de sala de aula?* Dissertation (Master's) - Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2011.
- FRANÇA, D. de S. Formação de Professores: a parceria escola-universidade e os estágios de ensino. *UNIREVISTA*, v. 1, n. 2, abr. 2006.
- FREITAS, H. C. L. de. A (nova) política de formação de professores: a prioridade postergada. *Educação & Sociedade*. Campinas, v. 28, n. 100, out. 2007.
- GAFFURI, P. *Rupturas e continuidades na formação de professores: um olhar para as práticas desenvolvidas por um grupo no contexto do PIBID-Inglês/Uel* Dissertation (Master's) - Universidade Estadual de Londrina, Londrina, 2012.
- GARCÍA, Carlos Marcelo. O professor iniciante, a prática pedagógica e o sentido da experiência. *Formação Docente*, Belo Horizonte, v. 2, n. 3, p. 11-49, ago./dez. 2010.
- GARCÍA, Carlos Marcelo; VAILLANT, Denise. *Desarrollo profesional docente*. Como se aprende a enseñar? Madrid: Narcea, 2009.
- GATTI, B. A. et al. *Um estudo avaliativo do Programa Institucional de Bolsa de Iniciação à Docência (PIBID)*. São Paulo: FCC/SEP, 2014.
- LIBÂNEO, José Carlos. As políticas de formação de professores no contexto da reforma universitária: das políticas educativas para as políticas da educação. *Revista Profissão Docente*, Uberaba, v. 4, n. 12, p. 33-55, set./dez. 2005.
- LÜDKE, M.; ANDRÉ, M. E. D. A. *Pesquisa em educação: abordagens qualitativas*. 2 ed. São Paulo: Editora Pedagógica e Universitária, 2013.
- MIZUKAMI, Maria da Graça Nicoletti. et al. *Escola e aprendizagem da docência: processos de investigação e formação*. São Carlos: EdUFSCar, 2002.

MOURA, Eliton Meireles de. *O programa institucional de bolsa de iniciação à docência PIBID na formação inicial de professores de matemática*. 197f. Dissertation (Master's in Education) - Programa de Pós-graduação em Educação. Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Uberlândia, 2013.

NÓVOA, Antônio. *Professores - Imagens do futuro presente*. Lisboa: Educa, 2009.

PAREDES, G. G. O. *Um estudo sobre o PIBID: saberes em construção na formação de professores de ciências*. Dissertation (Master's) - Universidade Federal do Paraná, Curitiba, 2012.

REALI, A. M. M. R.; TANCREDI, R. M. S. P. A importância do que aprende na escola: análise de uma experiência de parceria escola-famílias e universidade-escola. *Paideia*, Ribeirão Preto, SP, v. 15, n. 31, p. 239-247, 2005.

SHULMAN, Lee. Conocimiento y enseñanza: fundamentos de la Nueva reforma. Profesorado. *Revista de currículum y formación del profesorado*, v. 9, n. 2, 2005.

STANZANI, E. de L. *O papel do PIBID na formação inicial de professores de Química na Universidade Estadual de Londrina*. Dissertation (Master's) - Universidade Estadual de Londrina, Londrina, 2012.

TARDIF, Maurice. *Saberes docentes e formação profissional*. 13. ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2012.

ZEICHNER, Ken. M. 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, set./dez. 2010.

Submission: 12/04/2019

Approval: 19/08/2019