Practice as a curriculum component: questions and reflections

Practice Prática como Componente Curricular: questões e reflexões

Samuel de Souza Neto[a], Vandeí Pinto da Silva[b]

[a] Professor, Universidade Estadual Paulista (Unesp), Instituto de Biociências, Programas de Pós-Graduação em Educação e em Ciências da Motricidade, Rio Claro, SP - Brasil, e-mail: samuelsn@rc.unesp.br

[b] Professor, Universidade Estadual Paulista Júlio de Mesquita Filho (Unesp), Faculdade de Filosofia e Ciências, Marília, SP - Brasil, e-mail: vandeips@marilia.unesp.br

Abstract

This present reflection is motivated by difficulties imposed to graduation courses in order to interpret the meaning of Practice as a Curriculum Component (PCC), these difficulties expressed in different forms of implementation. The aim is to contribute to building a conception of PCC integrated to the political-pedagogical project of the course and contribute to the improvement of teacher's formation, in order to overcome formal curriculum adjustments in which the PCC only serves as a mechanism to facilitate compliance with the minimum workload of the course. The starting point is the analysis of PCC models already existent in public universities, its advances and challenges. Then we discuss the ambiguities of the legal guidelines about the concept of practice present in formulations such as "Teaching Practice and Supervised Internship", "Internship" and "PCC". The place of PCC in

the curriculum is also questioned: it's about to rescue practice as a formation reference, to overcome the lack of distinction between PCC and Internship, and the dichotomies between disciplines of specific formation and teaching. Finally, based on theoretical assumptions that link theory and practice, integration projects are proposed by means of which the PCC can contribute to the organization of the course, the interdisciplinary, collective work, the expansion of formation beyond the classroom and to the formation of teachers better prepared to face the current challenges.

Keywords: Practice as a Curriculum Component. Curriculum. Teacher formation.

Resumo

A presente reflexão é motivada pelas dificuldades postas aos cursos de licenciatura para interpretarem o significado da Prática como Componente Curricular (PCC), dificuldades essas expressas nas diferentes formas de sua implementação. O objetivo é contribuir com a construção de uma concepção de PCC integrada ao projeto político-pedagógico do curso e que colabore com o aprimoramento da formação do professor, de modo a superar ajustes curriculares formais nos quais a PCC serve apenas como mecanismo facilitador do cumprimento da carga horária mínima do curso. O ponto de partida é a análise de modelos de PCC vigentes numa universidade pública, seus avanços e desafios. Em seguida, são discutidas as ambiguidades das diretrizes legais acerca do conceito de prática presentes nas formulações "Prática de ensino e estágio supervisionado", "Estágio" e "PCC". O lugar da PCC no currículo também é problematizado: trata-se de resgatar a prática como referência da formação, de superar a indistinção entre PCC e Estágio e as dicotomias existentes entre disciplinas de formação específica e pedagógicas. Por fim, com base em pressupostos teóricos que articulam teoria e prática, são propostos projetos integradores por meio dos quais a PCC pode contribuir para a organicidade do curso, a interdisciplinaridade, o trabalho coletivo, a ampliação da formação para além da sala de aula e para a formação de professores mais bem preparados ao enfrentamento dos desafios atuais.

Palavras-chave: Prática como Componente Curricular. Currículo. Formação docente.

Introduction

This essay is the result of research and discussions held at São Paulo State University (Universidade Estadual Paulista – Unesp) on the subject of Practice as a Curriculum Component (PCC) and its relationship with the supervised curricular internship. It addresses issues related to the professionalization of teaching (HOLMES GROUP, 1986; TARDIF, 2002; BORGES, 2008), teacher knowledge (TARDIF, 2002), curriculum (SILVA, 1999; BORGES, 2008) and the epistemology of practice (SCHON, 1983, 1992; TARDIF, 2002). It aims at and proposes the establishment of a debate about PCC but also draws attention to issues related to curriculum and the supervised curricular internship. Although this essay is from finished, it is intended not only to elicit questions regarding some policies that have already been adopted or that are in the process of being adopted by universities and other institutions of higher education but also to question the advocacy, pragmatism and usefulness of the proposed reforms. This essay also questions the passivity with which legal guidelines are accepted, regardless of the advances or setbacks in teacher training that they may provide. This essay is not intended to deny the efforts that have been made to interpret and enforce the law but rather to focus on whether the paths taken have been the most promising.

Therefore, our starting point was the questionnaire "Summary report on the characteristics of teacher licensure programs" [Relatório síntese de caracterização das licenciaturas] (UNESP, 2011), which contains 43 open-ended questions that give rise to seven thematic axes: general organization of the program (questions 1-7); structure (questions 8-10); subjects (questions 11-16); supervised curricular internship (questions 17-33); PCC (questions 34-35); assessment (questions 36-39) and general indications (questions 40- 43).

This questionnaire, prepared by the Unesp Forum on Licensure Programs, was sent to the Unesp's 51 licensure programs, using as a reference each unit's program councils. Twenty percent (10) of those 51 programs did not return the questionnaires. Thus, the reflections on

PCC were based on the answers that were received and on the following documents, which were produced using the discussions held at Unesp: *Symposium: The Practice of Teaching in Question* [Simpósio: a prática de ensino em questão] (CARVALHO et al., 1993); *Thoughts on Teacher Education at Unesp* [Pensando a formação de professores na Unesp] (CARVALHO et al., 2002); and *Symposium II: The Practice of Teaching in Question* [II Simpósio: a prática de ensino em questão] (CARVALHO et al., 2009).

In the questionnaire, two questions were related to PCC and addressed the following aspects: (a) How is PCC organized?; (b) How is PCC developed?; (c) Specify the PCC course loads in specific subjects; (d) Specify the PCC course loads in education subjects; (e) Specify the PCC course loads in activities and/or projects; and (f) Is the PCC course load fully allocated in the timetable?

The answers given by the 31 respondents (from 40 degree programs) were vague and generic, implying questions about the data collection instrument itself, about the conditions under which the study participants answered the questions, and about the PCC "conceptions" contained in the political-pedagogical program projects, which thus far seem unclear.

Based on the two PCC frameworks presented, it was possible to infer that PCC is allocated to specific subjects, to foundational education subjects, to program subjects and to the supervised curricular internship. It was also stated that one pedagogical program has no PCC.

It was observed that of the 31 respondents (from 40 undergraduate degrees or programs), 32.3% identified a link between PCC and specific subjects, and 35.5% identified a link between specific subjects and foundational education subjects, indicating that PCC is primarily allocated to specific subjects. Other information that we found included the fact that, according to 73.3% of the respondents, PCC is allocated to the curriculum structure. However, no answers were provided for the following questions: (1) How is it organized?; (2) How is it developed?; and (3) What are the PCC course loads in specific subjects, in education subjects and in activities and/or projects? The fact that these aspects were

not answered leads to two questions: (1) What is PCC?; and (2) What is the place of PCC in the curriculum?

It is noted that not only PCC but also the supervised curricular internship are "losing" their original meaning as "reflective teaching practices" (SCHON, 1992; BORGES, 2008) and that the internship is becoming more restricted to teaching, either as a result of the national guidelines' orientation or the university's internal policies.

In this one-way street, the curriculum is not an exception. It tends to continue as a set of subjects (SILVA, 1999), despite some innovative experiences that are diluted in the internal motion of the university itself, among other proponents that prefer to begin the process of curricular change with subjects instead of with a discussion of professional profile or other, more significant aspects such as the political-pedagogical project, teaching or teacher education.

In the process of restructuring the programs, it was hoped that the Program Council, created at Unesp in 1989, could solve some of these problems. However, the Council attempts to perform its duties like a beetle, which, contrary to certain laws of nature, can even take flight, but in a very limited way, as seen in some of the reports presented in the data collection instrument. In this sense, it is also observed that until now, the Council of Licensure Programs (BRASIL, 2002a) has not been created in the university units, which represent a space that could provide a greater organic structure to discussions linked to PCC and supervised internships.

Another key aspect arising out of this context is the acceptance of new curriculum guidelines at the structural level, without being questioned at the level of university policy. Internally, there is isolated resistance. However, pragmatic thinking predominates, as follows: "If the demands were made by the Ministry of Education (Ministério da Educação – MEC), everyone is responsible for fulfilling them as quickly as possible". The opportunity to exercise academic autonomy and to "think on one's own" about each institution's responsibilities therefore is lost. By losing autonomy, the university loses the ability to tell the world its *raison d'être*: to

formulate transformational proposals. In this context, a reflection on the questions proposed and the data collected follows.

What is "practice" as a curriculum component?

The idea of permeating the entire training process with "practice" is not recent. By 1975, Valnir Chagas had drawn attention to this topic when answering a similar question: when should teaching practice be performed? That counselor noted that it would be inconsistent for practice to be rigidly situated before or after training programs. The ideal would be for practice to occur throughout the course of study (CHAGAS, 1975). Therefore, in 1975, the idea that "practice" should pervade the entire curriculum was already being discussed.

Twenty-six years later, the idea of *teaching practice* as a practice that produces something in the field of teaching was proposed. This proposition was evidenced in Opinion CNE/CP 009/2001 but identified as such in Opinion CNE/CP 21/2001, causing serious discussions on the subject because

> [a]s *teaching practice* is a conscious work whose guidelines are supplied by Opinion 09/01 [...] it must be planned for when preparing the pedagogical project and it should take place from the beginning of the training process and extend throughout the entire process. *In conjunction with supervised internship* and academic work activities, *it forms the identity of the teacher as an educator.* [...]
> When considering the whole of this Opinion in conjunction with the *new paradigm* of the guidelines, with the legal requirements and the quality standard that must exist in the licensure programs, *an additional 100 hours must be added to the legal minimum of 300 hours*, which in addition to broadening the range of possibilities, increases the time available for each form of practice chosen in the pedagogical course design. (BRASIL, 2001b, p. 10, emphasis added)

However, this view clashed with the teaching practice/supervised internship provision in the National Education Guidelines and Foundations Law (Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional – LDBEN) No. 9394/96 and the text of the referred Opinion itself, which in the end states without explanation that

> [t]hese 2000 hours of work for the *implementation of scientific-academic activities*, added to the 400 hours of *teaching practice* and the 400 hours of *supervised internship*, are the training field where the organization of the pedagogical program, planned for a minimum total of 2,800 hours, will be planted (BRASIL, 2001b, p. 14, emphasis added).

When establishing a new parameter for teaching practice, Article 65 of LDBEN 9394/96 established the minimum of 300 hours. That law indicated that in the previous legislation, *Teaching Practice* (subject) was included under *Supervised Internship* (activity) in most licensure programs, whereas in some, it was constructed as a *subject* with variable links to the internship. This situation eventually created a problem for teacher training that was not satisfactorily resolved. As a result, the new law sought to change this situation by requiring 300 hours of teaching practice, deferring to the State Council of Education the authority to set internship standards.

On September 23, 1997, the State Council of Education in the State of São Paulo indicated in the Report of the Full Council that "the expression 'teaching practice' encompasses learning theoretical notions, class conducting experiences and performing internships" (SÃO PAULO, 1997, p. 10). The Council's position was based on Article 82 of LDB 9394/96. Therefore, teaching practice becomes understood not only as an activity but also as a subject, and the following should be considered when planning it:

> Article 3 - The planning of internships *shall meet* the guidelines set by all professors of licensure programs and take into account *the extent of*

the teaching role of the future licentiate, in terms of teaching efficiency within the framework of the pedagogical proposals of schools.
Sole Paragraph – The *internships* will include, compulsorily, *activities* related to the *preparation, implementation and evaluation of educational proposals of schools, either public or private* (SÃO PAULO, 1997, p.10, emphasis added).

Within the domain of these changes, federal law is again manifested through the National Council of Education in its December 3, 1997 Opinion 744, which refers to Article 65 of Law No. 9394/96 and establishes the following guidelines:

Article 2 – *Teaching practice* should be the *link* between *theoretical training and pedagogical practice*, to reorganize the teaching exercise in the program;
Article 3 – The *teaching practice* should *include*, in addition to *activities of observing and conducting classes*, actions relating to the *planning, analysis and evaluation of the educational process*; (BRASIL, 1997, p. 1, emphasis added).

It is essential to stress that the official guidelines of the State of São Paulo predate the federal guidelines, thus serving as a "stepping stone". However, the federal opinion indicates a great deal of flexibility, elasticity or even amplitude. Teaching Practice is defined as both a subject and an activity, noting that "the expression 'teaching practice' encompasses learning theoretical notions, conducting class experiences and performing internships"; "schools, either public or private" are elected as the sites for this process, and it is indicated that the internship "will take into account the extent of the teaching role of the future licentiate" (BRASIL, 1997, p. 1).

Therefore, we see a strong clash of identity with respect to the term *teaching practice.* An attempt to resolve this clash is made by replacing Opinion CNE/CP 21/2001 with Opinion CNE/CP 28/2001 and

Resolution CNE/CP 1/2002, therefore adopting the idea of PCC. Although the words are changed, the previous meaning is maintained.

The documents make explicit a *conception of practice — a curriculum component* — that includes a dimension of knowledge that is present both at the time when the reflection on the professional activity is performed and during the internship at the time when the professional activity is performed (Opinion CNE/CP 009/2001).

In Opinion CNE/CP 028/2001, "practice" is understood to mean "the very way in which things are done whose content is traversed by a theory" (BRASIL, 2001c, p. 9).

> *Practice as a curriculum component* is, therefore, a practice that produces something in the teaching field. As practice is a conscious work [...] it must be planned for when preparing the pedagogical project, and it should take place from the beginning of the training process and extend throughout the entire process (BRASIL, 2001c, p. 9, emphasis added).

Thus, PCC is a practice that should produce something in the teaching field, which may be understood as: (a) a strategy for problematizing and theorizing issues relevant to the field of education and to the area of *teaching of...*, arising out of direct contact with the school and educational space and with the space for academic or professional experiences; and (b) a mechanism to facilitate integration between the different theoretical contributions that comprise the scientific research and the fields of knowledge in education and *teaching of...*

However, this practice will not be isolated, *restricted to the internship* and disjointed from the rest of the program, but instead will be present from the beginning of the program, permeating the entire training, thereby becoming the essence, reference or matrix that will guide the curriculum adaptation/restructuring process.

Likewise, this *practical dimension* in areas/subjects *may not be restricted to pedagogical subjects*, and coordination of the practical dimension will transcend the internship. It will aim to link the different practices in

an interdisciplinary perspective because this *practice* will emphasize the *procedures of observation and reflection, recording the performed observations and resolving problem situations*.

Therefore, the *400 hours of PCC* that were added to the curricula of professional training programs cannot and should not be viewed as a strategy to seek balance in the theory-practice relationship pertaining to subjects but instead should be thought of within an interdisciplinary perspective, seeking a practice that produces something in the teaching field, that aids in the formation of the identity of the teacher as an educator.

This practice, as previously mentioned, should focus on the procedures of observation and reflection, recording the performed observations and resolving problem situations. They are, therefore, *directed to the "teaching field"* (i.e., the teaching profession for instance, as a case study) because the conception of curricular practice made explicit in the documents is characterized as such (BRASIL, 2002a, p. 8, emphasis added).

What is understood from this proposal is that it seeks to establish a project for the 400 hours that is articulated and made formally explicit in the program's political-pedagogical project and that can be prepared and developed from an interdisciplinary perspective. Interdisciplinarity, together with the link between theory and practice, has been considered one of the important possibilities for overcoming the fragmentation that has taken place in the educational field. However, this interdisciplinarity encompasses the interpenetration of method and content between the subjects that jointly explore a given topic. This integration occurs during the joint construction of knowledge, beginning at the statement of the problem. Therefore, PCC also implies a new view of curriculum.

Practice as a curriculum component in the curriculum

In this context, PCC generated great confusion among the members of each Unesp Program Council with respect to licensure programs. At the time of the curriculum changes, council members eventually opted

for curriculum adjustment rather than curriculum restructuring. Thus, it became "common" to find PCC sprinkled in the undergraduate subjects—whether specific, pedagogical or interventional — and it often became confined to the "mission" of improving the theory-practice relationship within the subject itself.

For many teachers of specific content, this framework was configured in the hallways of the university as an excess of practices, not contributing to the development of the program because in their view, what students need is content. However, there are interesting attempts to overcome simple "applicationism", implementing a pedagogy of projects linked to this idea or, as suggested in the document *Thoughts on teacher education at Unesp* [Pensando a formação de professores na Unesp] (CARVALHO et al., 2002), in the form of integrative projects because

> it must transcend the classroom to the whole school environment and the school education itself, including different activities that provide future teachers with knowledge of the community, of the families and of the students themselves. [...] These activities, which should seek a correlation between theory and practice, *require a continuous movement between knowing and doing in the pursuit of meanings in management, administration and resolution of situations unique to the educational environment*. (CARVALHO et al., 2002, p. 11, emphasis added).

Considering this proposition as a possibility, it should be stated that on the one hand, a new paradigm or conception of training in the curriculum guidelines for training primary education teachers was presented. On the other hand, at the same time, the original idea of teaching practice/supervised internship that (when properly understood) challenged the hegemony of the academically, technically and scientifically guided curriculum, became fragmented.

The table below intends to demonstrate what is being discussed and points to the perspective of change in this training model.

Given this understanding, what is found in the analysis of most of the existing curriculum, based on Resolution CNE/CP 1/2002 and

Resolution CNE/CP 2/2002? The answer is a hybrid curriculum in which PCC, with rare exceptions, became depersonalized, and the dynamic of the academic model prevails. The theoretical basis tends to be provided during the first part of the training, while the internship — the professional practice — is allocated to the second half of the training process. There are changes in the sense of attempting not only to constitute a body of knowledge for the teaching profession but also to place teaching as the basis of training and to train educators. However, this is not clear in many pedagogical projects when the professional profile is examined because what is trained is not a teacher but a generalist.

Overall, there is a great paradox. There is an attempt to separate the teaching practice linked to supervised internships to locate the "practice" (teaching practice or PCC) as the mediator of the curriculum, thus permeating the entire training. However, in the curriculum under development, this is not what occurs, aside from the exceptions. Worse still, the supervised curricular internship tends to be confined to theory, with a pragmatic, not a discursive, consistency adopted by the school (SARTI, 2008).

	Academic model	Professional model
Professional	Focused on vocational training, considered a technologist, an expert who dominates a set of formalized knowledge derived from research, to apply them in school practice.	Focused on the formation of the reflective professional, who produces knowledge and is able to deliberate about in his or her own practice, to objectify it, to share it, to question it and refine it, and to improve the teaching of it.
Knowledge	Based on scientific epistemology.	Based on the epistemology of practice.
	One-dimensional and disciplinary view of knowledge at the basis of training.	Pluralistic view of knowledge at the basis of training.
	Scientific and curricular knowledge are the references for professional training.	Practical knowledge and skills are the basic references for professional training.
	University researchers and trainers produce and control the knowledge at the base of the training, whereas teachers apply the knowledge at the base of the training.	Teachers and researchers produce and control the knowledge at the base of the profession; experience and practical knowledge have the same status as scientific knowledge.

(To be continued)

(Conclusion)

	Academic model	Professional model
Training modalities	Focused on academic training.	Focused on practice.
	Short internship at the end of the program.	Alternating internships throughout training
	The university is the training center.	The school is the central locus of training.
	Despite visits to the field (the school environment), the university controls the entire training process.	Alternates between the school environment and the training environment of the university. The training process is shared and to some extent, even the assessment is shared among the actors.
	The actors involved in the training are academic staff. Teachers who receive trainees merely give advice and share their workspace; they do not participate in assessing interns.	Involves actors other than those traditionally involved in training. In addition to the associated teachers (or tutors, or internship advisers), it involves principals, education experts, technicians and supervisors.
	Relies primarily on traditional devices for knowledge transmission and notably on the idea that by mastering a good repertoire of cases and techniques, the professional is able to act in real teaching situations.	Involves devices for the development of reflection on practice and awareness of knowledge. Anchored by approaches to competencies, problems, projects, clinics, etc.

Source: BORGES, 2008, p. 161.

This issue becomes graver when policies are issued by UNESP itself that do not recognize the supervised curricular internship as an area of knowledge with a subject of its own, centered in a training epistemology linked to professional practice (TARDIF, 2002). There is devaluation and non-compliance with the historical and consolidated role performed in the area of teaching practice in the process of linking specific content and pedagogical knowledge. There is a devaluation of supervised internships: the school is not conceived as a training place.

Another problem arises when PCC is conceived as similar to teaching practice that is linked to a supervised internship. PCC becomes misconfigured into something else with a meaning that nobody knows, becoming distant from the perspective of the professional training model.

However, Opinion CNE/CES no. 15, of May 2, 2005, attempted to correct some of these distortions by indicating that

> [...] *practice as a curriculum component is the set of training activities that provide experiences for applying or developing knowledge or developing procedures proper to teaching.* Through these activities, the knowledge, skills and abilities acquired in various training activities that make up the program curriculum are put to use within the teaching field. *Activities characterized as practice as a curriculum component can be developed as a core or as a part of subjects or other training activities.* This includes the subjects of a practical nature related to teacher training, but not those related to the technical-scientific foundations corresponding to a particular area of knowledge.
>
> In turn, *supervised training is a set of training activities carried out under the supervision of professors from the educational institution and followed by professionals, in which the student experiences situations of effective professional practice* (BRASIL, 2005, emphasis added).

In this context, it is also understood that both PCC and the supervised internship should result in the professors responsible for them receiving full credit for that course load. However, there are difficulties within the ambit of the policies instituted at UNESP related to valuing didactic experiences involving a multifocal reality that take place entirely in more than one educational environment. Neither PCC nor internships conform to the conventional meaning of what is meant by "class" at the university. Therefore, they tend to stay on the sidelines of the subjects categorized as content and of the professors involved in hiring for the process. Therefore, it is time to dare...

Final considerations: the challenge of making practice an object of knowledge

The PCC, conceived as an integrative project and teacher training with practice as a training locus (BORGES, 2008; TARDIF, 2002),

invite thinking about a curriculum that contemplates a new training paradigm, as articulated across three main axes (SOUZA NETO; ALEGRE; COSTA, 2006).

From this perspective, reflections are oriented to a curriculum matrix that enables the link between what has been named as *horizontal* structure, i.e., the subjects that will compose each year; the *vertical* structure, with respect to the link between the different years; and a third axis, *transversal* and integrative, which aims to intervene and modify the *teaching practice* performed in programs that train primary education teachers, according to the specificity of the area of knowledge and field of intervention. Through their interdisciplinary character, integrative projects may make the program more organic with respect to these three axes (SOUZA NETO; COSTA, 2003).

Within this context, *pedagogical practice* is understood as praxis — i.e., reflected action — materialized from the process of curriculum planning, education planning and/or work planning until decision-making occurs in the everyday of teaching, of mentoring, of intervention. It is these pedagogical practices that constitute their professional identity of the educator, the teacher, as a teaching professional, a social agent, with the potential for transformation based on his or her professional role.

The transversal axis is the one in which PCC must be included. This notion was presented in Opinion CNE/CP 009/2001 as a new *conception of practice — curriculum component —* that encompasses a dimension of knowledge present both when professional activity is reflected upon and during the internship when the professional activity is exercised. In Opinion CNE/CP 028/2001, *practice* is understood as "the very way in which things are done whose content is traversed by a theory". Therefore, PCC "is a practice that produces something in the teaching field" (BRASIL, 2001c, p. 9). It should be "planned for when preparing the pedagogical project, and it should take place from the beginning of the training process and extend throughout the entire process in conjunction with supervised internship, and academic work activities" (BRASIL, 2001c, p. 9).

It should be noted, however, as has been previously stated, that this idea of permeating the entire training process with "curricular practice" is not new. Thus, *Practice* will not be isolated, restricted to the internship, disjointed from the rest of the program, but will be present from the beginning of the program, permeating the entire training, becoming thereby the essence, reference or matrix that will guide the curriculum adaptation/restructuring process.

Likewise, this *practical dimension* may not be restricted to pedagogical subjects in areas/disciplines, and the *coordination of the practical dimension* will transcend the internship. It will aim to link different practices in an interdisciplinary perspective because this *practice* will emphasize procedures of observation and reflection, recording performed observations and resolving problem situations.

Therefore, the *400 hours of PCC* added to the teacher-training curriculum cannot and should not be viewed as a strategy to seek balance in the subjects' theory-practice relationships but instead should be considered from an interdisciplinary perspective, seeking practice as a place of training and articulation that assists in the formation of the teacher's identity.

This practice, as has been mentioned, should be focused on the procedures of observation, reflection, recording the observations performed and resolving problem situations. It is, therefore, *directed towards "teaching"* because the conception of curricular practice is thus characterized in the documents that make it explicit (BRASIL, 2002a). As a proposal, it was understood that PCC might be organized in the form of *Integrative Projects*, with the prospect and implementation of *seminars of integration* and *practical experiences*.

These projects must have their own course in the curriculum but do not necessarily consist of a subject in the conventional sense of the word. They could be placed or organized under the responsibility of a group of professors who teach subjects during each semester and/or a single professor. PCC is a new element of the program in which an interdisciplinary topic that could include the interests of each subject

simultaneously will be proposed and decided by a group of professors and students each semester.

PCC consists of a new thematic concept that preserves disciplinarity in the curriculum structure but that must overcome it in practice. Therefore, it is an exercise in overcoming a Cartesian tradition of positivism that tends to compartmentalize contents and to lock them into stagnant, sometimes unlinked, curriculum grids. The goal is an organic curriculum, capable of interdisciplinarily linking different areas of knowledge.

For this purpose, PCC should be considered as a recognized space of pedagogic work that does not constitute a "traditional subject" in the sense of classes but that has a designated professor and an assigned course load and that operates as a unifying element that links the semester's different subjects. Thus, based on the assumption that PCC is not an isolated subject in the curriculum, it should be understood as a guiding axis of training that includes an integrative element of theory and practice throughout the program and that potentiates training actions that demonstrate the multi-interdisciplinary characteristics of knowledge.

It is also understood that research on teaching or aspects of teaching performance is a trigger for PCC through the association between theory and practice, understanding it in the sense of praxis, i.e., an intentional action. To make PCC viable, permeating the entire program, it is fundamental that licensure be valued by all of the professors working in the program. The valuation of PCC presupposes the discussion of the importance of teacher training within the program.

It is also important to define PCC, teaching practice and supervised internship. It is thus recommended to define a conception of PCC in the program's political-pedagogical project to include involvement by all professors, in the context of the licensure program, to enhance interdisciplinarity. Therefore, the link among specific content subjects, pedagogical subjects and PCC must be stated in the program's political-pedagogical project.

In short, PCC should be coherently linked with the program and distributed among specific subjects and pedagogical training subjects. We

emphasize the need for didactic and pedagogical training of teachers in licensure programs for PCC to be realized in an articulate and integral manner. Accordingly, there must be incentives for didactic and integrative projects, for the inseparability of theory and practice and for the proposition of linked axes for initial training, respecting the specificities of each program and valuing the clarification of the curricular nature of PCC, which may occur in different training spaces where teaching activities take place.

References

BORGES, C. *O professor de educação básica e seus saberes profissionais*. Araraquara: JM, 2008.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. *Lei n. 9394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996*. Brasília, DF, 1996. Available at: <http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/LEIS/l9394.htm>. Accessed in: Oct. 23, 2006.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. *Parecer CNE/CES n. 744, de 3 de dezembro de 1997*. Brasília, DF, 1997. Available at: <http://www.portal.mec.gov.br/index>. Accessed in: Oct. 6, 2008.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Parecer CNE/CP 9, de 8 de maio de 2001. *Documenta*, Brasília, n. 476, p. 513-562, 2001a. Available at: <http://www.uems.br/proe/sec/Parecer%20CNE-CP%20009-2001.pdf>. Accessed in: Oct. 23, 2006.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. *Parecer CNE/CP n. 21, de 6 de agosto de 2001*. Brasília, DF, 2001b. Available at: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/021.pdf>. Accessed in: Oct. 23, 2006.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. *Parecer CNE/CP n. 28, de 2 de outubro de 2001*. Brasília, DF, 2001c. Available at: <http://www.uems.br/proe/sec/Parecer%20 CNE-CP%20028-2001.pdf>. Accessed in: Oct. 23, 2006.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Resolução CNE/CP n. 1, de 18 de fevereiro de 2002. *Diário Oficial da União*, Brasília, 4 mar. 2002a. Seção 1. p. 8.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Resolução CNE/CP n. 2, de 19 de fevereiro de 2002. *Diário Oficial da União*, Brasília, 4 mar. 2002b. Seção 1. p. 9.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. P*arecer CNE/CES n. 15, de 2 de fevereiro de 2005*. Brasília: MEC/CNE, 2005.

CARVALHO et al. Simpósio de Licenciatura: "prática de ensino em questão". In: CARVALHO et al. *Simpósio de Licenciatura*: a prática de ensino em questão. São Paulo: Unesp/Prograd, 1993.

CARVALHO et al. *Pensando a formação de professores na Unesp*. São Paulo: Unesp/Prograd, 2002.

CARVALHO et al. II Simposio: a prática de ensino em questão – memória e síntese das discussões. In: CARVALHO et al. *II Simpósio de Licenciatura*: a prática de ensino em questão. São Paulo: Unesp/Prograd, 2009.

CHAGAS, V. *O ensino de 1º e 2º graus*: antes, agora e depois? 2. ed. São Paulo: Saraiva, 1975.

HOLMES GROUP. *Tomorrow's teacher*: a report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group, 1986.

SÃO PAULO (Estado). Conselho Estadual de Educação. *Relatório do Conselho Pleno*. 23 set. 1997. São Paulo: CEESP, 1997.

SARTI, F. M. O professor e as mil maneiras de fazer no cotidiano escolar. *Educação: Teoria e Prática*, v. 18, n. 30, p. 47-65, 2008.

SCHON, D. *The reflective practicioner*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

SCHON, D. Formar professores como profissionais reflexivos. In. NÓVOA, A. (Org.). *Os professores e sua formação*. Lisboa: Dom Quixote, 1992. p.78-93.

SILVA, T. T. *Documentos de identidade*: uma introdução às teorias do currículo. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 1999.

SOUZA NETO, S.; ALEGRE, A. de N.; COSTA, Á. C. A prática como componente curricular e o estágio curricular supervisionado: que rumo tomar? In: SOUZA NETO, S.; HUNGER, D. (Org.). *Formação profissional em educação física*: estudos e pesquisas. Rio Claro: Biblioética, 2006. p. 33-42.

SOUZA NETO, S.; COSTA, A. C. Imagens e projetos na formação de professores: pela superação das dicotomias nos currículos das licenciaturas. *Educação: Teoria e Prática*, v. 11, n. 20, 21, p. 47-50, 2003.

TARDIF, M. *Saberes docentes e formação profissional*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2002.

UNESP – Universidade Estadual Paulista Júlio de Mesquita Filho. *Relatório síntese de caracterização das licenciaturas*. São Paulo, 2011. Available at: <http://iage.fclar.unesp.br/licenciaturas/PDFs/sintese.pdf>. Accessed in: Apr. 30, 2013.