

CURRICULUM AND FORMATION: CONCEPTIVE-ACTIONALIST CONSTRUCTION IN FACED-UFBA'S FORMACCE

Roberto Sidnei Macedo*

Universidade Federal da Bahia

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5350-5999>

Denise Moura de Jesus Guerra**

Universidade Federal da Bahia

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5745-7974>

Társio Roberto Macedo***

Secretaria de Educação da Bahia – SEC/BA

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5138-6968>

ABSTRACT¹

This article discusses how FORMACCE, a research group within the PGEDU FACED-UFBA (UFBA's Education Graduate Program), at the heart of its studies, research, and interventions, creates conceptive and actionalist productions in curriculum and formation (*formação*)². Furthermore, it explains how the research group, through a problematizing, fundamental, and generative composition, views these two educational themes as interwoven, using the conception of *curriculum acts and formation as a fundamental learning experience* as a reference. Correspondingly, the article explains how the concept of formation is conceived in this context, using as a basis *The Ethnoconstitutive Theory of Curriculum* (Macedo, 2016). It also discusses how this conceptive and actionalist approach points to the need to de-instrumentalize the concept of curriculum and formation in favor of policies guided by the sharing of formative, authorial, and authorizing knowledge.

Keywords: curriculum; learning; formation.

* Professor in the College of Education at Universidade Federal da Bahia, Coordinator of the *FORMACCE Em Aberto* Research Group, Member of ANPED's GT 12. Member of the ABdC Curriculum Association. Salvador, Bahia, Brazil. E-mail: rsmacedo@outlook.com

** Adjunct Professor at the College of Education at Universidade Federal da Bahia, Vice-coordinator of the *FORMACCE Em Aberto* Research Group, Member of ANPED's GT 12. Member of the ABdC Curriculum Association, Coordinator at PIBID/UFBA. Salvador, Bahia, Brazil. E-mail: dmguerra@ufba.br

*** Pedagogical Coordinator for the Bahia State Department of Education. PhD in Education from the Postgraduate Program in Education (FACED-UFBA). E-mail: tarsio.hist@gmail.com

1 Translation to English by Paula Souza Alves.

2 Translator's note: The term *formation* has been chosen as the standard translation for the Portuguese word *formação* throughout this text. In the article, *formação* refers to a broad range of learning contexts, including academic education, teacher education/training, and professional development courses and/or workshops. The authors argue that *formação* extends beyond education or the development of technical skills, which is why *formation* was chosen instead of *training* or other possible terms. According to the *Dicionário Priberam da Língua Portuguesa*, *formação* can mean "a set of values or moral qualities resulting from education," "a set of specific knowledge that is taught or acquired," or "a class, session, or course designed to acquire or update professional knowledge or knowledge related to an activity."

RESUMEN

CURRÍCULO Y FORMACIÓN: LA CONSTRUCCIÓN CONCEPTUAL-ACCIONISTA DE FORMACCE FACED-UFBA³

Este artículo aborda cómo el Grupo de Investigación FORMACCE PGEDU FACED-UFBA desarrolla enfoques conceptuales y accionalistas sobre el currículo y la formación a través de sus estudios, investigaciones e intervenciones. Se expone cómo estos dos temas clave en el ámbito educativo son comprendidos de manera entrelazada por el Grupo, en un proceso de reflexión crítica e innovadora. Este enfoque se basa en la idea de que los actos de currículo y formación son experiencias de aprendizaje irreductibles. Desde esta perspectiva, se describe cómo se entiende la formación, inspirándose en La teoría etnoconstitutiva de Currículo (Macedo, 2016). Además, se argumenta que este enfoque conceptual y accionalista destaca la importancia de superar una visión meramente instrumental del currículo y la formación, promoviendo políticas significativas basadas en el intercambio de saberes formativos, autorales y autorizantes.

Palabras clave: currículo; aprendizaje; formación.

RESUMO

CURRÍCULO E FORMAÇÃO: A CONSTRUÇÃO CONCEPTO-ACIONALISTA DO FORMACCE FACED-UFBA

O presente artigo, em seus argumentos, trata sobre como o Grupo de Pesquisa FORMACCE PGEDU FACED-UFBA, no âmbito dos seus estudos, pesquisas e intervenções, cria produções conceptivas e acionalistas em currículo e formação. Explicita como essas duas temáticas do campo educacional passam a ser compreendidas de forma entretecida por este Grupo de Pesquisa, numa composição problematizadora, irreductível e generativa, tomando como referência a concepção de *atos de currículo e formação como experiência aprendente irreductível*. Nesse veio, explicita como a concepção de formação é concebida nesse entretecimento, tomando como inspiração fundante *A teoria etnoconstitutiva de Currículo* (Macedo, 2016). Argumenta, ademais, como essa abordagem conceptiva e acionalista aponta para a necessidade de se desinstrumentalizar a concepção de currículo e formação em favor de políticas de sentido orientadas pela partilha de saberes formativos, autorais e autorizantes.

Palavras-chave: currículo; aprendizagem; formação.

³ Texto traduzido por Diana Rueda.

Introduction

Throughout its long history of studies, research, interventions, and concept creation, FACED-UFBA's FORMACCE Research Group has developed a theoretical and actionalist approach that is continually (re)signified. It draws on its experiences and experimentations as a research group, focusing on agendas and issues related to curriculum and formation, with special attention to formation. In this regard, the group has intentionally engaged in a theoretical and actionalist construction aimed at distinguishing, making explicit, and relating the conceptions of curriculum and formation. This approach is primarily grounded in the *Ethnoconstitutive Theory of Curriculum* (Macedo, 2016), understood and established as a *curricular-formative theory-action*.

FORMACCE's conceptual constructions of curriculum and formation

Perspectives on curriculum and curriculum acts as ethnoconstitutive issues and agendas

If we understand that curriculum emerges as a living text that deals with knowledge and activities chosen as formative, constantly re-writing intentions and points of view, we can also recognize that the antinomian narratives separating theory and practice in the field and curricular practices have lost their pertinence and relevance. In this context, the idea of a moving and procedural perspective—coined by us as *curriculum acts* (Macedo, 2007)—precisely enhances the relational and constructionist character of this educational, socially, and culturally instituted elaboration. Furthermore, the concept of *curriculum acts* includes all those involved in the actions and fabrics of formation as curriculum actors, i.e. planners, teachers, administrators, students, staff, parents, families, communities, social movements, etc.

It is necessary to emphasize that, from the perspective of the *Ethnoconstitutive Theory of Curriculum* (Macedo, 2016), *curriculum acts* shape curricular-formative activity on a daily basis. They suggest that formation is not limited to external guidelines imposed by educational mechanics and their regulations. Consequently, learners—actors in training—are not merely seen as fulfilling educational demands, applying curricular standards, or, in Garfinkel's (1975) terms, as “cultural idiots” when engaging with curricular issues and proposals. For all practical purposes, they are curriculumants. That is, they are capable of producing curricular *ethnomethods*⁴.

Similarly, the idea of *curriculum acts* emphasizes the recommendation of not treating anthroposocial realities as mere products of insularized individuals, nor judging them solely by their individual actions. Instead, it focuses on understanding their activities as a crucial constructionist foundation for comprehending ongoing socio-educational orders. The conceptual power of *curriculum acts* in relation to formation serves as an epistemological resolution to understanding the deeply embedded pedagogical relationship between curriculum and formation. At the same time, it promotes the process of de-standardizing and democratizing the curriculum, framing it as an experience that is socially referenced and endorsed as a common good. It is therefore reasonable to conceive of curriculum and formation as interconnected achievements, interwoven within the spheres of activity, intimacy, and negotiation, as argued by Bélanger (2004). They are shaped by social actors and segments, and their histories, intentions, and interests, are always in relation to one another. In this context, an understanding of the process of instituting the curriculum lies in the

4 In ethnomethodology, ethnomethods refer to the ways individuals, within their sociocultural contexts, understand and interact with the world, thereby constructing their social orders.

socio-formational dynamics of *curriculum acts*, a space where hegemonies and re-existences are constructed through hybrid processes, contextualizations and re-contextualizations, territorializations, de-territorializations, and re-territorializations, as highlighted in the curricular studies of Lopes (2008), drawing on the work of Goodson, Bernstein, and Laclau. In these terms, we believe that formation in educational institutions unfolds within the dynamics of *curriculum acts*, where content and form, instituting and instituted, and powers and counter-powers function in an interconnected way (Macedo, 2010).

Furthermore, it is important to emphasize how the existential, social, and cultural dimensions of the formative experience serve as a central and powerful force for problematizing the long-standing and resistant instrumentalist conception of curriculum. Formative experience thus emerges as an *analyzer*⁵ for confronting the colonialist universalism of curricular concepts, practices, and policies. Thus, from a formative perspective, one might always say: we don't recognize ourselves in the curricular knowledge presented to us here. In these contexts, formative experience makes a difference in formative acts. Often, despite instrumentalist practices and reductionist fetishes, a constitutive license is no longer required to learn in a meaningful way.

An ethnoconstitutive concept of formation as an inextricable learning experience

It is important to emphasize at the outset that in earlier discussions about formation, we understood it as a set of conditions and mediations for learning, as is common in our field. In these terms, we had to make an effort to reconceptualize it as a phenomenon taking the form of a deep, broad, and unique experience—one in which the learner engages interactively and meaningfully, immersed in culture and society.

5 According to French institutional analysis, an *analyzer* serves as a mobilizer of debates, problematizations, explanations, and imaginaries, possessing significant generative power.

Thus, a key question arises: what meanings do we attribute to a learning *experience* in the educational world when we refer to it as formation? Another important question in the trajectory of this shift is: Could the idea of *formativity*, originally developed in Bernard Honoré's *Philosophy of Formation* (1992), as the set of conditions, mediations, experiences, and formulations involving the phenomenon of formation, be inaugurating the construction of an authentic *field* within educational situations and practices? In these terms, is there currently the possibility of a so-called *formatiological thought* or a body of knowledge that we could systematize and call *formationology*?

These questions reveal a persistent issue in our educational context: the difficulty in clearly distinguishing what constitutes formation. At the same time, they highlight the fact that certain themes, already established in other contexts, exist within a much more complex set of explanations, thus fueling problematizing formative actions that, *a fortiori*, take into account socio-existential and cultural experiences and demands in formation.

If we understand that, in the context of formation, there is still no space to discuss a specific *field* of knowledge—one with the depth of production, distinctions, and arguments necessary to recognize it as such, or even a *formationology*—on the other hand, we can already insist on the existence of a theme with its own luminosity, capable of sparking and developing a relatively intense debate about its emergence and its epistemological and political-pedagogical characteristics. It should be emphasized that the educational world has chosen curriculum and formation as central and (in)tense agendas in the socio-educational configuration, reflected in its narratives and institutional guidelines. These include the so-called, and often inadequate, "curriculum and formation policies".

Furthermore, four highly significant questions have led these concerns to shift in certain directions. The first is a totalizing question, one

that philosophy has long asked in its quest to singularize the understanding of the human being, without resorting to reductionism: how can we mobilize the debate on formation? The second question could be metaphorized as follows: Given the current power of the curriculum to shape education, why is it that, in our contexts of reflection and practice, curriculum and formation seldom interact? How can we foster a relational, interwoven perspective in this case? The third is much more specific: How can we understand formation as a circumstantial phenomenon that encompasses the existential, the desiderative, the sociocultural, the political, the ethical, the cultural, the spiritual, and the pedagogical? (Macedo, 2010, p. 34).

When we engaged in this debate, these questions highlighted a concern that strongly fueled our motivation: the lack of explicit discussions on formation as a distinct, legitimate phenomenon, one defined by its learning-experiential specificity. In this context, we recognize that our pedagogical tradition has tended to position formation either within its technological, didactic, or logistical frameworks, or, in teaching, as focused on “preparation” and “training.” Often, a supposedly isolated phenomenon within learner performances. Generally, formation is understood as education: a broader theory and practice of guidance, organization, or systematization of formative actions, with the meaning of formation often reduced to a mere and expected consequence of educational devices. In other words, if there was teaching, there was formation. The autopoietic and relational character that fundamentally defines formation as a learning phenomenon, inherently tied to socially and culturally instituted experience, is often neglected, simplified, or reduced to easy generalizations (Macedo, 2010).

We confess that when we first began these questionings and intercritical contributions, our specific competence in discussing the curriculum—despite our engagement with critical-constructionist dynamism and our deepening understanding of its epistemologi-

cal, political, and cultural dimensions—did not bring us any closer to understanding what truly happens when an individual is formed within the dynamics of the curricular context and its complex actions.

We can affirm that we lacked an understanding of what formation would look like if apprehended through the experience of curriculum-mediated learning. We also lacked debate on key facets of the epistemology of formation, as well as a deeper understanding of how a cognitive, social, cultural, and deductive entity is formed within a curricular context.

We cannot mistake or reduce the phenomenon of formation — which unfolds within a relational entity — to the management of formation and its rationality. It is no longer appropriate to conceive of formation as something externally determined, as an action to complete, readjust, or rectify learning experiences, nor as a mere response to bureaucratic demands. It is in these terms that Honoré (1992), throughout his vast work on formation, urges us that, rather than merely engaging in formative practices without questioning them or settling for brief inquiries that quickly lead to easy, self-evident answers, it is necessary to approach formation as a phenomenon to be discovered. Instead of a *tout court* theory to be “applied in practice,” let us speak of *meta-formative* experiences. According to Gadamer (1999), it is this experience and this line of thinking that offer humans their condition of finitude and limits. It is here that the experience of formation encounters temporality, duration, unfinishedness, and fulfillment—essential elements for reflecting on the complexity of time and the existences involved in the formation process.

We would also argue that the process we are considering here does not follow the logic of assembling a factory product, where strict control ensures a predetermined “quality,” nor does it unfold in an absolute or *a priori* manner. That said, it is crucial to emphasize that this argument does not dismiss the educational commitment to socially referenced and digni-

fied expectations in the institutional learning construction process. Nor does it underestimate the power of education to persuade and shape through its discourses, theories, policies, and implementations.

Within our *space-time* of concerns, we recognize that the politics of meaning surrounding the phenomenon of formation remains shrouded in a certain opacity, which significantly affects our formative practices. The meaning of the term is not made explicit through debate, and instead, it is inflated by a certain trivialization of its ontological, pedagogical, ethical, political, and cultural implications. Its *arkhé* — the foundational principle that underpins its historical and philosophical debate — has scarcely emerged in our study scenarios in terms of depth and expansion. Formative proposals and practices are often immersed in hazy conceptual fragments, reduced to technical facets, rarely dialogued, and insufficiently problematized in elucidative terms. We would even say they remain unconcerned, hovering in our fields of educational reflection.

Advocating for a socio-existential perspective in formation while simultaneously criticizing the historical technicism embedded in its approaches and mechanisms, Honoré (1992) argues that a significant portion of formative actions are inherently practices centered on techniques and their essentialist cultures.

In our specific context, we observe that formative actions today are largely reduced to heated debates on the mechanics, organization, and institutionalization of the curriculum, its impact on school systems and teacher education, as well as concerns about didactic efficiency. As a result, they often become oversimplified, centering on the mere “application” of didactic-curricular models and their (in)adequations.

In the formative context, assessment is often treated in a similarly reductive manner—either as an external judgment of individual learning performance or as a mere construction of numerical indicators detached from the exper-

iential processes and inherent complexity of formation. Formation is frequently tied to the device, mistaken for the application of artifacts or learning performances, simplified as a product, or deduced from theoretical and/or technical *a priori* frameworks. The persistent lack of deeper reflection and action on *assessment in formation* remains a concerning issue.

Thus, the idea of mass-producing formation is unthinkable; one only needs to observe the consequences of the massification of educational issues and agendas worldwide. It is equally unconceivable to define formation solely through extensive indicators, measurable dimensions, and quantifiable perspectives. The simplification and instrumentalization of educational reality by official statistics, for example, have often misled us about the true quality of formation. At best, such metrics allow for only limited approximations or generalized readings of the learning phenomenon. Opening up to possibility, to the project, to the conditions for creation, inventiveness, bricolage, the emergence of the imaginary, and the valued learning experience — none of this is attainable within such a logic. From this perspective, the exercise of *meta-formation* would also be unattainable, that is, the self-critical and intercritical⁶ reflection of individuals and social collectives on formation as a valued learning process in motion. Here, formation would not be realized merely by fulfilling demands. Learners would reflect on their formation as a complex, embodied, and implicated event, socially referenced in its unique singularity. To reflect on their own formation, beyond it being a “right” not prescribed by BNCC, would become an agenda for formation in process. “In these terms, the meta-formative exercise becomes a powerful problematizer for proposing

6 Atlan (1993, p. 67) is responsible for proposing and developing the concept of intercriticism, fundamentally in his work *With Reason and Without It: Intercriticism of Science and Myth*. For Atlan, what is significant is the necessary passage through the relativity of morality and culture, in their confrontations, which enables the existence of multiple ‘I’s.

experiences, policies, and curricular proposals” (Macedo, 2010, p. 45; Macedo, 2022, p. 57).

We can anticipate some elaborations on the plural form and the explicit structure of these arguments. For example, formation as a phenomenon in the making, or one that was shaped at some point in life, is not explained by the logic of any theoretical models. It is not something that can be deduced but rather understood and made explicit through the individual’s reflection and narration about their own process and completion of formation. What needs to be explained from the moment of conception – in a responsible and mutual way – are the pedagogical actions, devices, resources, conditions, policies, and institutional settings. Formation as the *experience* of an entity that learns, appears in action and meaning. This is why, according to Josso (2002, p. 76), *if it is not experiential, it is not formative*. This appearing in action and meaning can never be seen as a performance limited to the individual. In this regard, we would add, ontologically and socially: *either the formative process is relational, or it is not formation* (Macedo, 2010, p. 20).

Furthermore, considering that a socio-existential and cultural perspective of formation necessarily implies understanding its experiential character as learning in action, we can reflect alongside Josso (2002):

[...] In what is formation experiential or not?

It’s learning to analyze the contributions of our activities, our life contexts, our elective relationships and the events that take shape within us; it’s discovering that, in this development of our experiences, we have transformed some, more or less consciously, into founding experiences; it’s learning to invest our present in such a way that our experiences can become formative experiences that enliven or nourish our searches; it’s learning to discover the cognitive assumptions of our interpretations as well as our privileged registers of expression. All this learning enables the author-researcher to understand their own formation and, more generally, the field of formation itself from the point of view of the subject (Josso, 2002, p. 141).⁷

7 “[...] Em que a formação é experiencial ou não é? É apren-

More recently, we at FORMACCE have been working on distinguishing, by emphasizing the process of formation as an irreducible learning experience, the difference between the *formative act* and *formation as an experience*. What we refer to as *formational* tells us what it is connected to, what it is linked to, and what is relative to formation. When we use the term *formation*, it is tied to the sense of the experiential process *en train de se faire*⁸, at the heart of those who experience learning as an irreducible, singular, and singularizing phenomenon. There are no intentions here of universalizing meanings. This semantic choice helps us consolidate what we have already discussed intercritically in previous arguments, in terms of valuing formation as the experience of those who learn within curricular contexts. Moreover, for FORMACCE, formation as a plural and irreducible experience serves as an *analyzer of curriculum acts*. For the FORMACCE researchers, it represents a power to question every instituted and instituting curricular-formative element.

FORMACCE’s institutional experiences and interventions: examples of curricular-formative concepts and actions

Regarding FORMACCE’s ethnoconstitutive curricular interventions, our intention here—organized in the chronology of this section’s

der a analisar os contributos das nossas actividades, dos nossos contextos de vida, das nossas relações electivas e de acontecimentos que em nós tomam forma; é descobrir que, neste desenvolvimento das nossas vivências transformámos algumas, mais ou menos conscientemente, em experiências fundadoras; é aprender a investir o nosso presente de tal maneira que as nossas vivências possam tornar-se experiências formadoras que vivificam ou alimentam as nossas buscas; é aprender a descobrir os pressupostos cognitivos das nossas interpretações bem como os nossos registos de expressão privilegiados. O conjunto destas aprendizagens permite, pois, ao autor-investigador compreender a sua formação e, de uma forma mais geral, o próprio campo da formação do ponto de vista do sujeito” (Josso, 2002, p. 141)

8 In the process of becoming, as a state of flux.

presentation—is not to expose and characterize the entire experience of working with curriculum and formation, nor the final results arising from these interventions and/or research. Instead, it is to explain how the process of curricular-institutional work, in some way, constituted ethnoconstitutive curricular and formation itineraries and heuristics. In this way, it enabled the emergence of conceptual and actionalist elaborations which, in the end, have been constituting, through experience and experimentation, the *Ethnoconstitutive Theory of Curriculum*, formulated within the Research Group mentioned here.

The beginnings of FORMACCE, its early experiences and experimentations: on the curricular (re)elaboration of the Pedagogy Course at FES/UNEB

This is when, in the mid-1990s, the first conceptual-actionalist experience of the FORMACCE Research Group took place in its emerging process. A few years later, it was officially established at the heart of FAGED-UFBA and named the Open FORMACCE Research Group in the CNPq Directory of Research Groups. This experience had its inaugural development at the former College of Education of Serrinha (FES), a campus belonging to the State University of Bahia (UNEB), now called Department XI-UNEB, where the Pedagogy Course is located.

Through a decision involving faculty, administrators, and students, it was agreed in meetings that the College needed to (re)develop its curriculum to update the curricular guidelines established by the inaugural proposal, which proved significantly inadequate for formation purposes. In response to the demands of the educational field, the curriculum was primarily structured around teacher education, aiming to align with the forthcoming Curriculum Guidelines for Teacher Formation. A committee of faculty members specializing in curriculum studies took the lead in organizing the necessary actions, under the coordination of the Head of the Department.

The Department XI-UNEB is located in the city of Serrinha, a municipality in the semi-arid zone of the state of Bahia, with a high degree of poverty due to the difficulties caused by prolonged drought and extremely concentrated income. The region faces significant illiteracy rates, and its economy is primarily based on sisal production, family farming, and cattle and goat farming.

Focus groups, composed of faculty, administrators, students, and staff, were tasked with assessing the quality of the curriculum and suggesting possible adaptations. Representatives from the city's education department, principals of the *Escolas Normais* that hosted student interns, tenured municipal and state teachers, graduates, municipal secretaries from neighboring cities, and representatives from DIREC (the state's public education regulatory body) and the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE) were also invited to participate. To facilitate their contributions, they were briefed on the focus group dynamics and given access to relevant course curriculum documents.

The narratives of those directly and indirectly involved in the curriculum under study shed light on the *curricular ethnomethods* that shaped the group's understanding and design of institutional proposals. This process unveiled the "box of opacities" within a curriculum that had been conceived and proposed in a merely bureaucratic and decontextualized manner. As a result, the institution embarked on a curricular experience grounded in an ethnoconstitutive perspective, which had significant repercussions on future decisions regarding the evaluation of curriculum quality.

Regarding resistance to the revisions and the disputes surrounding these changes, it became evident how disciplinary corporatism generated a form of power closely tied to the defense of epistemological and disciplinary territories. These constituted the most visible and forceful resistance within the institution itself.

The experience of the curriculum reform process and its outcomes served as both an example and inspiration for other campuses within Bahia State University's multi-campus structure, including from a political standpoint, by contributing to the decentralization of university curriculum policies.

The development of the Curriculum Guidelines for Indigenous Schools in the State of Bahia

Working on the curriculum and formation *with* people and their daily lives, rather than *about* them, was the founding principle of the experience of building the curricula of Indigenous Schools in the state of Bahia and preparing local teachers and administrators to work with these curricula. In this regard, educators from Indigenous communities in the state of Bahia were invited to take part in a federal project that was laying the groundwork for the construction of the Curriculum Guidelines for Indigenous Education in Brazil. The Pataxó, Pataxó Hã Hã Hai from the south of the state, Kiriri, and Tuxá were the peoples that engaged most actively and mobilized themselves directly for the work required.

In constant interaction with the leaders of each people, it was agreed that cultural conversations (*com-versações*) on how to build curricular principles and guidelines would take precedence, based on the *space-time* of interaction within the indigenous peoples.

Both the indigenous leaders and the teachers from the communities involved in the curriculum and formation work developed the curricular possibilities with the team coordinated by Clélia Cortes, an indigenous researcher and trainer at NEPEC FACED-UFBA⁹, in a process of spatio-temporal mobilization distributed either within the communities themselves or in the formation spaces created by the Bahia State Department of Education in Salvador. This approach helped the team to understand the principles and guidelines of the curriculum

through an in-depth contextualization and re-contextualization of each indigenous peoples' experience, valuing their knowledge and forms of organization, which were chosen as foundational for the curricula under construction. The major overarching concepts that organized the curriculum themes, as well as the axes that articulated the knowledge, were produced in an (in)tense cultural conversation between indigenous knowledge and its transversalities and the knowledge established and required by the educational principles of the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education.

In the *intercritical* and propositional dialog between the indigenous teachers and the team responsible for developing the project, indigenous teacher leaders emerged who ended up playing a crucial role in the development of the propositional summaries of the curricula. They were particularly instrumental in making explicit the *ethnomethods* through which the cultural knowledge of the indigenous peoples and their educational demands were understood.

Drawing from focus groups, conversation circles within the communities, and extended meetings—many of which took place in indigenous contexts—the proposed curricula emerged with significant transversal themes. These themes were shaped by the political and formative relevance of the historical struggles of the indigenous peoples of Bahia, particularly in their fight for territory, environmental and economic sustainability, and the affirmation of their cultures.

Through the practice of “sensitive listening” (Barbier, 2004), it became evident how, in a *meta-formative* process, we were able to highlight, during the construction of the curriculum, how anthropologically and mutually we learned about human realities so distant from one another, how we deconstructed some myths and embraced others. In this context, working on the curriculum offered the university team pivotal learning moments through encounters with the daily lives of the indigenous peoples of Bahia. This experience became one of the

⁹ Former Research and Study Center in Curriculum of the Graduate Program in Education at FACED-UFBA.

significant and enduring foundations of the *Ethnoconstitutive Theory of Curriculum*.

This project was one of the fertile seeds for the future construction of the National Curriculum Guidelines for Indigenous Education in Brazil.

Working on curriculum and formation with public health educators at UNASUS

Conceived to advise organizations connected to health programs in the state of Bahia, within the broader health policies of the Ministry of Health, the actions of UNASUS - *Universidade Aberta do Sistema Único de Saúde (Open University of the Brazilian Unified Health System)*, were aimed at addressing both the curricular structuring demands and the education of individuals from organizations directly affiliated with the State Health Department, as well as the Schools of Public Health.

Inspired by the concept of Permanent Education in Health, *work as an educational principle* is at the core of formation guidelines and actions, as well as a pedagogical perspective rooted in the principles of active and critical-emancipatory pedagogies, ethnoconstitutive curricular and educational interventions were implemented with a focus on educating health professionals. This was based on an understanding of formation as a relational and, at the same time, irreducible experience, intertwined with work and its problematization. In these terms, approaching the contexts, institutions, and individuals demanding formation to sensitively understand their needs and the *ethnomethods* with which they constructed their claims, while also pointing to solutions based on their work contexts, led to the inter-critical objectifications made in the encounter with the knowledge already established in the work and in the specialized literature regarding curriculum and formation in the health field.

Once the demands had been heard and recorded, the team that synthesized the actions — coordinated by researcher Solange Viana from the Institute of Collective Health at UFBA

— built, in collaboration with the curriculum actors involved, explicit and problematizing workshops on curriculum and formation in health, as well as curricular and formative experiences with the institutions and their professionals. Based on these workshops, which always led to the expanded socialization of the productions, proposals for curricula and formative processes were developed.

At these meetings, we had the opportunity to listen to and record the *ethnomethods* with which the demands were constructed and presented, including their *describability, intelligibility, analyzability, systematicity, and sensitivity*.

The productions of the groups were not seen as right or wrong, but as valuable material for understanding and problematizing proposals, while also aiming to build curricula and formative processes. In terms of formative work, it occurred simultaneously with the construction of the curricular proposals. The use of *formative diaries* played a central role in this process, including their online use (Guerra, 2014), as the formative experiences also had distance-based configurations. This was due to the large number of demands, the territorial extent, and the socio-cultural diversity of the state of Bahia, along with the resulting health problems and their respective demands for solutions. Through this device, access was gained to a type of formation with broader and more ethnoconstitutive learning stories, since the learning processes were reported from the professional life in formation. This experience highlighted a significant process of *self-formation* and *meta-formation*. In the latter case, the students' reflections were not only on the formation contents and activities, but also on how they were involved in this process, in a refined assessment of their value. *Hetero-formation, auto-formation, eco-formation* and *meta-formation*¹⁰ (Pineau, 2000), were fruitful

¹⁰ These four formative experiences conceived by Pineau (2000) are discussed in our book *Compreender/mediar a formação* (Macedo, 2010). They imply that formation, as a valued learning experience, takes place through relation-

experiences that clearly qualified the formation that took place and was achieved.

It's worth mentioning that all the formative activities were transversed by artistic presentations linked to the themes being worked on, as well as lectures by specialists in both the curriculum and the areas of health work. This didactic-pedagogical construction considered the team's commitment to multi-referencing¹¹ all the work with the curriculum and formation as a pedagogical principle and a requirement in response to the complex institutional, contextual, and formative plurality from which the demands originated.

The conception and constitution of SIN-PRO-BA's Formation Department

With accumulated ethnoconstitutive expertise in curricular/formative studies and proposals, FORMACCE was challenged to carry out *collaborative formation-research* with SINPRO-BA, the Bahia State Teachers' Union. This formation-research evolved into a foundational research project for the group itself. The demand from fellow teachers in basic education was to *collaboratively* build principles that would guide SINPRO in establishing its future Formation Department, with the understanding that learning was becoming a valuable political agenda for the union. Collectively, the research project, the studies, and the actions of composition and analysis of the understandings produced were carried out through (in)tense curricular conversations between the Union and the university team. What Henri Atlan (1993) refers to as an epistemology of *talking together* was forged. It was the professional *implications* that predominantly mobilized and shaped the entire creation of research knowledge and the propositions that emerged from it. This process was based on an exchange of

ethnomethods between the teachers participating in the research and university researchers, all of whom were committed to sharing knowledge, experiences, and formative proposals in a singular and singularizing context.

Ethnofocused groups, individual narratives, and document analysis were conducted, alongside meetings that expanded depending on the topic at hand. The *subsuming notions* that structured the analyses emerged through meetings where the participation criterion was to welcome the contributions of those who, in one way or another, had been engaged in the process of shaping the principles that would guide SINPRO's formation policy.

From an ethnoconstitutive perspective, an academic-formative meta-construction emerged from the unique political-formative encounter between the university and the basic education teachers' union, towards collaborative formation-research.

This formation-research experience is densely analyzed and explained in the institutional work of SINPRO-BA, entitled *Práxis e Devir: trabalho e formação docente* (2006).¹²

Curriculum formation-research with PARFOR-UNEB teachers

At the request of the coordinators of Plataforma Freire at Bahia State University (PARFOR-UNEB), the management team of this continuing teacher formation program implemented a formative action for pedagogical coordinators. This formative action was developed in response to the coordinators' request for a deeper understanding of the Program's curricular specificities and to expand their knowledge of curricular issues and guidelines.

Based on the coordinators' indications in the surveys conducted by the management group, key guidelines were selected for development, including curriculum and experience, curriculum and autonomy, curriculum and emancipation, curriculum and ongoing teacher development, and curriculum and teaching

ships with others, with oneself, in relationships with the environments we live in and in critical assessments of our involvement with the learning we are willing to do.

11 For Ardoino (1993), multi-referentiality implies recognizing the inherent incompleteness of human actions and the inevitable heterogeneity of their emergence.

12 *Praxis and Becoming: work and teacher education*

work. It was also decided that the experience would be transformed into a formation-research initiative, with the materials provided by the coordinators serving not only as input for a procedural evaluation but also, with the teachers' consent, as research material.

The ethnoconstitutive perspective was developed through experiential devices for professional learning, such as the production of diaries, reflective letters about the course, and collective processes for constructing understandings of the themes. Artistic expressions created by the material production groups were integral to the process, consistently shared in both small and extended group sessions. This approach aimed to multi-referentialize the objectified understandings of the themes explored by the instructors.

Tensions were minimal and emerged primarily in the intersection between the teachers' experiences with the curricula they worked with in PARFOR and the (in)formations that had a formative impact on the group. The teachers also reflected on how their schools' curricular structures predominantly reproduced disciplinary logic. As a notable advancement, they positively highlighted the localized and transversal approach to research and internships, as well as the way their own teaching experiences were validated and embraced in the formative process through the instructors' practices.

Through these *ethnomethods*, the teachers actively engaged in the course, transforming the experience into a kind of *curricular agora*—one marked by profound, generative, and meaningful formative experiences.

The research highlighted the pertinence of using diaries (Guerra, 2014), formative reflection letters and the artistically innovative ways of presenting understandings of the learning process.

The creation of curricula for SUS (Brazilian Unified Health System) schools demanded by PROFAE-MS

The implementation of formative activities by PROFAE – the Project for the Professionaliza-

tion of Nursing Workers, linked to the Ministry of Health – aimed at developing curricula for eleven federal technical health schools across various Brazilian regions (Amazon, Northeast, Midwest, Southeast, South) with distinct local demands. This process intensified the ethnoconstitutive and multi-referential approach of the team responsible for creating the curricula. However, among the previously mentioned experiences, this one encountered significant tension during the initial curriculum discussions at the first meeting where the operationalization of the project was presented to the curriculum designers and PROFAE technicians. In this context, a proposal was presented for developing the curricular frameworks for the eleven schools, which included a set of “Competency Standards” common to all the curricula. This proposal from PROFAE left the team of curriculum experts perplexed and tense, as their approach differed significantly. The team was committed to maintaining curricular conversations with the social actors from the diverse socio-cultural contexts where the curricula would be designed, implemented, and evaluated. For them, it was crucial not to lose sight of the contextual singularities of each setting. The tension escalated to such an extent that, in the initial stages of the conversation, there was talk of the impossibility of operationalizing the agreement between the University and PROFAE/MS, highlighting the dilemma at the heart of the situation. In other words, there seemed to be no solution to the problem that had emerged. This standstill stemmed from fundamentally opposing views on epistemology and curriculum policy. On one hand, the curriculum team adhered to an ethnoconstitutive perspective, heavily influenced by multi-referential approaches. On the other hand, PROFAE's technical proposal was initially based on prescribed competency standards, with no clear justification for their use as the organizing principle of the curriculum.

Through (in)tense negotiation, a (non-re-signed) consensus was reached, in which the

competency standards created by PROFAB would be considered. However, the curricula would be designed and implemented through a curricular conversation involving all the actors in the schools in each state. Their specific contexts and the demands of health promotion policies and actions would serve as the foundation. Additionally, the concept of competence would be redefined by incorporating the principles of permanent education, a multi-referential curriculum, and ethically, politically, aesthetically, and culturally grounded curricular proposals.

As a result, each curriculum, built around autonomous and connective modules, would be designed to accommodate the experiences of professionals from each region. Health workers with in-depth regional knowledge of how the population became ill and of public health interventions, for example, but lacking the technical training required, could enter leveling modules. Their knowledge would not only be valued but also intercritically validated, enabling them to be included in the course and ultimately complete their technical formation in full. In this context, the encounter with experience became central to curriculum design and implementation. This experience of designing and planning curricula in the field of health left a lasting legacy for the FORMACCE Research Group: a firm concept of how curricula should not disregard experience as a political-formative approach. It also demonstrated how tactics and strategies could be created to disrupt the norm and, if possible, shift the momentum away from the push for curricular standardization.

The development of the Franciscan Curriculum Framework (RCF)

It is important to highlight that the group of teachers in the municipality of São Francisco do Conde made an autonomous decision to design and develop their own Curriculum Reference Document in a moment when the state was implementing the National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC) and the Bahia Curriculum Reference Document (DCRB). Based on this

decision, the FORMACCE Research Group was invited to participate in the process since the Pedagogical Coordination of the municipality's Department of Education recognized that the theoretical, educational, and methodological contributions developed by the group could enrich the Curriculum Framework—not only in its design, construction, and implementation but also in shaping its formative guidelines.

This represents a unique curricular-formative encounter, where achievements emerged from *(in)tense curricular cultural conversations* (Macedo, 2016). Through this intercritically propositional formative itinerancy, the Franciscan Curriculum Reference was established, collaboratively built with teachers from the municipality of São Francisco do Conde throughout 2019. The process unfolded in a context of *(in)tense curricular and formative elaborations*, enriched by pedagogical, political, historical, and cultural debates.

By decision of the teachers' collective, a critical study was conducted on the constitutive logic of the BNCC, using as a central framework the curricular work with knowledge: knowing *how to do, how to be, and how to coexist*. This approach also emphasized necessary curricular and formative transversalities, rejecting the use of the BNCC's conceptions of competencies and skills as the foundation for structuring curricular principles and organizers. Although intercritical approaches to certain aspects of the BNCC were occasionally employed, the right to propositional criticism was never relinquished.

It was also understood that competencies and skills—central curricular concept-devices in the BNCC and the DCRB—had a non-explanatory perspective on the adoption of this curricular model. In the BNCC, in particular, competencies and skills appeared in a non-relational and non-contextualized manner, shaped without the necessary sensitivity to the contextualist formative processes that curriculum policies urgently required. Consequently, efforts were directed toward constructing a socially endorsed and contextually grounded learning

curriculum, emphasizing *knowledge in practice* and *knowing how to be*. Three fundamental categories guided the entire development of the RCF: *curriculum policy, work, and formation*.

In the process of debating the curricular conceptions of the *Ethnoconstitutive Theory of Curriculum*, the teachers' collective developed the *founding and expanded transversalities* of the References. The objective was to make the document as connective as possible, always considering the socio-educational reality of the municipality and its socio-educational and political-institutional relations.

Recognizing, welcoming, and working inter-critically with the voices, demands, and proposals of students in the municipal network such as children in early childhood and elementary school was a crucial stage in constructing the RCF. To engage with the children, we employed pictorial representations, conversation circles, videos, and various records to explore their perspectives: what they enjoyed learning at school, what they wished to learn, what they wanted to learn but hadn't, what they hoped to do and learn at school, what their families wanted them to learn, and what they considered important about their families' expectations. Thus, they spoke freely and in depth about the knowledge they valued and appreciated. Among elementary and middle school students, discussions predominantly centered on their formative experiences and the significance they attributed to them, (in) tensely expanding and experimenting the curricular cultural conversations.

For over a year, efforts were made to recognize, welcome, and engage with the voices and curricular demands of teachers and students in the municipal school system. Through dialogue with these curricular actors and their contributions, we undertook the task of purposefully describing the everyday curricular experiences of the schools and their realities. This process unearthed valuable and necessary formative insights while also revealing curricular gaps that needed to be intercritically addressed. This

intercritical curricular movement aligned with the principles of *Ethnoconstitutive Curriculum Theory*, which emphasizes never designing a curriculum *for* others *without* their involvement—since, in doing so, one often risks creating a curriculum *against* them.

In addition, we embraced and documented the significance of the RCF's educational perspective, particularly in its commitment to a *nomadic curriculum construction*. Educators moved through diverse educational contexts across the municipality, visiting school units to engage directly with teachers and students. This dynamic approach led to a collective decision to propose the establishment of *Curriculum and Educational Observatories* (Macedo, 2016) connected to the Network's educational hubs. These observatories were driven by two central, problematizing questions: How can the pedagogical work of school units be organized based on the Franciscan Curriculum Framework? How can a legacy of autonomy be established for school units to conceive and implement unique and singularizing curriculum policies? These questions stemmed from the recognition that schools possessed their own curricular identities and had the potential to collaboratively shape and develop curriculum and formation policies. Driven by the fundamental commitment to establishing a curriculum policy rooted in solidarity and active participation with schools and their teachers, curricular-formative workshops were conducted within school units. These workshops, guided by the problematizing questions, provided spaces for schools to engage in an ongoing process of curriculum construction, reinforcing the idea that curricula are dynamic and continuously evolving.

Thus, curriculum policy and teacher work and formation emerged as transversal themes that shaped the entire conception and development of the Franciscan Curriculum Framework. Notably, teachers recognized the collective construction of the RCF as a singular formative experience, one that deepened their engagement

with curriculum-making as both a pedagogical and political act.

Even before its official publication, the Curriculum Reference for the municipality of São Francisco do Conde—still in its finalization phase—was adopted as an example in the extensive online professional development program for the (Re)elaboration of Curricula for the Municipalities of Bahia, conducted by the National Union of Municipal Education Directors, Bahia section (UNDIME-BA).

The broad policy of curriculum (re)elaboration of the UNDIME-BA Formation Program

This article highlights a unique curricular-formative encounter, where the emerging achievements resulted from (in)tense *curricular conversations*. Through an intercritically propositional educational itinerancy, UNDIME/BA, in partnership with the Pro-Rector of Undergraduate Education at UFBA, the Superintendence of Distance Education at UFBA, and the National Union of Municipal Education Councils of Bahia (UNCME), established the Program for the (Re)elaboration of the Municipal Curriculum Referentials of Bahia. Developed collaboratively with teachers over approximately six months in 2020, this initiative unfolded in a context of (in)tense online curricular and formative (re)elaborations. The process was marked by strong local affirmations and rich pedagogical, political, ethical, aesthetic, and cultural debates *with* teacher collectives engaged in this broad and complex curricular-formative policy.

It should be noted that, authorized and mediated by UNDIME-BA, the teachers' collectives in the municipalities decided to autonomously carry out the policy of designing and constructing their Curriculum Referentials during the state movement to implement the National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC) and the Bahia Referential Curriculum Document (DCRB). It was based on this decision that the FORMACCE Research Group from the College

of Education at the Federal University of Bahia was invited to participate in this curricular-formative construction process. The UNDIME-BA Pedagogical Coordination recognized that the curricular, formative, and methodological contributions developed and implemented by FORMACCE could add significant value to the (re)elaboration of the Municipal Curriculum Referentials, both in terms of their design, construction, and implementation, as well as in shaping their formative guidelines.

Experiencing the educational challenges of the period following the launch of the BNCC, UNDIME-BA understood the clear intention of most municipalities to carry out a curriculum development process that considered local contextualization and recontextualization. It therefore understood that, to start a movement to (re)elaborate political-pedagogical projects, for example, it was important for the municipalities to have defined their respective curricular reference *a priori*.

Thus, UNDIME-BA decided to implement a formation program aimed at fostering broad participatory debates with teachers from Bahia's municipal public schools. This initiative sought to encourage teachers to reflect on their roles as active participants in the curriculum, particularly in relation to the Referentials under discussion and their "curriculum acts" (Macedo, 2016). The goal was to establish a curricular-formative proposal that could contribute to potential improvements and expansions while considering the foundations already outlined in the BNCC and the DCRB.

To bring this initiative to life in the municipalities and foster a *multi-referential and spiral curricular movement*—one that encompassed studies, debates, and the formulation of frameworks while actively engaging teachers—UNDIME-BA developed a formation project aimed at establishing strategic partnerships to materialize its curricular utopia. This effort focused on mobilizing teachers and creating the necessary conditions for them to collaboratively conceive, discuss, construct, and propose

curricular referentials for their municipalities in an authoritative and empowering manner.

Based on the study and analysis of the DCRB's introductory texts and through the Program, we aimed to encourage proposals that embraced the concept of curriculum as a collective effort, built *with* and *by* the network. These proposals considered both local and territorial specificities, while also integrating a *glocal* perspective (Robertson, 1994).

In the expansive, innovative, and contemporary UNDIME-BA formation program, which engaged teachers from around 400 municipalities and involved 73,000 teachers, FORM-ACCE and its educators had the opportunity to experiment intercritically and on a large scale with some of the foundational concepts of the *Ethnoconstitutive Theory of Curriculum*. These included *curriculum acts*, curricular conversations, cultural institutes of education, authorizing curricula, experiential and happenstance curricula, circumstantialized curriculum, and intercritical education. It was within this context that the first critical insights emerged regarding what came to be known as *anti-teaching policies* and the propositional development of the concept of *curriculating teaching* (Macedo, 2024).

In the end, the program and its actions were positively assessed, with particular emphasis on the fact that, for the first time, groups of teachers studied and debated curricular-formative issues in-depth and dialogically, focusing on their municipal interests. They also had the opportunity to engage in online formation, which was marked by rigor, responsibility, and formative quality. It was further concluded that the relationships developed with digital culture were significant in terms of fostering formative-critical learning.

The formative experience of UFBA's Pedagogical Residency Program: curriculum acts and intercriticism

Understanding the *curriculum acts* in the formative experiential process of the Pedagogical

Residency Program, with a focus on the politics of the meanings of what is formative, allowed us to gain insight into how school curricula evolve through the actions of the curriculum actors/authors: supervising teachers, undergraduate students, and preceptor teachers.

Understanding the praxical power of *curriculum acts* has contributed to confronting and empowering the democratic process of contemporary curricula, along with the resulting formative policies and decisions. In this regard, recognizing *curriculum acts* has allowed participants in both initial and ongoing formation to narrate, problematize, and analyze the dynamics of the curriculum— a space where perspectives, hegemonies, and forms of resistance are constructed.

Inspired by Macedo (2016), who asserts that it is impossible to conceive or implement curriculum and formation without a transformative intent, we have observed in our experiences with the Pedagogical Residency Program that intercritical mediations challenge reductionist and prescriptive curricular logics rooted in imposed models. At the same time, these mediations foster a closer connection with people, contexts, and the world of work and production. According to Macedo (2016, p. 85), intercritical curricular mediations emerge from the dynamic and generative encounter of the *ethnomethods* of curriculating social actors, shaped through debate and argumentation between intentionalities.

This is where the notion of *curricular authorization*, as advocated by Macedo (2010; 2016), becomes essential. A curriculum that is both conceptualized and enacted within a socio-existential and political-cultural formative framework necessitates an authorization process, which can only be fully realized through the exercise of intercriticism. As Macedo (2016, p. 94) asserts, "The conquest of authorization is the most fruitful way to experience an intercritical process of autonomization in formation." Both processes are accompanied by a journey of self-inquiry and contextual engagement, re-

quiring ongoing problematizing reflection. This dynamic shift in curricular actors' discourses and lived experiences manifests as alteration, a transformation grounded in self-eco-organization, where individuals, communities, and their environments are mutually implicated. As Macedo (2016, p. 95) states, "This perspective leads us to perceive the human being as a being that changes when it self-eco-organizes, involving people, other entities, and their environments."

Assessment in continuous formation of UFBA faculty: the experience of the Didactic Workshops

Faculty members participating in the Didactic Workshop at the Federal University of Bahia (UFBA) are encouraged to critically examine the dilemmas of their teaching practices and their connection to students' learning processes, incorporating self-assessment, peer assessment, and transformative perspectives. Throughout this process, they often recognize a tendency to replicate the assessment models they experienced as students. At the same time, they explore alternative approaches, striving—through methodological strategies such as exams and grading—to ensure the development of knowledge and skills that prepare students for the job market (Guerra & Zen, 2018).

However, in the wake of Macedo's (2010) studies on *assessment in education*, self-evaluation is an act of epistemological, ethical and pedagogical coherence, understood as a form of ethically oriented self-reflection.

The formation process of UFBA faculty members, driven by the Didactic Workshop, has fostered critical reflection and decision-making regarding learning assessment in daily university education. Faculty members are encouraged to move beyond bureaucratic assessment practices tied to rigid instructional objectives. Through engagement with the Didactic Workshop, they have redefined their approaches, developing pedagogical actions that emphasize the inseparability of learning and assessment.

This process highlights student agency in understanding their own learning pathways and reinforces the formative dimension of assessment, always grounded in accountability, autonomy, and transformation.

Thus, the re-signification of assessment in education has enabled the continuous updating of curricula, always respecting the irreducible learning experiences of students. In this process, interactive and collaborative didactic-pedagogical practices are prioritized to cultivate meaningful and valued university learning. As a result, these practices not only enhance student autonomy and authorship in the construction of formative knowledge but also establish an *arkhé* of university education and formation.

Concluding thoughts

The arguments presented in this article embody an explicit and formative commitment, grounded in ontological, political, ethical, aesthetic, socio-cultural, and pedagogical dimensions. This commitment is reflected in an interwoven perspective on curriculum, *curriculum acts*, and formation, emphasizing their actionalist implications within the context of formative practices.

From the perspective of these concluding reflections and their generative commitment to shaping a curricular-formative becoming, we envision—and have long been experiencing—how these conceptions intersect with significant actionalist circumstances in the work of FORMACCE and its researchers within the field of public curriculum and formation policies. In this sense, we have observed how these themes, approached from a multi-referential, experiential, and intercritical perspective, acquire actionalist potency when they co-create curricular and formative initiatives with educators in general and, more specifically, with teachers as central actors in *formaccean* actions. Within this framework, we have been engaging in various educational contexts to

critically analyze what we term *anti-teaching* policies, while also advancing, through formative collaborations with teachers, the notion of *curricular teaching in prominence* (Macedo; Silva; Guerra; Ferreira; 2024).

We conclude this article with a question and a challenge that (in)tensely moves and compels us in our daily institutional actions as FORMACCE researchers: how can we expand the intercritical reception of the conceptual and actionalist guidelines articulated and propositionally outlined here in the field of public curriculum and formation policies? What underpins this inquiry is the enduring transversality that drives the FORMACCE Research Group—namely, the commitment to mobilizing its networks so that public curriculum and formation policies, particularly those concerning teachers, may shape a broad and plural republicanist political-formative act.

REFERENCES

- ARDOINO, Jacques. L'approche multirréférencielle (plurielle) des situations éducatives et formatives. **Pratique de Formation (Analyses)**. 1993, n° 24-26, p.15-34.
- ATLAN, Henri. **Com razão e sem ela**. Intercrítica da ciência e do mito. Tradução de Fátima Gaspar e Carlos Gaspar. Lisboa: Instituto Piaget, 1993.
- BARBIER, René. **A Pesquisa-ação**. Tradução de LucieDidio. Brasília: Liber Livro, 2004.
- BÉLANGER, Paul. A qui profite le développement de l'éducation des adultes?. In: Dominicé, Pierre. **Quel héritage générationnelle transmettre en formation d'adultes**. Colóquio de Formação de Adultos. Genebra: 2004, p. 18-19.
- GADAMER, Hans-Georg. **Verdade e método**: traços fundamentais de uma hermenêutica filosófica. Tradução de Paulo Flávio Meurer. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1999.
- GUERRA, Denise. Diários reflexivos como atos de currículo e dispositivos de formação. In: Guerra, D. M.; Macedo, Roberto S.; Macedo, Sílvia M.; Reis, Leonardo R.; Azevedo, Omar (Orgs). **Escritos formacceanos em perspectiva**: Saberes implicado, saberes que formam. Salvador: EDUFBA, 2014, p. 35-52.
- HONORÉ, Bernard. **Vers l'oeuvre de formation**. Paris: L'harmattan, 1992.
- JOSSO, Marie-Christine. **Experiências de vida e formação**. Tradução de José Cláudio e Júlia Ferreira. Lisboa: EDUCA, 2002.
- LOPES, Alice C. **Políticas de integração curricular**. Rio de Janeiro: EDUERJ, 2008.
- MACEDO, Roberto S. **Compreender e mediar a formação**: o fundante da educação. Brasília: Liber Livro, 2010.
- MACEDO, Roberto S. **A teoria etnoconstitutiva de currículo**: uma teoria-ação curricular formacional. Curitiba: CRV, 2016.
- MACEDO, Roberto S.; SILVA, Herbert G.; GUERRA, Denise; SILVA, Renê; FERREIRA, Cristiane. **Currículo e formação com professoras(es)**: políticas antidocência e a docência curriculante em realce. Curitiba: CRV, 2024.
- MACEDO, Társo R. Séries Televisivas, interações em rede e experiências formativas em história. **História e Ensino**. V. 28, n. 1, p. 58-77, jan-jun, 2022.
- PINEAU, Gaston. **Temporalités en Formation**: vers de nouveaux synchroniseurs. Paris: Anthropos, 2000.
- ROBERTSON, Rolan. Globalisation or glocalisation? **Journal of International Communication**, v. 1, n° 1. p. 33-52.
- SINPRO-BA. **Práxis e devir**: trabalho e formação docente. Salvador: SINPRO-BA, 2006.
- ZEN Giovana; GUERRA Denise. Avaliação da aprendizagem no contexto da docência universitária. In: D'ÁVILA, Cristina; MADEIRA, Ana Verena. **Ateliê didático: uma abordagem criativa na formação continuada de docentes universitários**. Salvador: EDUFBA, 2018.

Received in: 09/27/2024
Approved in: 02/07/2025



Este é um artigo publicado em acesso aberto sob uma licença Creative Commons.