

Access/Retention in Multifunctional Resource Rooms: a reality in Amazonas

Dorimar Gomes Ferreira^I
João Otacílio Libardoni dos Santos^{II}

^ISecretaria de Estado de Educação do Amazonas (SEDUC/AM), Manaus/AM – Brazil

^{II}Universidade Federal do Amazonas (UFAM), Manaus/AM – Brazil

ABSTRACT – Access/Retention in Multifunctional Resource Rooms: a reality in Amazonas. The purpose of this study was to learn about the access and retention of students who are the target audience of Special Education in Multifunctional Resource Rooms (MRRs), from the perspective of teachers, in the municipalities of the Rio Madeira Microregion in southern Amazonas. The Qualitative Descriptive approach was used to outline the research, and data were collected using a semi-structured interview script. The findings point to the role of families, as the school has difficulty sensitizing parents so that they see themselves as an important part of the inclusion process and can recognize the MRR as an important space for their children.

Keywords: School Inclusion. Multifunctional Resource Room. Access. Permanence.

RESUMO – Acesso/Permanência em Salas de Recursos Multifuncionais: uma realidade no Amazonas. O objetivo deste estudo foi conhecer o acesso e a permanência dos alunos público-alvo da Educação Especial nas Salas de Recursos Multifuncionais (SRMs), na perspectiva dos professores, nos municípios da Microrregião do Rio Madeira, no sul do Amazonas. A abordagem Qualitativa Descritiva foi utilizada para delinear a pesquisa e os dados foram coletados por meio de roteiro de entrevista semiestruturado. Os achados apontam para o papel das famílias, pois a escola tem dificuldade em sensibilizar os pais para que eles se vejam como parte importante do processo de inclusão e possam reconhecer a SRM como um espaço importante para seus filhos.

Palavras-chave: Inclusão Escolar. Sala de Recursos Multifuncionais. Acesso. Permanência.

Introduction

The inclusion of students who are the target audience of Special Education in schools in Brazil, encompassing those with disabilities, pervasive developmental disorders, and high abilities/giftedness, has been ensured by numerous legal instruments (Brasil, 1988; Brasil, 2008; Brasil, 2009; Brasil, 2011; Brasil, 2015), which guide the education system and guarantee the provision of Specialized Educational Services (SES).

Admission to the SES is part of the student's right as a target audience of special education, and the school is responsible for advising both the family and student on the importance of participating in this service. To receive SES services, students must be properly enrolled in regular education as well as in specialized educational services. The service, ideally, should be provided in the school's own multifunctional resource rooms, or in another regular school, in the opposite shift to the student's regular school hours, thus not being a substitute for regular classes (Brasil, 2009). According to Decree No. 7611 of 2011, section 3, "[...] multifunctional resource rooms are environments supplied with equipment, furniture, and teaching and learning materials for the provision of specialized educational care" (Brasil, 2011, p. 2).

Since the *National Education Plan (PNE)*, Brazil has made undeniable progress in terms of access to regular classes of basic education for students from 4 to 17 years of age, demonstrating a quantitative leap in the number of enrollments in regular education. According to the *Technical Summary of the Census of basic education* (2019) presented in the Brazilian Yearbook of basic education for the years 2009 and 2019, a significant increase was recently observed in Amazonas, from 47.2% in 2009 to 84% in 2019, in the North region, from 64% in 2009 to 94.3% in 2019, and in Brazil, from 60.5% in 2009 to 87.2% in 2019.

However, while official figures show an increase in the number of students with disabilities, pervasive developmental disorders, and high abilities or giftedness enrolled in basic education, it should not be forgotten that effective school inclusion occurs in everyday school life, which is dependent not only on enrollment, but also on students' permanence in school, ensuring them the necessary conditions for the development of their maximum potential (Campbell, 2016). Pansini (2016) claims that the expansion of the SES for students, as well as the expansion of multifunctional resource rooms, do not allow for an increase in the offer of specialized educational services for public students in the MRRs and the evolution of enrollments in the regular education network. Even though enrollments in basic education have increased significantly, this advance has contributed to the perpetuation of the false universalism observed in general education in relation to the expansion of schooling in Brazilian society.

In the Amazonas context, the authors discovered that, despite an increase in the number of students enrolled in special education, there are insufficient Multifunctional Resource Rooms to meet the rise in enrollments of the target audience of Special Education in regular education. Moreover, Queiroz and Guerreiro (2019) reported that the educational and pedagogical policy of Special Education in the municipal network of Manaus has boosted the enrollment of students targeted by special education in regular schools and in specialized educational services. However, due to increased enrollments, the Multifunctional Resource Rooms (MRRs) cannot include all students, and information on how students are assisted in the MRRs is not provided.

Data from the Ministry of Education (MEC) published in the *State Education Plan of Amazonas (2015)*, show that in 2013 there were 389 MRRs in the state network of Amazonas. However, according to the Research and Statistics Management of the State Secretariat of Education and Teaching Quality of Amazonas SEDUC/AM, the number of MRRs in 2019 had reduced to 157. Thus, despite an increase in the number of special education students enrolled in the network, the number of MRRs decreased by 40.3%.

Therefore, it is understood that ensuring the enrollment of students with special educational needs in general education classes does not guarantee inclusive practices, as these students may face barriers within the school system that impede their access and retention in school. In light of the foregoing, the objective of the current study was to investigate how students who are the target audience of special education gain access to and remain in multifunctional resource rooms in the municipalities of Calha do Madeira-AM.

Method

The present study is characterized by a qualitative approach. The data were analyzed with particular concern for the details of the interview transcriptions, respecting as much as possible the way in which they were recorded or transcribed. Attention was paid to the meaning, taking into account the informant's point of view, and importance was attributed to the interpretation, reality, context, and worldview of the subjects involved in the research in the most faithful way possible (Bogdan; Biklen, 1994 apud Teixeira, 2015, p. 11). The type of research is descriptive in nature, as it sought to understand the access and permanence of Special Education students in the Multifunctional Resource Rooms (MRRs), based on the opinions of Specialized Educational Service (SES) teachers. For Campos (2008, p. 48) it is research that "[...] seeks to know and interpret reality without interfering in it and describing what happens in reality". In this way, we can establish the reasons for these phenomena.

For data collection, the following municipalities were chosen for convenience in the Microregion of Madeira, in the south of the State of Amazonas: Humaitá, Manicoré, Novo Aripuanã, Apuí, and Borba.

These municipalities are close to the Madeira River, a river in the Amazon River basin, which borders the states of Rondônia and Amazonas. The study participants were teachers who worked in MRR schools in municipalities in the Madeira-AM microregion, under the management of SEDUC. Of the 09 teachers who worked in 2019 at MRRs in the municipalities, 08 teachers participated in this research as one teacher was on maternity leave.

Procedures for data collection

The research was submitted to the Research Ethics Committee (CEP) through Plataforma Brasil in accordance with Resolution 466/2012 of the National Health Council and was approved under opinion no. 3,723,004. Subsequently, we requested the Special Education Coordination of the Department of Education and Teaching Quality (AM), to carry out a survey of the MRR rooms of the state network in the municipalities and teachers by the Coordination of the Madeira River microregion. The 05 municipalities included 06 state schools with MRRs, 06 MRRs, and 09 teachers (Table 1).

Table 1 – Number of schools with MRR's from Calha de Madeira in the State of Amazonas

MUNICIPALITIES	SCHOOLS WITH MRRs	MRRs	MRR TEACHERS
Humaitá	2	2	3
Manicoré	1	1	1
Apuí	1	1	2
Novo Aripuanã	1	1	2
Borba	1	1	1
TOTAL	06	06	09

Source: Author's own elaboration (2020).

Based on this information, contact was made with the 05 municipal coordinators via telephone to explain the objectives of the study and data collection procedures, and send the authorization for data collection. The coordinators provided the telephone contacts of the SES teachers in the MRRs. Contact was made with the teachers via telephone to provide a brief explanation of the research and the Informed Consent Form was sent. After agreeing to participate, days and times were scheduled according to availability. A semi-structured interview guide was used with a total of 16 open and closed questions, subdivided into 03 parts: The first part included questions that allowed us to characterize sex, age, length of service teaching in the multifunctional resource room, and professional qualifications. The second part sought to understand how students access the MRR, and the third part aimed to establish the way in which the students participate in the MRR at school. The interviews were carried out individually by telephone, as they occurred during the Pandemic period and due to health protocols, it was not possible to carry out the research on site. The calls were recorded with the help of a Motorola cell phone

voice recorder from the interviews with the teachers. The average interview time was 50 minutes and the recordings were later transcribed with the help of Express Scribe Transcription Software.

Procedures for Data Analysis

Closed questions were analyzed using descriptive statistics with percentage frequency of responses. For data related to open questions, we used the thematic content analysis technique (Bardin, 2009). Firstly, pre-analysis was carried out, based on skim reading, to organize the material that constituted the research corpus. In this exploration, three steps were adopted: choosing counting units; selection of counting rules, and choosing categories. The categories were pre-established, based on the research objective and then the counting rule was obeyed, defined by the frequency of appearance, with the interpretation being inferred based on the theoretical framework. The data were analyzed both in their singularity and collectivity.

Results and discussion

To materialize the research problem, we used the narratives of SE (special education) teachers who work with special education students in the context of multifunctional resource rooms of the state education system, in five municipalities in the microregion of Calha de Madeira in Southern Amazonas: Humaitá, Manicoré, Apuí, Novo Aripuanã, and Borba. The speeches of the participants were systematized into 04 thematic units for better presentation of the results, as presented and analyzed below:

Access

To describe the access dimension, we present below descriptions of teacher strategies, referral requirements, and difficulties encountered by teachers when referring special education students to MRRs.

Referral Strategies

Concerning the strategies used to refer students to MRRs, 04 teachers expressed concern about publicizing the role of the SE teacher at the start of the school year and seeking special education target audience students for Multifunctional Resource Rooms in other schools through conversations with the teachers, pedagogues, or managers of these schools (P1, P3, P4, and P8). The other four teachers reported that they wait for students to be referred by teachers, pedagogues, or school administrators at the school where the SE student is enrolled in regular education (P2, P5, P6, and P7).

P1: After a week or so, when the school year begins, we go to our schools and talk to the administrators and teachers. And we request that they refer these students to us.

P3: At the beginning of the year, we visit all schools [...].

P4: I visit schools. Then I take a look at the children's situation, talk to the teachers, and they visit the school [...]

P8: We put together a team, we go to schools. We receive them like this, through a referral from the teacher.

P2: Look, here it's the school pedagogues or the managers... They refer the students to us, telling us about their needs. And then we assess the child, and they get enrolled.

P5: Automatically, when the student is enrolled, the system says if they are a special education student, if they have a disability. Then, the system automatically generates a registration for the resource room.

P6: The referral of children to the resource room is through a survey with teachers or it occurs directly if the student has a medical report about it.

P7: They have to be enrolled in regular education... Then they are later enrolled in the resource room [...].

In terms of referrals, the SEDUC/AM Special Education Coordination recommends that SE students be “[...] identified by the school team and indicated for curricular complementation in the Resource Room” (Guidelines of the National Policy on Special Education from the Perspective of Inclusive Education Resource Rooms/Seduc/AM, 2019). Referrals are made not only by the teachers in the regular class, but also by the pedagogue or school manager, as evidenced by the teachers' speeches.

We also noticed in the teachers' speeches that some of them are concerned about enrolling students from regular schools in the MRR at the start of the school year. These initiatives were described by two teachers from Humaitá, one from Borba, and one from Manicoré. In these contexts, we can see that the territorial issue does not hinder the effort of these teachers to offer and disseminate SE in schools, as these actions occur in both smaller and larger municipalities. These teacher strategies differ from what Nozu and Bruno (2016) and Valadão (2016) discovered in their studies in which the process of identifying the target public students of SE in MRRs in other Brazilian contexts begins with teachers working inside the regular class.

In another question, we asked the teachers if and what steps they had taken to promote access to students to the MRR. Among the responses, 05 teachers answered *yes*, they had promoted actions, and 03 teachers responded *occasionally*. The actions were carried out during the school year, with the goal of allowing SE students who are enrolled in regular education but do not attend the multifunctional resource room to learn about and appreciate the value of this service. Thus, 03 teachers reported promoting meetings at the school where the MRR service is provided, 02 teachers reported having conversations with families at the school where they work at the MRR, 01 teacher publicized the service on the municipality's local radio, and 02 teachers promoted lectures at popular schools. Teachers' actions are critical because, as Borges, Gualda and Cia (2015) point out, the school needs to develop diverse and innovative communication strategies with parents so that the message is sufficient and effective when transmitting relevant information about child development and learning.

Referral requirements

The identification of students who attend MRRs is an important factor because it is intrinsic to theoretical issues, such as: the definition of disability, disorders, high abilities/giftedness, and learning difficulties; duplicate registration; the transfer of funds; and the role of the medical report, which is sometimes a necessity to ensure enrollment in SE and is a source of great controversy (Oliveira; Manzini, 2016). Regarding the requirement of a medical report for assistance in the MRR in the municipalities involved in this research, 07 professors stated that a medical report is not required to attend the multifunctional resource room (P1, P2, P3, P5, P6, P7, P8) and that although they always advise parents to seek a medical report for the student, this does not prevent students from being enrolled in the MRR. According to these teachers, a descriptive report is made in the regular class with the parents' awareness of the student's situation so that the student can be enrolled in the MRR. However, 01 of these 07 teachers (P5) stated that a report is not required but preference is given to those who have one. Only 01 teacher (P4) stated that a medical report is required for students to attend the multifunctional resource room, but the teacher refused to justify this requirement.

P1: [...] They don't necessarily need to have a medical report, but they could have, we select some students, with more visible characteristics.

P2: [...] We were instructed by GAE to accept students with and without a medical report.

P3: No, a medical report is not required because in some deficiencies it is clear [...] we talk to the family and ask them to take the exams just so we can have proof of it.

P6: We do not require a medical report for the child to start attending the resource room.

P7: Only if the student has the medical report, but if they don't have one, for example, SEDUC does not pose an obstacle [...]

P8: Look, in cases where it is detected that this child or adolescent, it is visible that there is something going on[...] we already work on it until the medical report comes out.

P5: So, those who attend it go automatically without a medical report, not that we ask for it. We talk to the parents depending on the teacher's report. Of course, when there are vacancies, priorities will be made for those students who have a medical report.

P4: Yes.

According to the statements from the teachers, the majority do not use the medical report as a criterion for enrolling a student in the MRR. They are also concerned with assisting and guiding families on how to obtain the report, which we believe is related to the importance these professors place on receiving a diagnosis in order to better assist the student. In their studies, Glat and Pletsch (2011) discovered that one of the major weaknesses in the implementation of inclusion policies is the process of evaluating and referring students with special educational needs. Despite the knowledge-power relationships of a medical diagnosis, in practice teachers and other professionals still consider clinical assessment to be their primary source

of referral to Special Education services, especially because many teachers are unsure on how the pedagogical assessment is carried out.

Regarding teachers who deny assistance to students due to a lack of a report or who leave students waiting for a place to be enrolled, we understand that the medical report cannot be used as a criterion that makes it impossible for the student to be enrolled in the multifunctional resource room, as the concept we defend in this work is inclusion and that there is no need for a medical report to be an impediment to access to MRR for educational purposes.

According to Silva and Ribeiro (2017), using the report as a parameter for organizing pedagogical work is harmful to student learning because the instrument does not highlight possibilities, but rather biological issues that compromise this learning. As a result, it should be noted that the requirement is not the most serious issue that pervades the report, but rather the significant influence it wields in the educational context.

Difficulties encountered for referrals

Education in Amazonas presents a significant challenge, not only in terms of providing training, information, and changing teachers' perceptions regarding educational inclusion, but also in dealing with access issues in the majority of the state's cities (Matos; Batista; Santos; Lemos, 2019). Concerning the difficulties in referring students to MRRs, 05 teachers (P1, P2, P3, P4, and P7) identified *parental acceptance* as a barrier in this process, 01 teacher reported the medical report as a way to meet the educational needs of children in the MRRs, and 02 teachers stated that they have no difficulties in referring students to MRRs.

P1: We had cases where parents were hesitant to take their children to the resource room because they believed it would be too demanding, exhausting, and time-consuming.

P2: We have trouble not only with the referral, but also with the family's acceptance.

P3: Many parents also refuse to accept that their child has a disability, claiming that their child does not require monitoring at school.

P4: It depends on whether the father wants to and whether the mother accepts it, as many do not.

P7: Look, sometimes yes, when the student has difficulty, it's sometimes the father, it's the family that doesn't accept it.

In terms of family participation in SE, the National Policy for Special Education from the Perspective of Inclusive Education emphasizes the following: family and community participation act as protagonists in educational actions that recognize and value the differences present in daily school life, as well as the creation of effective conditions of participation and learning for all (Brasil, 2008). However, we can see that most teachers have difficulty gaining the cooperation of parents for their children to be referred to and attend the MRR.

The relationship between family and school has been described as a less than harmonious and satisfactory phenomenon because the

expectations of each institution or actor involved are not met and are not very conducive to the students' growth and development (Oliveira et al., 2010). Because the SE is a non-mandatory service that is critical for the target student of special education, it is critical for the school to have a good relationship with the parents so that they understand the importance of their role in the school and also the role of the SE for these students.

Retention

To analyze retention, we sought to identify the number of enrollments and dropouts in 2019 and the barriers to retention, and describe the actions taken to reduce dropouts among the special education students in the MRR. In the current study, we use the term "dropout" to describe students who stop attending the MRR even though they require assistance.

Number of enrollments and dropouts in MRRs in 2019

According to the teachers' reports, there were 12 classes and 09 MRR teachers in the municipalities surveyed in 2019, however, during the research we had contact with 08 teachers and information from 11 classes. Table 2 displays data on the number of students enrolled and those who dropped out of the MRR in 2019, considering the municipality in which they are located, and the number of classes offered (Table 2).

Table 2 – Number of enrollments and dropouts in MRRs in 2019, in the municipalities of Calha do Madeira

City	School	Room	Class	Enrollments	Dropouts	Dropout %	Final Enrollments
Humaitá	E1	S1	T1	25	06	24%	19
			T2	23	04	17%	19
	E2	S1	T1	20	14	70%	06
			T2	13	09	69.2%	04
Borba	E1	S1	T1	10	05	50%	05
			T2	10	03	30%	07
Manicoré	E1	S1	T1	05	00	00%	05
			T2	06	00	00%	06
Novo Aripuanã	E1	S1	T1	14	04	28.5%	10
Apuí	E1	S1	T1	20	01	5%	19
			T2	20	03	15%	17
Total	06	06	11	166	49	29.5%	117

Source: Elaborated by the author (2020).

There were significant differences in the numbers of students enrolled from one municipality to the other. There were a large number of students in Humaitá, and significantly less in Manicoré. In general, the table shows a dropout rate of 29.5%, which means that for every three students who enroll, one drops out. If we break the values

down by school and class, there are some classes with a dropout rate of 70%.

These statistics are noteworthy because the SES in the MRR is having difficulty maintaining the enrolled students. Evasion and abandonment have no clear origin. The issue is not a lack of connection to public policies, family breakdown, or even students' learning difficulties, but rather the combination of several factors (Filho; Araújo, 2017). According to Dourado (2005), all of these issues are related to the objective conditions of the population, in a country historically marked by strong social inequality, which is characterized by the presentation of troubling social indicators and, in this sense, lacks broad public policies, including the guarantee of optimization of access, permanence, and management policies with social quality in basic education.

When we look at dropout rates in municipalities, we can see that the problem is the same. It has been observed that MRRs may be unable to fulfill their role in promoting school inclusion of students enrolled in the Specialized Educational Service (SES) due to high dropout rates. The SES proposes to contribute in a complementary and supplementary manner, with methodologies and resources, to ensure the viability of the teaching-learning process, which must be made available to all students, according to their individual needs. National and international experiences show that without this support, implementing inclusive education will be difficult (Glat et al. 2003; Mittler, 2003; Mendes, 2006 apud Matos et al., 2019). When analyzing the number of students who attend the MRR, there are reports of 03 teachers complaining about the number of students served by the MRR, claiming that they have a lot of students, which reduces the assistance time available to meet student demand (P1, P2, and P3).

P1: We sought to adjust the schedules based on the quantity, as we had done in previous years when we had a large number of students. And then we planned to carry out this service with each student at least twice a week.

P2: The correct procedure is to stay with them for at least two hours, but due to high demand, we only stay with them for one to two hours, depending on the student's needs.

P3: I like to work them individually, so I schedule as much time as possible for each one, because the demand in our rooms has grown.

The Technical Note – SEESP/GAB/No 11/2010 establishes that the specialized educational service teacher must consider the challenges experienced by Special Education students in regular education, based on the objectives and activities proposed in the curriculum, among its attributions, one of which is the provision of care according to the specific needs of each student, establishing a schedule and workload, individually or in small groups. In addition, through a document titled Guidelines of the National Policy for Special Education from the Perspective of Inclusive Education Resource Rooms, SEDUC/AM guides teachers who work or will work at MRRs in relation to pedagogical actions in the SES.

According to this document, the regularity of the service must be defined based on the needs of the student, with a minimum of two hours per week recommended, which may occur on alternate days, for one hour each day. Depending on the work objectives, the assistance can be provided individually or in small groups. The MRR professor should prepare the assistance schedule based on the student's demand and may be flexible in terms of the number of days and time spent with each one (GAEED; DEPPE; SEDUC-AM, 2019).

It is clear from this report that we cannot focus solely on quantitative aspects, as the SES contemplates factors such as chronological age, level of learning, class grade, and the type and degree of difficulty or disability presented by the student. When we consider the need for individualized assistance in relation to the total number of students to be assisted, we truly believe that in some classes, the Multifunctional Resource Room teacher will not have enough time, resulting in a reduction in assistance time for all students.

It is well known that the learning process requires the consideration of different rhythms and experiences, as well as various opportunities for the proper mediation between what the student can accomplish on their own and what the pedagogical mediation necessitates. In relation to the various times of learning, it is necessary to create the appropriate spaces with the essential resources. Thus, the teacher can develop criteria such as: level of learning, disability, age, or even more specific issues, such as days when the student does not attend other services and therapies; the organization and the definition of the number of students served are attributions of the specialist professor. "[...] Some students will attend the SES more frequently than others" (Saviani, 2003, p. 6).

Thus, there is no script, guide, or previously specified treatment formula, and each student will have a type of resource to use, as well as a service duration (Ropoli et al., 2010). Seeking to provide students with disabilities, pervasive developmental disorders, and high abilities and/or giftedness with adequate spaces for learning, MRR teachers may choose alternatives to optimize their work (Saviani, 2003). Considering the amount of time allocated to assisting students in the MRR in the municipalities of Madeira, we believe the first step should be to listen to teachers' concerns about the number of students in MRRs in order to better serve them. One suggestion would be to increase the number of these classrooms and teachers in order to properly mediate between what the student can accomplish on their own and what the pedagogical mediation requires.

From this perspective, given what was observed in this study, the dropout rates that occur in these cities, as well as the problematization of the time available in relation to the number of students, become conditions for the organization of the teacher's pedagogical work, necessitating further research into the factors that are directly interfering with student permanence, as we consider the SES to be a

fundamental service to provide the necessary equality of conditions for a quality education.

Reasons that interfere with retention

Concerning the factors that influence a student's continued attendance at the multifunctional resource room, the following are the most frequently mentioned by teachers: school reception, parental participation, and school transportation to MRRs.

P1: The issue of reception is what we call human accessibility, and it is essential for students to remain in assistance. So, we fight very hard for the issue of accessibility: adaptations, ramps, and wider doors. But every now and then we lose sight of what is most important: human accessibility. It's looking at the other, giving the other a chance.

P3: The first reason is that the parents are unaware of what is being worked on in the resource room. Not that we don't explain what is done in the room, because we always hold meetings at the beginning of the year and explain how the work is done, but unfortunately, many parents don't attend them, so they don't know about the subject, which causes students to drop out.

P8: Yes, they talk a lot about transportation for their children, which makes assistance for them difficult. Many people always use transportation as an excuse. We work with students from the entire state network of schools, and we have schools where the resource room is a long distance away. And this adds a layer of difficulty. I can even see how this makes sense, because those who have access to transportation frequent the resource room more often.

Plaisance (2010) explains that simply putting the students in the same space does not mean that their exclusion has been eliminated. A student can be enrolled in a regular school and still face rejection and marginalization as a result of their difficulties. The expectations of the school environment, and what is expected from the student, are directly reflected in the contents taught in the classroom, which is a strong reason for dropping out. According to Fernandes (2011), the inclusion of students from lower socioeconomic groups, different ethnic groups, and, in this case, people with disabilities who were previously excluded from schools, should result in greater equality of opportunity. However, these children go to school, and the environment does not always provide genuine opportunities for social participation or access to citizenship, because veiled practices of prejudice and exclusion continue to circulate and spread in this space.

Because each student has their own intellectual and cultural framework, a lack of understanding on the part of the school environment ends up driving the student away from school in some cases. We noticed in the teachers' speech that attitudinal accessibility is regarded as critical for the special education student's permanence in school. According to Matos and Lemos (2020), education is indeed beautiful, but it is not an adventure; rather, it is laborious and frightening. It entails committing to one's own and others' lives, and at times, even protecting oneself, so that students, restless and curious about what they learn, can construct their own knowledge. The authors also advise that in Special Education, creativity is the watchword for addressing needs that arise during the teaching and learning pro-

cess. The difficulties that arise in daily school life must be met as challenges inherent in the profession, always remembering that by putting ourselves in the place of others, we evolve as people and open doors and windows to a more harmonious human coexistence (Matos et al., 2019).

Another issue raised by the teachers is family participation, which is also regarded as one of the major impediments to permanence in the MRR. Collaborations between teachers, family members, and other school professionals, according to Mendes (2006), are required for school inclusion to be successful.

Collaboration allows us to overcome some of the barriers that prevent special education students from fully participating and developing in the regular education system, while also achieving personal and professional development for all those involved.

The Specialized Educational Service must incorporate the school's pedagogical proposal, involve family participation to ensure full access and participation of students, meet the specific needs of the special education target audience, and be implemented in conjunction with other public policies (Brasil, 2011). According to Borges, Gualda, and Cia (2015), it is up to school professionals to seek ways to encourage family members to participate, and this behavior was mentioned as one of the school factors that could influence the success of the special education child in regular education. According to Silva (2008, p. 10), "[...] due to the area's tradition, professionals continue to provide services based on models centered on children and do not always find a way to make the family a partner". Even when family participation is considered, these school contexts are still characterized by the behavior of acting on invitations, proposals, and requests from the school. There are no demonstrations in relation to movements to listen to family members and their needs in order to develop joint actions.

Therefore, we recognize that parental involvement in the school environment contributes to students' learning and retention, but that it is up to the school to create situations of approximation with the students' families, providing opportunities for special spaces and contexts that create a natural receptivity between them and the school, developing positive attitudes rather than just complaints or objections, as is seen today. According to Travi et al. (2009), when a school does not become flexible, remaining in a rigid and stiff system, it can easily produce or reproduce school failure. In general, school failure occurs when the school does not connect with the family, does not bet on the true possibilities and capabilities of each individual, and thus does not respect their uniqueness in the learning process.

Another issue raised by teachers is school transportation, with parents having difficulty transporting their children to the MRR after school hours, whether at the school where their child is enrolled in regular education or at a school where they only go to the MRR. According to Oliveira (2009), this fact of SES in resource rooms occurring

during the period opposite to the student's usual school shift appears to be a challenge in other places; additionally, students from schools that do not have MRRs must travel to nearby schools that offer this type of service, which can end up hindering the teacher's service due to distance between schools and timetables (Oliveira, 2004). Fernandes and Caiado (2015) revealed that some parents are unable to afford transportation and other expenses, resulting in a lack of access to schools for the SES after school hours.

In Article 2 of Resolution No. 4, dated October 2, 2009, the SES has the role of complementing or supplementing the student's education through the provision of services, accessibility resources, and strategies that remove barriers to their full participation in society and learning development. For the purposes of these guidelines, accessibility resources in education are those that ensure access to the curriculum for students with disabilities or limited mobility by promoting the use of teaching and learning materials, spaces, furniture, and equipment, communication and information systems, transportation, and other services (Brasil, 2009).

Thus, we believe it is necessary to re-evaluate the availability of school transportation to meet this aspect raised by teachers, which is currently not available to students who attend the SES during the period opposite to their usual school shift. One solution would be a collaboration between the State and the Municipality, allowing children to continue attending the SES in the MRR.

Actions for Retention

Concerning the initiatives of schools with MRRs to determine the reasons why students stop attending the resource room, all teachers stated that they contact the students' parents or guardians to confirm why the student dropped out. Among the various methods of contact with families, four teachers reported that they visited families on their own initiative, three teachers made phone calls to parents with the help of school administrators and educators, and two teachers visited parents. Only one teacher reported that contact was made only by phone under the MRR teacher's supervision.

Regarding the promotion of actions taken to ensure student retention in the MRR, 03 teachers (P1) emphasized that they are always encouraging and including the students in project activities and events at the school where they attend the MRR, 02 reported (P2) contact with families through visits when the student has not gone to class or the MRR in a while, 01 teacher (P6) emphasized her search for collaboration with other teachers and professionals to assist her in MRR meetings with parents to discuss the importance and need for the child to be in the multifunctional resource room, 01 teacher (P5) reported on the MRR teacher's way of working, with pedagogical resources and dynamic activities, and 01 teacher highlighted (P8) making phone calls to parents, especially when the number of students is

low. It is worth noting that 07 teachers emphasize that these initiatives are led by MRR teachers.

P1: Specifically, the actions that we professionals in the resource room carry out are incorporated into the school's projects. We have been incorporating our class into school-sponsored events. We've been going through this procedure.

P2: In fact, this comes more from us resource room teachers; we promote actions, visit homes and families, inform the manager when a student is not attending the resource room, and she then asks us to visit their homes and families to find out what is going on.

P6: We promote actions for students to remain in school, yes, by bringing health professionals to meetings and explaining the importance of attending the resource room. To reach an agreement with the child's family, the school forms a partnership between the teacher in the regular class and the teacher in the resource room. These are the actions promoted by the school.

P5: I believe our actions involve treatment; as I previously stated, it is the way we work in the resource room that makes the student stay. They are all young, right? So, we seek a more alluring way to capture the student's attention. Our actions occur inside the classroom with the students, using assistive technologies, materials they enjoy, trying to innovate our methodology, activating them in the classroom, to involve their presence.

P8: My manager is always following up, making calls, calling the parents, so that they bring the students to the resource rooms.

Although actions for permanence take place, we recognize that they are limited to the MRR teacher's responsibility, because it is they who take the initiative. It is also noted that each teacher employs the strategy they believe to be the most appropriate, without first consulting other school departments. The lack of information and support exchanged between teachers in regular education and those in resource rooms imply a lack of partnership, as well as a lack of support from the pedagogical team for teachers in resource rooms (Fantinato; Mendes, 2016).

Therefore, given the dropout situation in these multifunctional resource rooms, we believe it is critical that the actions developed be designed in collaboration with the entire school team, not just the SES professor, so that the effectiveness of the arrangements can be analyzed through collaborative work, aimed at the learning, participation, access, and persistence of the special education student. Collaborations between teachers, family members, and other school professionals, according to Mendes (2006), are required for school inclusion to be successful. Through collaboration, it is possible to overcome some of the obstacles that impede the full participation and development of the special education student in the regular education system, as well as the personal and professional development of everyone involved.

Final Considerations

Based on the teachers' opinions, the definition of the MRR as the research focus allowed us to gain a deeper understanding of the difficulties that pervade the access and retention of students who are the target audience of Special Education in the MRRs of 05 municipal-

ities in the interior of Amazonas. Although laws guarantee the inclusion of students who are the target audience of Special Education and the support of specialized educational services, we observed difficulties regarding the access and permanence of these students in the MRR, with two of the factors mentioned being family issues and student transportation.

We noticed efforts by these professionals to implement inclusive practices, however, most of the time, they are carried out unilaterally, without the participation of the school community, failing to meet the proposal of intersectoral work. Furthermore, attempts to get closer to the family are still not achieving the goal that these parents perceive themselves as part of the inclusion process and understand the importance of MRRs in the education of special education students.

We believe that there is much to be done, and that finding those who are guilty in hindering the process is not the way to go. It is necessary that the SES teacher has support and backing both from the Coordination of Special Education SEDUC/AM and from the school's pedagogical team, so that together they can be agents of change and transformations in their surroundings for the promotion of inclusion, enabling the elimination of barriers that prevent students from their right to an inclusive education and motivating the families to be pro-inclusive. We understand that the study contemplated what it set out to investigate about MRRs, but this does not imply that the model is complete. Thus, new questions for future studies are relevant, where parents, regular education teachers, managers, and pedagogues can be heard.

Furthermore, the particular characteristics of each location, as well as the importance of other factors that may interfere with access and permanence in MRRs, must be considered. This study is expected to spark further research that seeks answers to the proposed questions while also raising new questions and actions that can contribute to effective school inclusion¹.

Received January 18, 2022
Approved on April 23, 2024

Note

¹ Funding: This study was carried out with the support of the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel – Brazil (CAPES) - Financing Code 001, the Amazonas State Research Support Foundation - FAPEAM and the State Department of Education - SEDUC/AM.

References

- BARDIN, Laurence. **Análise de Conteúdo**. 70. ed. Lisboa, Portugal: LDA, 2009.
- BORGES, Laura; GUALDA, Danielli Silva; CIA, Fabiana. **Relação da família e escola: opinião de professores. Educação: teoria e prática**, Rio Claro/SP, v. 25, n. 45, p. 168-185, jan./abr. 2015.

BRASIL. Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil. **Diário Oficial da União**, Brasília, 1988. 35 ed. 1988. Disponível em: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/constituicao/constituicao.htm. Acesso em: 05 maio 2020.

BRASIL. Política Nacional de Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Educação Inclusiva. **Diário Oficial da União**, Brasília, 2008. Disponível em: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/seesp/arquivos/pdf/politica.pdf>. Acesso em: 05 maio 2020.

BRASIL. Resolução CNE/CEB n.º 04, de 02 de outubro de 2009. **Diário Oficial da União**, Brasília, DF, 5 de outubro de 2009. Disponível em: http://portal.mec.gov.br/dmdocuments/rceb004_09.pdf. Acesso em: 05 maio 2020.

BRASIL. Decreto nº 7.611, de 17 de novembro de 2011. Dispõe sobre a educação especial, o atendimento educacional especializado e dá outras providências. **Diário Oficial da União**, Brasília 18 de setembro de 2011. Disponível em: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2011-2014/2011/decreto/d7611.htm. Acesso em: 05 maio 2020.

BRASIL. INEP. Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira. **Plano Nacional de Educação PNE 2014-2024: Linha de Base**. – Brasília: Inep, 2015. Disponível em: <https://pne.mec.gov.br/>. Acesso em: 05 maio 2020.

BRASIL. INEP. Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira. **Sinopse Estatística da Educação Básica 2009**. Brasília: Inep, 2019. Disponível em: <http://portal.inep.gov.br/sinopses-estatisticas-da-educacao-basica>. Acesso em: 05 maio 2023.

CAMPBELL, Selma Inês. **Múltiplas Faces da Inclusão**. Rio de Janeiro: Wak, 2016.

CAMPOS, Luiz Fernando. **Métodos e técnicas de pesquisa em psicologia**. São Paulo: Alínea, 2008.

DOURADO, Luiz Fernandes. **Elaboração de políticas e estratégias para a prevenção do fracasso escolar** – Documento Regional BRASIL: Fracasso escolar no Brasil: políticas, programas e estratégias de prevenção ao fracasso escolar, 2005.

FANTINATO, Aline Costa; MENDES, Enicéia Gonçalves. Análise da produção científica em dissertações e teses com foco no funcionamento das salas de recursos. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, v. 11, n. 4, p. 2087-2103, 2016. E ISSN: 1982-5587. Disponível em: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v11.n4.8182>. Acesso em: 05 maio 2023.

FERNANDES, Ana Paula Cunha dos Santos. **Estudos e observações sobre vivências docentes da Educação de Jovens e Adultos no processo de inclusão escolar**. 2011. 145 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade do Estado do Pará, Belém, 2011.

FERNANDES, Ana Paula Cunha dos Santos; CAIADO, Katia Regina. Evasão de alunos com necessidades educacionais especiais em escolas ribeirinhas: limites e desafios do atendimento educacional especializado. **Revista Cocar**, Belém/Pará, n. Edição Especial, n. 1, p. 127- 146, jan./jun. 2015.

FILHO, Raimundo Barbosa Silva; ARAÚJO, Ronaldo Marcos de Lima. Evasão e abandono escolar na educação básica no Brasil: fatores, causas e possíveis consequências. **Educação Por Escrito**, Porto Alegre, v. 8, n. 1, p. 35-48, jan./jun. 2017.

GAEED. Gerência de atendimento educacional específico e da diversidade; DEPPE. Departamento de Políticas e Programas Educacionais; SEDUC-AM. Secretaria de Estado de Educação do Amazonas. **Diretrizes da Política Nacional de Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Educação Inclusiva-Salas de Recursos**. Manaus, 2019.

GLAT, Rosana. **Panorama nacional da educação inclusiva no Brasil**. Relatório de consultoria técnica, Banco Mundial, 2003.

GLAT, Rosana; PLETSCH, Marcia Denise. **Inclusão escolar de alunos com necessidades especiais**. Rio de Janeiro: EDUERJ, 2011.

MATOS, Maria A. de S.; BATISTA, Claudenilson P.; SANTOS, Christiane B. dos; LEMOS, Cátia de. Políticas Públicas de Inclusão: a democracia como um desafio para as escolas públicas no Cenário Amazônico. **Textura**, v. 22 n. 52, p. 219-240, jul./set. 2020.

MATOS, Maria et al. Atendimento de educandos com deficiência visual: saberes e práticas inclusivas. **Espacios**, v. 40, n. 23, 2019. ISSN 0798 1015.

MENDES, Eniceia Gonçalves. Colaboração entre ensino regular e especial: o caminho do desenvolvimento pessoal para a inclusão escolar. In: MANZINI, Eduardo José (Org.). **Inclusão e acessibilidade**. Marília: ABPEE, 2006.

MITTLER, Peter. **Educação Inclusiva: contextos sociais**. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2003.

NOZU, Washington Cesar Shoit; BRUNO, Marilda Moraes Garcia. Organização e Funcionamento das Salas de Recursos Multifuncionais na Rede Pública de Ensino de Paranaíba/Ms. **Interfaces da Educação**, Paranaíba, v. 7, p. 226-250, 2016. ISSN 19.

OLIVEIRA, Cassia Carolina Braz de; MANZINI, Eduardo José. Encaminhamento e Perfil do Público-Alvo da Educação Especial de uma Sala de Recursos Multifuncionais: estudo de caso. **Revista Brasileira de Educação Especial**, Marília, v. 22, n. 4, 2016.

OLIVEIRA, Cynthia Bisinoto et al. A relação família-escola: intersecções e desafios. **Estudos de Psicologia**, Campinas, v. 27, n. 1, p. 99-108, 2010.

OLIVEIRA, Fabiana Maria das Graças Soares de. **As salas de recursos como apoio pedagógico especializado à educação escolar do deficiente mental**. 2004. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação da Universidade Federal do Mato Grosso do Sul, Campo Grande, 2004.

OLIVEIRA, Lucilia Vernaschi de. **Sala de recursos e o desenvolvimento da linguagem escrita**. 2009. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Faculdade de Educação, Universidade Estadual de Maringá, Maringá, 2009.

PANSINI, Flávia. Atendimento educacional especializado em salas de recursos multifuncionais um "serviço" a serviço do que e de quem? In: MOURÃO, Arminda Rachel et al. **Tópicos em Educação especial e Inclusão no Contexto Amazônico**. Manaus: EDUA, 2016.

PLAISANCE, Eric. **Ética e Inclusão**. Tradução: Fernanda Murad Machado. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**, v. 40, n. 139, p.13-43, jan./abr. 2010.

QUEIROZ, Júlia Graziela Bernardino de Araújo; GUERREIRO, Elaine Maria Bessa Rebello. Política Educacional e Pedagógica da Educação Especial na Pers-

pectiva da Educação Inclusiva na Rede de Ensino Público de Manaus. **Revista Brasileira de Educação Especial**, Bauru, v. 25, n. 2, p. 233-248, abr./jun. 2019.

ROPOLI, Edilene Aparecida et al. **A Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Educação Inclusiva: escola comum inclusiva**. Brasília, n. Ministério da Educação Secretaria de Educação Especial: Universidade Federal do Ceara, 2010.

SAVIANI, Nereide. Currículo – um grande desafio para o professor. **Revista de Educação**, São Paulo, v. 16, p. 35-38, 2003.

SILVA, Renata Maldonado Silva; RIBEIRO, Luana Leal. Permanências do modelo médico nos discursos dos professores da educação especial. **Revista Educação, Artes e Inclusão**, v. 13, n. 01, jan./abr. 2017.

TEIXEIRA, Nádia França. Metodologias de pesquisa em educação: possibilidades e adequações. **Caderno pedagógico**, Lajeado, p. 7-17, 2015. ISSN 1983-0882.

TRAVI, Marilene et al. A. A escola contemporânea diante do fracasso escolar. **Psicopedagogia**, v. 26, n. 81, p. 425-434, 2009. ISSN 0103-8486.

VALADÃO, Gabriela Tannús et al. Avaliação e Educação Especial em São Carlos. **Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs**, v. 16, p. 269-274, 2016.

Dorimar Gomes Ferreira is Master in Education from the Universidade Federal do Amazonas. He has a degree in Physical Education from the Universidade Federal do Amazonas (2013) and a Degree in Higher Education from the Universidade do Estado do Amazonas (2006). She is currently a teacher - State Secretariat of Education and Teaching Quality. He has experience in the field of Education, with an emphasis on Special Education.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6622-0047>

E-mail: dorimargomesferreira824@gmail.com

João Otacílio Libardoni dos Santos has a PhD (2010/2014) in Human Movement Sciences from the State Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina. He is currently Adjunct Professor Level III at the Federal Universidade Federal do Amazonas.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1048-8164>

E-mail: jlibardoni@ufam.edu.br

Availability of research data: the dataset supporting the results of this study is published in this article.

Editor in charge: Luís Armando Gandin

