


**BETWEEN POLICY AND PRACTICE: THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL POLICY FOR INCLUSIVE SPECIAL EDUCATION IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION OF MARANHÃO (2009–2016)**

**ENTRE A POLÍTICA E A PRÁTICA: A IMPLEMENTAÇÃO DA POLÍTICA NACIONAL DE EDUCAÇÃO ESPECIAL INCLUSIVA NA SECRETARIA ESTADUAL DE EDUCAÇÃO DO MARANHÃO (2009–2016)**

**ENTRE LA POLÍTICA Y LA PRÁCTICA: LA IMPLEMENTACIÓN DE LA POLÍTICA NACIONAL DE EDUCACIÓN ESPECIAL INCLUSIVA EN LA SECRETARÍA DE EDUCACIÓN DEL ESTADO DE MARANHÃO (2009–2016)**

 <https://doi.org/10.56238/sevened2025.030-071>

**Carlos José de Melo Moreira<sup>1</sup>, Amauri Carlos Ferreira<sup>2</sup>, Verônica Lima Carneiro Moreira<sup>3</sup>**

---

**ABSTRACT**

This article analyzes the implementation processes of the National Policy for Special Education from the Perspective of Inclusive Education (PNEE-EI, 2008) in the State Department of Education of Maranhão (SEDUC/MA) between 2009 and 2016, through three federal programs: Inclusive Education Program: Right to Diversity, Program of Multifunctional Resource Rooms (SRM), and Accessible School Program. The study combines historical, documental, and empirical analysis to understand how national inclusive education policies were operationalized in a local context. The research adopted a qualitative approach, using policy cycle analysis, field observation, document analysis, and interviews with 25 subjects, including managers, technicians, and teachers. The results indicated that the implementation of PNEE-EI promoted significant advances, such as the expansion of enrollments of students with special educational needs (PAEE), the establishment of SRMs, and improvements in school infrastructure. However, structural, pedagogical, and cultural challenges remain, including regional inequality, insufficient resources, and gaps in teacher training. The analysis showed that inclusion is not limited to the physical presence of students in mainstream classrooms, but involves conceptual appropriation, pedagogical integration, and cultural change within schools. It was concluded that PNEE-EI constitutes a relevant instrument for the promotion of rights and the democratization of education, but its success depends on collective engagement, continuous monitoring, and adaptation to local specificities, highlighting inclusion as a historical-social process under continuous construction.

**Keywords:** Public Policy. Inclusive Education. Special Education. Secondary Education.

---

<sup>1</sup> Post-Doctorate in Education. Universidade Federal do Maranhão. E-mail: carlos.moreira@ufma.br  
Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3116-3760> Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/9019908682723815>

<sup>2</sup> Post-Doctorate in Education. Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Minas Gerais.  
E-mail: mitolog@pucminas.br Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4771-3465>  
Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/1038910628183279>

<sup>3</sup> Post-Doctorate in Education. Universidade Federal do Maranhão.  
E-mail: veronica.carneiro@ufma.br Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-3291-4784>  
Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/7825456970088645>

## RESUMO

Este artigo analisa os processos de implementação da Política Nacional de Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Educação Inclusiva (PNEE-EI, 2008) na Secretaria de Estado da Educação do Maranhão (SEDUC/MA), entre 2009 e 2016, por meio de três programas federais: Programa Educação Inclusiva: Direito à Diversidade, Programa de Salas de Recursos Multifuncionais (SRM) e Programa Escola Acessível. O estudo combina análise histórica, documental e empírica para compreender como políticas nacionais de educação inclusiva foram operacionalizadas em contexto local. A pesquisa adotou abordagem qualitativa, utilizando análise de ciclo de políticas, observação de campo, análise documental e entrevistas com 25 sujeitos, incluindo gestores, técnicos e professores. Os resultados indicaram que a implementação da PNEE-EI promoveu avanços significativos, como expansão das matrículas de alunos público-alvo da educação especial (PAEE), instalação de SRMs e melhorias na infraestrutura escolar. Contudo, persistem desafios estruturais, pedagógicos e culturais, como desigualdade regional, insuficiência de recursos e lacunas na formação docente. A análise evidenciou que a inclusão não se limita à presença física de alunos na sala comum, mas envolve apropriação conceitual, integração pedagógica e mudança cultural na escola. Concluiu que a PNEE-EI constituiu instrumento relevante para a promoção de direitos e democratização da educação, mas seu êxito depende de engajamento coletivo, monitoramento contínuo e adaptação às especificidades locais, apontando para a inclusão como um processo histórico-social em constante construção.

**Palavras-chave:** Política Pública. Educação Inclusiva. Educação Especial. Ensino Médio.

## RESUMEN

Este artículo analiza los procesos de implementación de la Política Nacional de Educación Especial desde la Perspectiva de la Educación Inclusiva (PNEE-EI, 2008) en la Secretaría de Estado de Educación de Maranhão (SEDUC/MA), entre 2009 y 2016, a través de tres programas federales: Programa de Educación Inclusiva: Derecho a la Diversidad, Programa de Salas de Recursos Multifuncionales (SRM) y Programa Escuela Accesible. El estudio combina análisis histórico, documental y empírico para comprender cómo las políticas nacionales de educación inclusiva se operacionalizaron en un contexto local. La investigación adoptó un enfoque cualitativo, utilizando análisis del ciclo de políticas, observación de campo, análisis documental y entrevistas con 25 sujetos, incluidos gestores, técnicos y docentes. Los resultados indicaron que la implementación de la PNEE-EI promovió avances significativos, como la expansión de matrículas de estudiantes público objetivo de la educación especial (PAEE), la instalación de SRM y mejoras en la infraestructura escolar. Sin embargo, persisten desafíos estructurales, pedagógicos y culturales, como desigualdad regional, insuficiencia de recursos y lagunas en la formación docente. El análisis evidenció que la inclusión no se limita a la presencia física de los estudiantes en el aula común, sino que implica apropiación conceptual, integración pedagógica y cambio cultural en la escuela. Se concluyó que la PNEE-EI constituye un instrumento relevante para la promoción de derechos y democratización de la educación, pero su éxito depende del compromiso colectivo, la supervisión continua y la adaptación a las especificidades locales, destacando la inclusión como un proceso histórico-social en constante construcción.



**Palabras clave:** Política Pública. Educación Inclusiva. Educación Especial. Educación Secundaria.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The discussion on inclusive special education in Brazil has occupied, in recent decades, a central position in research agendas, public policies and pedagogical practices at all levels of education. Since the promulgation of the Federal Constitution of 1988, which recognizes education as a right of all and a duty of the State (art. 205), and ensures specialized educational service preferably in the regular school system (art. 208, item III), successive legal and programmatic frameworks have been instituted in the country, signaling a break with historically predominant segregating perspectives in the education of people with disabilities, global developmental disorders and high abilities/giftedness. The culmination of this process took place with the publication of the National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education (PNEE-EI) in 2008, a document that, inspired by international treaties such as the Salamanca Declaration (UNESCO, 1994) and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN, 2006), consolidated the principle of inclusion as a guideline for education systems.

However, between the formulation of the policy and its effective implementation in the states and municipalities, challenges, tensions and contradictions emerge that problematize the achievement of the goals established at the federal level. The theory of the policy cycle proposed by Stephen Ball (1994; 2001; 2012) is especially useful for understanding this process, as it allows us to analyze educational policy in three interdependent dimensions: the context of influence (formulation and agenda disputes), the context of text production (legal documents, programs and plans) and the context of practice (interpretation and recontextualization by local actors). This perspective shows that policies are not merely implemented, but reinterpreted and transformed in their circulation, so that the distance between intentions and practices is an inherent part of the political-educational process.

In the state of Maranhão, marked by historical, socioeconomic and educational inequalities, the implementation of the National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education (PNEE-EI, 2008) and the associated federal programs took on particular contours. The State Department of Education (SEDUC/MA), through the Superintendence of Special Education (SUEESP), was the body responsible for operationalizing these national guidelines, especially between 2009 and 2016, a period in which significant structural and administrative expansion was observed: creation and equipping of Multifunctional Resource Rooms, adherence to the Accessible School

Program and expansion of continuing education actions for teachers for Specialized Educational Service (AEE). Also, official data recorded a significant increase in the enrollment of students targeted by special education (PAEE) in the state network, with emphasis on high school.

However, the analysis of this experience reveals that quantitative advances did not automatically translate into effective inclusion. Problems persist related to teacher training, curricular accessibility, the articulation between the resource room and the common room, the financing of policies and the permanence of students with quality. Studies such as those by Bueno (1993), Mazzotta (2005), Jannuzzi (2012) and Kassir (2011) have already indicated that enrollment, although fundamental, is only the first stage of school inclusion. The biggest challenge is to ensure conditions for the learning, participation and development of subjects in the daily life of the school. This finding is also confirmed in the SEDUC of Maranhão, where institutional reports and testimonies of managers and teachers show material, structural and pedagogical difficulties for the consolidation of the inclusive policy.

In this scenario, it is pertinent to analyze the implementation of inclusive special education in SEDUC/MA between 2009 and 2016 in the light of the contradictions between national policy and local practices. The choice of this time frame is due to the importance of the initial phase and greater investment of the PNEE-EI and the federal programs that supported it. The objective of this chapter is, therefore, to present the extent to which the state actions of SEDUC have been able to materialize the principles of the national policy of inclusive special education, identifying advances, limits and tensions.

The analysis proposed here is anchored in the results of the research carried out at the Superintendence of Special Education, SUEESP-SEDUC/MA, which combined documentary analysis (federal legislation, SEDUC/MA reports, action plans and inclusive pedagogical programs), interviews with managers and technicians of SUEESP and review of the specialized literature. Such an approach makes it possible to understand not only the normative dimension of the policy, but also its reinterpretation in the school routine, where pedagogical and management practices are negotiated between different actors.

The relevance of this research transcends the case of Maranhão, as it highlights the dynamic, conflicting and contradictory character of the implementation of public educational policies in Brazil. More than noting gaps, it seeks to understand how, between policy and practice, inclusion processes are built that, although still incomplete, represent

relevant social and pedagogical achievements. It is about recognizing both the advances and the challenges, reaffirming inclusive education as the ethical and political horizon of Brazilian public schools.

Organized in five sections, this chapter begins with this introduction, followed by the presentation of the theoretical-methodological framework that supports the research. The third section addresses the historical trajectory and legal foundations of special education in Brazil and Maranhão, highlighting the tensions between segregating practices and normative advances. In the fourth section, the results of the field research are discussed, evidencing advances, limits and contradictions in the process of implementing the inclusive policy analyzed. Finally, the fifth section brings together the final considerations, synthesizing the main findings and pointing out challenges and perspectives for the consolidation of more consistent, equitable, and sustainable inclusive education public policies.

## **2 METHODOLOGICAL PATHS**

The definition of methodological paths is an essential step in any scientific investigation, especially when it comes to research focused on the analysis of educational public policies, whose complexity involves multiple social, cultural, institutional and pedagogical dimensions. This research is part of the field of qualitative investigations in education, having as its object of study the National Policy of Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education (PNEE-EI), instituted in 2008, and as the place of realization the State Secretariat of Education of Maranhão (SEDUC/MA), focusing on the period from 2009 to 2016, when the implementation of this policy was intensified through specific federal programs.

The guiding question of this research was to analyze: - What were the processes of implementation of the National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education (PNEE-EI, 2008), through three federal programs: a) Inclusive Education: Right to Diversity; b) Multifunctional Resource Rooms; and c) Accessible School; developed in partnership between MEC/SEESP and SUEESP/SEDUC/MA, in the high schools of the state education network of Maranhão, between 2009 and 2016?

From this question, the objectives of the research were outlined. - General objective: To analyze the implementation processes of the PNEE-EI (2008) in SEDUC/MA, considering the federal programs of Inclusive Education, Multifunctional Resource Rooms

and Accessible School, in the period from 2009 to 2016, and their impacts on the pedagogical and administrative practices of special education. - Specific objectives: - To identify how federal programs were operationalized in the state education network of Maranhão and how they contributed to the implementation of the PNEE-EI. - Analyze the perceptions of managers, technicians and teachers about the effectiveness of the programs and the transformation of school practices aimed at students who are the target audience of Special Education (PAEE). - Examine the structural, pedagogical and political advances and limitations in the implementation of inclusive policy. - Investigate the articulation between federal macropolicy and state micropolicy, considering the role of SUEESP/SEDUC/MA in the mediation of actions. - Propose reflections on the challenges still present for the consolidation of inclusive education in the state context.

The relevance of this investigation lies in the need to understand how the National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education (PNEE-EI) was appropriated and implemented by SEDUC in Maranhão, a state with a reality marked by historical inequalities, lack of infrastructure and institutional complexities. Examining this process makes it possible to show the extent to which national regulations are translated into concrete practices capable of ensuring the right of access, permanence and learning to students who are the target audience of special education (PAEE). The study contributes to revealing advances, limits and contradictions of inclusive policy at the state level, offering elements that strengthen both academic reflection on educational policies and the formulation of more consistent strategies for managers, teachers and public policy makers.

The methodological approach adopted was qualitative, based on the premise that the educational reality cannot be reduced to isolated indicators or statistics, but requires contextualized interpretation of the practices, discourses and contradictions present in schools and in public management instances. According to Minayo (2001; 2012), qualitative research makes it possible to apprehend meanings, motivations and interpretations present in social relations, making it especially suitable for the study of educational policies, as these are materialized in the interaction between subjects, institutions and norms. In this sense, the investigation was not limited to the collection of formal data, but sought to understand how the PNEE-EI was appropriated, resignified and tensioned in the schools and special education centers linked to SEDUC/MA, based on the historical, social and political conditions that shaped its implementation.

The methodological strategy articulated documentary analysis, literature review, field observation and semi-structured interviews. The documentary analysis focused on national and state legislation, official guidelines, technical reports and administrative records of SEDUC/MA, especially those prepared by the Supervision of Special Education (SUEESP). This material allowed the identification of the institutional paths, the resources made available, the established goals and execution reports related to the three federal programs of inclusive education. By considering the documents as discursive constructions, permeated by political and pedagogical interests, the analysis allowed us to highlight how inclusive politics was translated into practical guidelines and concrete actions. According to Ball (1994), policies can be understood as texts and discourses subject to multiple interpretations, which requires critical analysis articulating documents, observations and interviews.

The bibliographic review mobilized national and regional academic productions on special education policies and inclusive education. Classic authors were consulted, such as Jannuzzi (1992; 2012), Bueno (1993), Mazzotta (2005), Carvalho (2004; 2010) and Kassar (2011), as well as references on public policies, such as Ball (1994; 2001), Bowe and Ball (1992), Mendes (2024) and Lopes and Oliveira (2023). This review made it possible to situate the PNEE-EI in the context of contemporary political and pedagogical disputes, as well as to identify gaps and advances in the implementation of the national policy of inclusive special education in the SEDUC of Maranhão.

The field research was carried out in three inclusive state schools, four Special Education Centers and a Center for High Abilities and Gifted Activities linked to SEDUC/MA. This direct approach made it possible to understand pedagogical and administrative practices, identify resources used, perceive tensions between norms and school reality, and observe how managers and teachers deal with the daily challenges of inclusion. For Lüdke and André (1986), direct observation is an indispensable instrument in qualitative research in education, as it allows capturing aspects that would hardly be evidenced only by documents or interviews.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 25 subjects, including supervisors, technicians, managers and teachers, ensuring diversity of perspectives and deepening of the analyses. The participants were 1 supervisor from SUEESP; 3 technicians from SUEESP; 3 inclusive school managers; 4 managers of Special Education Centers; 1 manager of the Center for High Skills and Gifted Activities; 3 teachers of multifunctional



resource rooms; 5 teachers from common/inclusive classrooms; 3 teachers from Special Education Centers; and 3 teachers from the Center for High Skills and Giftedness. The interviews were recorded, fully transcribed and coded with alphanumeric codes to preserve anonymity, respecting the ethical precepts of research in the human sciences.

The analysis of the empirical data followed the guidelines of content analysis, according to Bardin (2011), organized in three stages: pre-analysis, exploration of the material and treatment of the results. This analysis allowed us to identify categories and subcategories related to the implementation of the policy, articulating the subjects' statements, official documents and specialized literature. The triangulation between different sources of data, interviews, observations and documents reinforced the internal validity of the research (Denzin, 2006).

From the theoretical-methodological point of view, the research articulated three analytical dimensions: 1. Macrostructural: national policies and regulations, including the PNEE-EI and the federal inclusion programs. 2. Mesostructural: actions implemented by SEDUC/MA, especially through SUEESP. 3. Microstructural: pedagogical and administrative practices in inclusive schools, Special Education Centers and High Skills Centers.

This approach was inspired by the policy cycle of Bowe and Ball (1992), which interprets policies as resulting from the interaction between different contexts: that of influence, that of text production and that of practice. This perspective made it possible to understand how the PNEE-EI was appropriated, reinterpreted and tensioned in the SEDUC of Maranhão, allowing the connection of documentary and bibliographic analysis to the experiences lived by the subjects in school spaces.

The time frame from 2009 to 2016 was defined considering that it is the period immediately after the publication of the PNEE-EI (2008), when its implementation began to be effectively monitored by the MEC in conjunction with states and municipalities, as well as the expansion of federal programs aimed at inclusion, before the changes that occurred from 2017 onwards.

The historical-dialectical method guided the investigation, allowing us to understand the implementation of inclusive policy as part of a historical process marked by social, political and pedagogical contradictions, contextualizing inclusive education in Maranhão in the face of regional inequalities, structural limitations and political-pedagogical disputes (SAVIANI, 2007).

However, based on the definition of the research object, the investigative question, the objectives and the justification, the *locus* and the subjects of this research were delimited, as well as the methodological procedures adopted. The analysis combined the study of federal and state documents related to the inclusive special education policy, interviews with 35 subjects directly involved in the process and the observation of school practices and contexts, composing a qualitative research path. This strategy made it possible to critically understand how the PNEE-EI was implemented in SEDUC/MA, revealing tensions between formulation and practice, management challenges and mobilized pedagogical strategies. On the basis of these elements, the chapter is organized into five sections: the first corresponds to this introduction; the second presents the theoretical-methodological framework of the research; the third discusses the historical trajectory and legal foundations of special education in Brazil and Maranhão; the fourth exposes and analyzes the results of the field research, highlighting advances, limits and contradictions; and, finally, the fifth section brings the final considerations, which summarize the main findings and point out challenges and perspectives for the consolidation of inclusive policies in Maranhão.

### **3 HISTORY AND FOUNDATIONS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION IN BRAZIL AND MARANHÃO**

The trajectory of special education in Brazil, and particularly in Maranhão, is deeply intertwined with the social, political and cultural transformations that marked the formation of the country. From the colonial period, through the construction of the imperial State, the republican reforms, the constitutional and legal frameworks, to the most recent policies, there is a process in constant tension between exclusionary practices and movements to claim rights. The objective of this section is to present this historical and legal path of inclusive special education in Brazil and Maranhão, emphasizing its importance for understanding the context in which the implementation of the PNEE-EI in the SEDUC of the State is inserted. This historical knowledge constitutes an indispensable basis for the analysis of the data discussed in the next section, allowing us to understand how historical, social, structural, and normative conditions influence the advances, limits, and contradictions of inclusive policy in SEDUC in Maranhão.

During the colonial period, education was restricted to specific groups, especially the children of the elite, under the leadership of the Jesuits. According to Saviani (2019),

the Jesuit school prioritized catechesis and the basic training necessary to maintain social order. People with disabilities were made invisible in this scenario, relegated to the domestic space or to charitable assistance, without any prospect of school inclusion. This picture of exclusion lasted for centuries, until, in the Empire, the first specialized institutions appeared.

In 1854, the Imperial Institute of Blind Boys (now the Benjamin Constant Institute) was founded in Rio de Janeiro, followed in 1857 by the Imperial Institute of the Deaf and Dumb (today the National Institute for the Education of the Deaf – INES). Jannuzzi (2012) points out that these institutions were inspired by European models, especially French, and had a medical-welfare character. The service was segregated and limited to a small portion of the population, mostly residing in the imperial capital. Disability was understood as incapacity, and teaching aimed above all at professionalization in artisanal crafts. Maranhão, in this period, did not have its own institutions, depending on isolated initiatives, usually linked to the Church or local philanthropy.

With the First Republic (1889–1930), the Brazilian State maintained a silent stance towards special education. As Mazzotta (2005) observes, private and philanthropic initiatives prevailed, often supported by religious congregations. In Maranhão, the historical conditions of structural poverty and educational exclusion aggravated the absence of public policies aimed at people with disabilities (Carvalho, 2004). Care, when it existed, was limited to a few urban institutions with scarce resources, perpetuating the social and school marginalization of these subjects.

The Vargas Era (1930–1945) brought about some institutional reorganization. The 1934 Constitution was the first to recognize the right of the "exceptional" to education, albeit in segregated ways. The Ministry of Education and Health, created in 1930, took over the coordination of educational policies and expanded the role of the State in this field. However, as Kassir (2011) points out, the concept of disability continued to be linked to disability, and special education remained limited to specific institutions, focused on functional adaptation and preparation for work. In Maranhão, this scenario has not been translated into consistent local policies, maintaining dependence on assistance initiatives.

During the civil-military dictatorship (1964–1985), special education gained space in legislation. Law No. 5,692/1971, which reformulated the teaching of 1st and 2nd grades, established the obligation to attend to the "exceptional". This change, however, was based on the paradigm of integration, that is, it provided for the insertion of students with

disabilities in regular classes without effective curricular or pedagogical adaptations. Bueno (1993) observes that this perspective confused enrollment with inclusion, since formal access did not guarantee real learning conditions. In Maranhão, specialized educational services remained fragmented, restricted to a few urban institutions, often managed by philanthropic or religious organizations (Carvalho, 2010).

The Federal Constitution of 1988 marked a decisive inflection. By consolidating education as a right of all and a duty of the State, the Magna Carta established, in its article 208, item III, that specialized educational service should preferably occur in the regular school system. For the first time, educational inclusion was recognized as a fundamental legal principle. Mazzotta (2005) emphasizes that this milestone inaugurated a new paradigm, although its effectiveness depended on consistent public policies and structural investments.

Previous constitutions had generically mentioned the "exceptional", but without breaking with the segregating logic. It was only in 1988 that the idea of inclusion as a fundamental right was consolidated, driving subsequent infra-constitutional legislation. In this context, the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDBEN) of 1996 was decisive. In its article 58, it defined special education as a transversal modality, ensuring specialized educational service preferably in the regular network, free of charge and with specific resources. In line with the 1988 Constitution and international documents, such as the Salamanca Declaration (1994), the LDBEN became a reference for the formulation of inclusive policies in the following decades.

The Salamanca Declaration, approved by UNESCO in 1994, had great repercussions in Brazil. The document reaffirmed inclusive education as a human right and advocated the reorganization of education systems to serve all students in regular schools. According to Mantoan (2003), Brazil's adherence to this international commitment strengthened the inclusion movement, stimulating programs and projects that increased the enrollment of students who were the target audience of special education (PAEE). In Maranhão, this period was still marked by inequalities, but initiatives aimed at the integration of students with disabilities in regular education have already been observed, albeit in an incipient way.

The early 2000s consolidated the movement towards a national policy for inclusive education. The National Education Plan (2001–2010) brought specific goals for special education, reinforcing the mandatory enrollment of students with disabilities in the regular

network. The culmination of this process was the launch of the National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education (PNEE-EI), in 2008. This document represented a historic milestone by affirming inclusive education as a guiding principle of educational policies, overcoming the paradigm of integration and proposing the reorganization of education networks to ensure access, permanence, participation and learning for all students.

According to Kassir (2011), the National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Special Education, PNEE-EI of 2008 materialized the advances accumulated in recent decades, but also faced resistance, especially from sectors that defended the maintenance of special schools and classes. In Maranhão, its implementation was conditioned by historical challenges, such as the structural precariousness of state schools, the lack of teachers trained in the area and regional inequalities. Research such as those by Carvalho (2010) and Sousa (2017) points out that, although there was an expansion of specialized educational services (SEA) in the period, obstacles related to accessibility, continuing education and effective inclusion in regular classrooms persisted.

In the most recent period, inclusive education, although consolidated as an international and national guideline, has become the object of intense disputes in the field of public policies. In September 2020, the federal government issued Decree No. 10,502/2020, which instituted the call: - National Policy on Special Education: Equitable, Inclusive and with Lifelong Learning. The document was widely criticized by experts and entities in the area for representing a setback in relation to the 2008 PNEE-EI, since it reopened the possibility of schooling students targeted by special education (PAEE) in segregated institutions and classes. Authors such as Kassir (2021) and Garcia (2021) observe that the decree reinforced the dual and welfare logic, contrary to the 1988 Constitution, the Salamanca Declaration (1994) and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN, 2006). The measure was also contested by bodies such as the National Association of Researchers in Education, ANPEd and the National Council of Education (CNE), which denounced the risk of dismantling the inclusive achievements accumulated in recent decades. In response, the Federal Supreme Court (STF), in Direct Action of Unconstitutionality No. 6,590, suspended the effects of the decree in 2021, reaffirming the centrality of the 2008 PNEE-EI as a regulatory framework in force and reinforcing that school inclusion must be effective in the regular network, and it is up to

the State to guarantee the necessary resources and support, without resorting to segregation.

After this episode of attempted regression by a conservative federal government, the debate on inclusive special education remained at the center of Brazilian educational policies. Recent research (Lopes & Oliveira, 2023; Mendes, 2024) show that, despite the normative advances accumulated since the 1988 Constitution and the consolidation of the 2008 PNEE-EI, the effectiveness of inclusion continues to be conditioned by factors such as consistent teacher training, architectural accessibility, curricular adequacy, and overcoming attitudinal barriers. In Maranhão, this reality is expressed in visible contrasts: at the same time that there has been an expansion of multifunctional resource rooms and the offer of training programs by SEDUC/MA, schools persist without adequate physical conditions, in addition to cultural and institutional resistance that hinder the effective inclusion of students who are the target audience of special education.

In this sense, the historical trajectory of special education in Brazil and Maranhão is marked by relevant normative advances, but also by the permanence of exclusionary practices. From the invisibility in the colonial era, through the creation of the first segregated institutions in the nineteenth century, to the integrationist logic predominant in the twentieth century and the consolidation of the principle of inclusion in the twenty-first century, it is observed that each stage brought important achievements, but also challenges not overcome. The 2008 PNEE-EI remains a reference framework, even though its full implementation depends on structured public policies, administrative continuity and the confrontation of deep social and regional inequalities.

This historical-legal path offers subsidies to understand the dilemmas faced by the Maranhão State Department of Education (SEDUC/MA) in the process of implementing the inclusive special education policy. From these inherited contradictions, it becomes possible to analyze how, between 2009 and 2016, the state sought to consolidate actions aimed at inclusion in the midst of structural, pedagogical and political obstacles. The following section will present the results of the field research and discuss how these data reveal the advances and limits of the implementation of the National Policy for Inclusive Special Education within the scope of SEDUC/MA, considering the impacts and challenges faced in this period.

#### **4 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL POLICY ON INCLUSIVE SPECIAL EDUCATION AT SEDUC/MA (2009–2016): RESULTS AND CHALLENGES**

As analyzed in the previous section, which discussed the history and foundations of special education in Brazil and Maranhão, understanding this context is essential to interpret the implementation of federal inclusive education programs in SEDUC/MA. The National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education, formally instituted by the Ministry of Education in 2008, was a milestone for the redefinition of practices and guidelines aimed at students who are the target audience of Special Education (PAEE) in Maranhão, consolidating the full integration of Special Education into regular education. Within the scope of SEDUC/MA and the Supervision of Special Education (SUEESP), its application, between 2009 and 2016, was articulated with three structuring programs: the Program for the Implementation of Multifunctional Resource Rooms (SRM), the Accessible School Program and the Teacher Training Program for Inclusive Education. This section aims to present and discuss the results of the data collected in the process of implementing these programs, analyzing the advances, challenges and impacts of inclusive policies, and introducing the detailed analysis that will be developed throughout this section.

The analysis of the actions implemented allows us to understand not only the advances achieved, but also the challenges in the democratization of access, permanence and quality of education for PAEE students, evidencing structural, pedagogical and political tensions that cross the state education network. The National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education (BRASIL, 2008a) brought about a paradigmatic change by establishing that PAEE students should preferably be enrolled in regular classes, with the right to Specialized Educational Service (SES) and complementary pedagogical support services. To operationalize this policy in the SEDUC of Maranhão, SUEESP articulated with federal programs, seeking to implement actions that promote inclusion in a systematic and structured way.

The subjects of this research, composed of 25 participants, including managers, technicians, teachers and professionals linked to regular schools, specialized educational centers and the Center for High Skills and Giftedness, highlighted that the three federal programs have become fundamental instruments for the construction of a state policy aimed at inclusion. One of the managers emphasized: "Without the federal programs,

SEDUC/MA would not have been able to structure the resource rooms or train teachers to work with PAEE students" (Subject GE1).

Despite the advances, the interviewees pointed out limitations related to insufficient resources, difficulty in pedagogical articulation between teachers in the common classrooms and the SEA, and the absence of systematic monitoring, which shows that inclusion is not restricted to enrollment, but requires a continuous process of school transformation, as emphasized by Glat and Pletsch (2012).

The Program for the Implementation of Multifunctional Resource Rooms, established by Normative Ordinance No. 13/2007, aimed to support education systems in the organization and provision of Specialized Educational Service (SES), contributing to the strengthening of the process of educational inclusion in common education classes (Brasil, 2007). In Maranhão, between 2009 and 2016, 313 Type I and II SRMs were implemented, distributed in regular schools in the state network, marking a significant institutional advance in the implementation of the National Policy for Inclusive Special Education.

The Multifunctional Resource Rooms were conceived as pedagogical spaces equipped with equipment, furniture and teaching materials specific to the SEA, as defined in Decree No. 6,571/2008. This decree establishes SEA as a set of institutionally organized activities, accessibility and pedagogical resources, provided in a complementary or supplementary way to the training of students in regular education (Brasil, 2008b). The conception of the AEE, consolidated by Decree No. 7,611/2011, provides that the service is free of charge for students with disabilities, global developmental disorders and high abilities/giftedness, and should be carried out transversally to all levels and stages of education, preferably in the regular network.

The research subjects reported positive perceptions about the implementation of SRMs, highlighting that these spaces work as a strategic support for school inclusion. One manager noted: "The Multifunctional Resource Room is the differential in our school unit. The SEA teacher helps us with everything, from enrollment to learning assessments" (Subject GE2). Another manager pointed out: "With this national policy, we now have several professional Libras interpreters in the network, in addition to the SRMs. It has greatly improved our work with PAEE students in general" (Subject GE3).

Despite the recognition of the advances, the analysis of the data reveals limitations. Some subjects qualified the implementation process as "reasonable" or "insufficient",



highlighting that the number of SRMs still does not meet the needs of all schools in the state network, resulting in situations in which students enrolled in regular schools do not have access to SEA. Studies by Garcia and Michels (2011), Baptista (2011) and Bruno (2010) corroborate these observations, pointing out that, although SRMs are privileged spaces for SEA, there are still weaknesses in the pedagogical articulation with common education.

Direct observation in the three inclusive schools surveyed showed reasonable physical and material conditions, with equipped classrooms, functional computers, printers, datashow and technological resources for accessibility. However, the distribution of SRMs remains unequal, especially in the interior regions of the state, which limits the universalization of care and demonstrates the need for continuous policies and systematic monitoring.

The SEA in SRMs has the function of supporting the development of PAEE students, allowing them to overcome intellectual, motor or sensory limitations and actively participate in common education. According to Bruno (2010), the SRM model, although strategic, presents risks of reductionism, if limited to the use of technologies without effective integration with the curriculum of the common classes. In this sense, the subjects highlighted that the successful implementation of SEA depends on articulation between teachers of the common room, SEA team, school technicians and families, favoring learning and social inclusion of PAEE students.

The Accessible School Program, launched in 2007, was designed to promote physical, architectural, technological and communicational accessibility in regular schools, complementing the actions of the Multifunctional Resource Rooms. Its main objective is to ensure that students who are the target audience of Special Education (PAEE) can access the school space, participate in pedagogical activities and enjoy adequate learning conditions, including ramps, adapted bathrooms, adequate signage, accessible furniture and technological equipment (Brasil, 2007; Mantoan, 2015).

At SEDUC in Maranhão, the execution of the program was articulated with the expansion of SRMs and the strengthening of Specialized Educational Service. According to the research subjects, the interventions promoted by the program were significant, although still insufficient to fully meet the needs of the state network. A technician from SEDUC/MA stated that: "Without these resources we would not have been able to start the accessibility process, but the reality of schools in the interior is still very precarious"

(Subject PSI1). Another manager pointed out: "The implementation of ramps, adapted bathrooms and the acquisition of technological equipment enabled concrete advances, but we still need to advance a lot" (Subject GE1).

The literature on educational accessibility reinforces the importance of a comprehensive approach. Mendes (2010) and Santos (2014) highlight that accessibility is not limited to specific physical adaptations, but should encompass communication, pedagogical materials, access to assistive technologies and the development of inclusive didactic resources. This includes educational software, braille materials, accessible digital resources, Libras interpretation and other support technologies, allowing PAEE students to participate actively and meaningfully in school activities.

In the context of the three inclusive schools surveyed, it was observed that the infrastructure was reasonably organized: all had adapted furniture, computers, datashow and printers in operation. In two of them, there was internet available for pedagogical use and in one there was not, which also shows inequality of access to essential resources for effective inclusion. The research also showed that the effectiveness of accessibility depends on the articulation between the pedagogical team, SEA teachers, common room teachers and families, consolidating inclusion as a collective process.

The subjects' statements revealed complementary perceptions: "These three federal programs collaborated a lot for the democratization of teaching for PAEE students. We were able to equip 313 schools with SRMs and other technological equipment" (Subject ST1). However, it is noteworthy that, even with the advances, there are structural gaps, especially in schools in the interior, where the material and technological lack still limits the effectiveness of inclusive teaching (Subject PSI2).

In summary, the Accessible School Program, according to the data analyzed, represented a relevant advance in the democratization of access and permanence of PAEE students, enabling minimum conditions of participation. However, the inequality between school units and the need for continuous maintenance of equipment reveal that full inclusion still requires consistent public policies, sustainable investments and constant pedagogical articulation, ensuring that the resources implemented are in fact used effectively.

Teacher training is a central element for the implementation of the National Policy on Special Education from the Perspective of Inclusive Education, since inclusion is not achieved only through enrollment, but through the transformation of pedagogical practices

and school relations. The Teacher Training Program for Inclusive Education, implemented by MEC and articulated with SEDUC/MA, aimed to train professionals to work in Specialized Educational Service (SES) and in common rooms, promoting inclusive pedagogical practices and reflections on diversity, accessibility and rights of students who are the target audience of Special Education (PAEE) (Carvalho, 2011; Glat; Fernandes, 2005).

According to the subjects interviewed, the courses, workshops and seminars offered by the program had a positive impact on changing conceptions about inclusion and on the articulation between SEA and regular education. One teacher observed: "The training helped us to understand the role of the common room teacher in the inclusive process, overcoming the idea that the PAEE student was only the responsibility of the SEA" (Subject P2-PUIE). Another teacher highlighted, however, that continuing education was limited: "The training was good, but short and little articulated with the daily life of the schools" (Subject P5-PUIE).

The literature emphasizes that training for inclusion should be continuous, processual and linked to the school context, allowing teachers to develop skills to meet diversity in a contextualized way. Carvalho (2011) and Glat and Fernandes (2005) state that punctual or isolated training, without articulation with daily pedagogical practice, is not enough to promote effective transformations in inclusive education. The practice observed in the three schools surveyed revealed that, although teachers have incorporated some inclusive strategies, there is still difficulty in joint planning between regular education and SEA teachers, especially in classes with a large number of students.

The managers highlighted that the training contributed to broadening the understanding of inclusive education as a collective process, involving the entire school community: "From the training, we realized that inclusion is not only a function of the SEA; it is the responsibility of all teachers and school professionals" (Subject GE1). Even so, gaps in post-training follow-up were reported, which compromises the consolidation of inclusive practices. The absence of systematic pedagogical supervision and spaces for continuous reflection hinders the effective articulation between theory and practice, limiting the effects of the program on the learning and participation of PAEE students.

In short, the Teacher Training Program for Inclusive Education proved to be relevant to expand knowledge, sensitize teachers and strengthen the inclusive perspective in schools. However, the limitations in the duration of the courses, in the

articulation with the school routine and in the continuity of training show that teacher training should be understood as a permanent, strategic and integrated process with the set of inclusive education policies, being indispensable to ensure the effectiveness of Specialized Educational Service and the democratization of quality teaching.

The Specialized Educational Service (SES) has been consolidated as the central axis of the National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education, functioning as a complementary and supplementary service to regular education. Between 2009 and 2016, SEDUC/MA, through SUEESP, implemented 313 Multifunctional Resource Rooms (SRM), distributed in the regular schools of the state network, intended to serve students who are the target audience of Special Education (PAEE). SRMs were legally defined as spaces equipped with specific pedagogical and technological resources, with the objective of supporting students in overcoming barriers to learning and full participation in regular education (Brasil, 2007; Brazil, 2008a; Brazil, 2008b; Brazil, Decree No. 7,611, 2011).

According to the subjects interviewed, SEA made it possible to transform the logic of care, which was previously concentrated in the four Special Education Centers and in the Center for High Abilities and Giftedness, into a decentralized service, integrated into the school routine. One manager reported: "SEA started to be in the school context as a whole, ceasing to be a parallel service and becoming an integral part of the teaching units" (Subject SS). Another highlighted the importance of interdisciplinary articulation: "With the national policy, we started to have Libras interpreters and other professionals, which greatly improved inclusive work" (Subject GE3). These perceptions indicate that SEA contributed to effective inclusion, promoting the participation of PAEE students in common classrooms and strengthening meaningful learning.

The analysis of empirical data, however, reveals persistent challenges. Despite the implementation of the 313 SRMs, the number is still not enough to serve all schools in the state network, resulting in students enrolled in regular schools without regular access to SES. In terms of organization and pedagogical articulation, six of the subjects evaluated classified the process as "Very Good" and two as "Good", indicating recognition of institutional efforts, but pointing out the need for improvement in the universalization of care. In addition, research by Cavalcanti (2011), Silva (2009), Oliveira and Lima (2011) and Miranda (2011) shows that, in several education systems, the articulation between

regular education and SEA is still precarious, limiting the effectiveness of inclusive practices.

The implementation of SEA also promoted significant changes in management and human resources. The professionals involved began to work in an integrated way with teachers in the common room and with the families of PAEE students, contributing to a continuous monitoring of learning. One manager highlighted: "The Multifunctional Resource Room is the differential in our school unit. The SEA teacher supports us from enrollment to evaluations" (Subject GE2). In this sense, SEA has become a tool to promote autonomy, independence and active participation of students, overcoming historically segregating models of Special Education.

The complementary and supplementary character of SEA is reinforced by the diversity of activities and resources offered, including assistive technologies, educational software, adapted pedagogical materials and differentiated teaching strategies. Bruno (2010) warns, however, that there is a risk of SEA becoming reductionist if it focuses only on the use of technologies, without effective integration into the common room curriculum. The observations carried out in the three inclusive schools demonstrated that, despite reasonable physical and material conditions, the infrastructure still does not fully meet the demand, especially in terms of digital accessibility, adapted furniture and alternative communication resources.

The democratization of quality education, the structuring axis of the inclusive policy, involves not only enrollment, but permanence, effective learning and guarantee of equal opportunities for PAEE students. Santos (2014) emphasizes that effectiveness depends on continuous pedagogical support, the use of technological resources and the active participation of the family. One technician reported: "Without federal programs, we would not have been able to decentralize care. Today SEA is done in several schools in the state, but it is still not enough" (Subject ST1). The subjects' answers indicated that, although federal programs have expanded access, the quality of care and the permanence of students still face structural, pedagogical and political limitations.

The analysis of the graphs constructed from the interviews shows that most subjects evaluated the processes of democratization of education as "reasonable" or "insufficient", highlighting the need for continuity of investments, technological renewal, teacher training and expansion of SEA in all teaching units. The implementation of the inclusive policy through the SEDUC of Maranhão, therefore, presents significant

advances, but remains a process under construction, conditioned to the maintenance of State policies that guarantee effective inclusion, meaningful learning and respect for diversity (Mendes, 2010; Mantoan, 2015).

Finally, the challenges faced highlight four central structural and conceptual aspects. The first is of a political-economic nature, related to the neoliberal model and to policies to reduce social investments, which directly impact the capacity to implement and maintain the SEA. The second is historical and pedagogical, linked to the selective and excluding tradition of common schools, which still favors uniform practices, making it difficult to value diversity. The third aspect refers to the ideological implementation of inclusive policies, which, although based on legal principles of inclusion, often reproduce models of "exclusionary inclusion", meeting the objectives of the market to the detriment of the real pedagogical needs of students. The fourth aspect is the social evaluation of student performance, in which students who do not correspond to market expectations are considered "failures", evidencing the persistence of stigmatizing practices that devalue learning diversity.

Thus, the implementation of the SEA, articulated with the SRMs and federal policies, proved to be central to the effectiveness of Inclusive Special Education in SEDUC/MA between 2009 and 2016. Despite the advances in the decentralization of service, in the expansion of human and technological resources and in the integration with the pedagogical practices of regular schools, significant challenges persist regarding the universalization of access, pedagogical articulation, teacher training and the maintenance of continuous policies that guarantee the permanence, learning and appreciation of the diversity of PAEE students. The consolidation of full inclusion requires, therefore, continuous efforts, institutional commitments, and State policies that prioritize education as a universal and transformative right.

The analysis of the implementation of the National Policy on Special Education from the Perspective of Inclusive Education in SEDUC/MA, in the period from 2009 to 2016, shows significant advances, but also persistent challenges that impact the effectiveness of the inclusive process. Among the advances, the creation and implementation of 313 Multifunctional Resource Rooms, the decentralization of the Specialized Educational Service (AEE) from the four central units to the common schools, the expansion of specialized human resources, including Libras interpreters, and the integration of pedagogical actions into the school curricula stand out. The interviewed

subjects, managers, technicians and teachers, reinforce that such measures were central to promote the inclusion of students who are the target audience of Special Education (PAEE) and to improve meaningful learning in regular education. As one manager pointed out: "SEA started to be in the school context as a whole, ceasing to be a parallel service and becoming an integral part of the teaching units" (Subject SS).

The democratization of access and permanence with quality emerges as a central axis, emphasizing that inclusion is not limited to enrollment, but requires pedagogical articulation, adequate resources, continuing teacher training and family participation. The data collected indicate that, although the three federal programs, Multifunctional Resource Rooms, Accessible School and Teacher Training for Inclusive Education, have expanded access and improved infrastructure, structural, pedagogical and social barriers persist. One technician observed: "Today SEA is done in several schools in the state, but it is still not enough" (Subject ST1), highlighting the need for continuous investments and stable policies that guarantee the effective permanence of PAEE students and the quality of teaching.

The evaluation of inclusive practices in the state network, based on the perceptions of managers and teachers, reveals important contradictions. While some units demonstrate organization, pedagogical articulation and good use of technological resources, others still have significant gaps in attendance, insufficient materials, lack of continuing education and lack of articulation between SEA teachers and the common room. One teacher reported: "The student included and the teacher suffer to carry out the policy. Often there is no dialogue between the SEA teacher and the common room" (Subject P5-PUIE). Such evidence confirms the arguments of Mantoan (2015) and Omote (2018) about the need for inclusion to be understood as a complex process, which involves structural, pedagogical and cultural changes.

Specialized educational services and the democratization of teaching reveal four structural dimensions that influence the success or limitations of inclusive policy. First, the political-economic aspect, marked by the neoliberal model and the reduction of social investments, which compromises the sustainable implementation of the SEA. Second, the historical-pedagogical aspect, related to the selective and homogenizing tradition of common schools, which marginalizes students who do not fit the profile of "standard student". Third, the ideological aspect of inclusive policies, which often reproduces an "excluding inclusion", meeting market demands more than the real needs of PAEE

students. Finally, the social and evaluative aspect, in which students considered "less productive" face stigmatization and risk of dropping out of school, evidencing the persistence of discriminatory and exclusionary practices.

It is also observed that, in order to ensure the effectiveness of SEA and inclusion, it is essential that pedagogical processes be contextualized, interdisciplinary and articulated with the specific needs of each student. The adoption of diversified technological and pedagogical resources, combined with the participation of the family, is an essential tool for the construction of autonomy, independence and meaningful learning. According to Santos (2014), effective inclusion requires attention to the specificities of each student, combining pedagogical support, communicational accessibility and curricular adaptation, reinforcing that inclusive education is a right that is realized in the daily practice of the school.

In summary, the National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education, articulated with federal programs, provided relevant advances in SEDUC/MA between 2009 and 2016: decentralization of service, expansion of SEA. However, the challenges remain significant, especially regarding the universalization of access, consistent pedagogical integration, the continuing education of teachers and the continuity of public policies that guarantee the full democratization of education. The fulfillment of these goals depends on political commitment, efficient management and engagement of the entire school community, consolidating inclusion as a right, and not just as a temporary government policy.

Therefore, the analysis of the implementation of the policy in Maranhão demonstrates that the educational inclusion of PAEE students is a historical and continuous process, which requires articulated actions, sustainable investments, permanent teacher training and systematic monitoring. More than a legal achievement, inclusion represents a social and pedagogical commitment to diversity, equity and quality of education, reaffirming that the inclusive school must be able to transform practices, value potential and guarantee the right of all students to learning and full participation in school and social life.

## 5 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The historical trajectory and foundations of special education analyzed in section three provided the necessary context to understand the complexity of the implementation



of the National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education (PNE-EI) in SEDUC/MA between 2009 and 2016. The study showed that, although the policy was formally instituted at the national level, its operationalization in the SEDUC of Maranhão required articulation between different federal programs, adaptation to local conditions and conceptual appropriation by education professionals. This historical and institutional scenario revealed that the implementation of inclusive policies does not occur in a linear way, but in constant interaction with specific social, cultural, and political contexts.

The research question posed at the beginning of this investigation was to analyze:

- What were the processes of implementation of the National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education (PNEE-EI, 2008), through three federal programs: a) Inclusive Education: Right to Diversity; b) Multifunctional Resource Rooms; and c) Accessible School; developed in partnership between MEC/SEESP and SUEESP/SEDUC/MA, in the high schools of the state education network of Maranhão, between 2009 and 2016? This question guided the entire investigation, allowing the analysis not only of the quantitative results, but also of the challenges and contradictions faced by the subjects involved. Throughout the study, the proposed objectives were fully considered: to understand the articulation between macropolitics and micropolitics, to identify institutional and pedagogical advances, and to discuss the limits and potentialities of inclusive politics in the state context.

The analysis showed that the federal programs functioned as strategic instruments of transformation, articulating actions of teacher training, administrative reorganization and physical and pedagogical adaptation of the schools. However, the achievement of these advances depended on the practical and conceptual appropriation of inclusion by managers, teachers and technicians, revealing that policies of a normative nature need human engagement and institutional awareness to generate concrete effects. Thus, it was observed that school inclusion is not limited to the enrollment of PAEE students in regular schools, but involves a profound cultural and pedagogical change, which requires integration between SEA and the common room, continuous monitoring and curricular adaptation.

Despite progress, structural and pedagogical challenges persist that limit the universalization of the policy. The inequality of infrastructure between urban and rural schools, insufficient resources, gaps in continuing education and difficulties in

pedagogical articulation still compromise the full effectiveness of the PNE-EI. These factors reinforce that the implementation of inclusive policies should be understood as a dynamic process, dependent on resources, management, community engagement, and sensitivity to local specificities.

By returning to the objectives of the research, it is found that it was possible to analyze part of the processes of implementation of the PNE-EI in SEDUC/MA, evaluate the impacts of the three federal programs and identify both advances and structural and pedagogical limitations. The research showed that inclusive policies require not only planning and standardization, but constant practical reconstruction by educational actors, reflecting a historical-social movement that transcends the analyzed period and points to the need for continuity and improvement of the strategies implemented.

In summary, the effectiveness of inclusive education depends on a dialogued articulation between national guidelines and local practices, between material and human resources, and between public policies and collective engagement, demonstrating that the implementation of an educational policy is not restricted to normative formalization, but involves the complex interaction between different levels of management, actors and social contexts. The methodological approach adopted in this research, based on the analysis of the policy cycle and the triangulation between official documents, field observations and interviews with managers, technicians and teachers, made it possible to understand not only the planning and execution of the programs, but also the ways in which these processes are reinterpreted, negotiated and adapted to the concrete reality of the school units. This methodological perspective revealed the importance of considering school micropolitics as a space for mediation between national macropolitics and local experiences, demonstrating that the results of inclusion strongly depend on the practical and conceptual appropriation of programs by education professionals.

The historical analysis presented in section three showed that special education in Brazil and Maranhão has followed trajectories marked by tensions between exclusionary practices and movements to claim rights, emphasizing that inclusive policies do not arise in a vacuum, but in a specific social, political, and cultural context, in which achievements and limitations alternate and overlap. By integrating this historical perspective with the analysis of the data collected, it was possible to identify how structural, pedagogical and institutional factors influence the implementation of inclusive policies, highlighting that significant advances, such as teacher training, the increase in the number of enrollments

of students targeted by special education, the installation of Multifunctional Resource Rooms and the adaptations promoted by the Accessible School Program, took place in the midst of persistent challenges, such as regional inequalities, scarcity of resources and gaps in continuing education.

The results obtained demonstrated that inclusion is a dynamic and multifaceted process, which requires constant negotiation between different actors and levels of power, demanding creativity, flexibility, resilience and ethical and professional commitment from all those involved. The research showed that the implementation of inclusive policies is as much an exercise in planning and management as it is a cultural and pedagogical construction, in which each school and each professional act as agents of transformation. Thus, the effectiveness of the policy depends not only on compliance with standards or the execution of programs, but on the ability to mobilize reflective, collaborative, and innovative practices that ensure learning, participation, and appreciation of diversity in all school spaces.

At the same time, this study reinforces that inclusion should not be seen as an attainable end state, but as a continuous process of social and educational construction, in constant movement and adaptation. The experience of SEDUC/MA in the implementation of these three federal government programs in the period from 2009 to 2016, demonstrated that well-structured policies, when combined with effective engagement, can produce concrete and measurable impacts, but also show that historical, structural and cultural challenges require permanent monitoring, critical evaluation and constant review of practices.

Therefore, concluding this analysis, it is possible to consider that school inclusion represents a synthesis between historical, political construction and pedagogical practices, integrating theoretical knowledge, analysis of empirical data and critical reflection on the process of educational transformation. In its context, inclusion is a collective project of processes, which depends on the shared commitment between the State, education professionals and society. With the analyses presented, it is possible to recognize that, despite the limitations, the paths taken point to a school historically built in a more equitable and democratic way, capable of valuing diversity and offering real learning opportunities to all students, consolidating the right to education as a collective heritage and allowing us to envision a future in which inclusive education becomes not just a goal, but a daily and lasting practice in all schools in Maranhão and Brazil.

## REFERENCES

- Ball, S. J. (1994). *Education reform: A critical and post-structural approach*. Open University Press.
- Ball, S. J. (2001). *Políticas educacionais: Teoria e prática* (T. T. da Silva, Trans., 2nd ed.). Artmed.
- Ball, S. J. (2002). Sociologia das políticas educacionais e pesquisa crítico-social: Uma revisão pessoal das políticas educacionais e da pesquisa em política educacional. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, 2(2), 10–32.
- Baptista, R. (2011). *Educação inclusiva: Práticas e desafios*. Cortez.
- Brasil. (1988). *Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil de 1988*. Diário Oficial da União.
- Brasil. (1971). Lei nº 5.692, de 11 de agosto de 1971: Reformula o ensino de 1º e 2º graus. Diário Oficial da União.
- Brasil. (1996). Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996: Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional – LDBEN. Diário Oficial da União.
- Brasil. (2007). Portaria Normativa nº 13/2007: Institui diretrizes para a implantação das Salas de Recursos Multifuncionais. Ministério da Educação.
- Brasil. (2007). Programa Escola Acessível. Ministério da Educação.
- Brasil. (2008a). Política Nacional de Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Educação Inclusiva (PNEE-EI). Ministério da Educação.
- Brasil. (2008b). Decreto nº 6.571, de 17 de setembro de 2008: Regulamenta o Atendimento Educacional Especializado. Diário Oficial da União.
- Brasil. (2011). Decreto nº 7.611, de 17 de novembro de 2011: Regulamenta o Atendimento Educacional Especializado para estudantes com deficiência, transtornos globais do desenvolvimento e altas habilidades/superdotação. Diário Oficial da União.
- Bruno, D. (2010). *Inclusão escolar e tecnologia: Limites e possibilidades*. DP&A.
- Carvalho, L. (2011). Formação de professores para educação inclusiva: Desafios e perspectivas. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, 16(46), 123–138.
- Carvalho, M. B. W. B. de. (2004). *A política estadual maranhense de educação especial (1997–2002)* [Doctoral dissertation, UNIMEP]. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação.
- Carvalho, M. B. W. B. de. (2008). As peculiaridades da educação especial na política educacional do Maranhão (1997–2002). In M. A. Almeida, E. G. Mendes, & M. C. P. I.

- Hayashi (Eds.), Temas em educação especial: Múltiplos olhares (pp. 53–61). Junqueira & Marin; CAPES-PROESP.
- Carvalho, M. B. W. B. de. (2010). Professores de educação especial: Aspectos da política educacional maranhense. In M. G. da Silva & M. B. W. B. de Carvalho (Eds.), Faces da inclusão. EDUFMA.
- Cavalcanti, M. (2011). Educação inclusiva e gestão escolar. EDUFRPE.
- Garcia, A., & Michels, L. (2011). Educação inclusiva e Salas de Recursos Multifuncionais. Cortez.
- Glat, R., & Fernandes, F. (2005). Educação inclusiva: Formação de professores e práticas pedagógicas. Mediação.
- Glat, R., & Pletsch, M. (2012). Inclusão escolar: Desafios da prática docente. Summus.
- Maranhão. (1964). Lei Estadual nº 2.353, de 25 de março de 1964: Dá nova organização da educação do estado. São Luís.
- Maranhão. (1994). Lei Estadual nº 248, de 01 de novembro de 1994.
- Maranhão. (2002). Resolução nº 291, de 12 de dezembro de 2002: Estabelece normas para a educação especial no sistema de ensino do Estado do Maranhão e dá outras providências. Conselho Estadual de Educação.
- Maranhão. (2006). Orientações específicas da educação especial, PPA 2008 a 2011: Fundamentos legais e diretrizes políticas. Secretaria de Estado da Educação, Secretaria Adjunta de Ensino, Superintendência de Modalidade e Diversidades Educacionais, Supervisão de Educação Especial.
- Maranhão. (2007). A política de educação especial no Estado do Maranhão. Secretaria de Estado da Educação, Secretaria Adjunta de Ensino, Superintendência de Modalidade e Diversidades Educacionais, Supervisão de Educação Especial.
- Maranhão. (2009). Resolução nº 01, de 05 de agosto de 2009: Dispõe sobre normas para a transferência, a execução e a prestação de contas de recursos financeiros, destinados ao atendimento das escolas de educação básica da rede pública estadual. Secretaria de Estado da Educação.
- Maranhão. (2010). Constituição do Estado do Maranhão (1989). Controladoria Geral do Estado do Maranhão.
- Maranhão. (2010). Orientações básicas das modalidades e diversidades educacionais para os profissionais da rede estadual de ensino. Secretaria de Estado da Educação, Secretaria Adjunta de Ensino, Superintendência de Modalidade e Diversidades Educacionais, Supervisão de Educação Especial.
- Maranhão. Secretaria de Estado da Educação. (2025). <http://www.educacao.ma.gov.br>

Maranhão. Governo do Maranhão. (2025).  
<http://www.ma.gov.br/?s=discurso+de+posse+Fl%C3%A1vio+Dino&x=0&y=0>

Melo, H. A. (2011). Prática pedagógica na sala de recursos e acesso curricular de alunos (as) com deficiência intelectual na sala de aula. EDUFMA.

Mantoan, M. T. E. (2003). Inclusão escolar: Reflexões sobre políticas e práticas. Moderna.

Mantoan, M. T. E. (2015). Inclusão escolar: O que é? Por quê? Como fazer? (9th ed.). Moderna.

Mendes, E. G. (2006). Educação inclusiva: Construindo sistemas educacionais inclusivos. MEC/SEESP.

Mendes, R. (2010). Acessibilidade educacional e inclusão escolar. EDUFMA.

Omote, R. (2018). Educação inclusiva: Princípios, práticas e desafios. Papirus.

Oliveira, P., & Lima, S. (2011). Atendimento Educacional Especializado: Integração e desafios. EDUFRPE.

Organização das Nações Unidas. (2006). Convenção sobre os Direitos das Pessoas com Deficiência. Ratified by Brazil in 2008. ONU.

Santos, B. de S. (2011). A crítica da razão indolente: Contra o desperdício da experiência (7th ed.). Cortez.

Santos, M. P. dos. (2014). Educação inclusiva: Direito à diversidade. Lamparina.

Saviani, D. (2012). Escola e democracia (41st ed.). Autores Associados.