

School physical education: teachers' autonomy and responsibilities

Educação Física Escolar: autonomia e responsabilidade docente

Educación Física Escolar: autonomía y responsabilidad docente

Walter Roberto Correia - Universidade de São Paulo | Escola de Educação Física e Esporte da USP | São Paulo | SP | Brasil. E-mail: wr.correia@usp.br |  ORCID

Sergio Roberto Silveira - Universidade de São Paulo | Escola de Educação Física e Esporte da USP | São Paulo | SP | Brasil. E-mail: ssilveira@usp.br |  ORCID

Abstract: This article has as its goal to justify and analyze the thematic propositions of the XV Seminar of School Physical Education: teachers' autonomy and responsibilities. To do so, the theme is historically contextualized from two phases: 1) The search for legitimacy in the academia and; 2) The search for approximating teachers and their teachings. In the first one, it is possible to affirm that the seminars organized by EEFUEUSP, from their very beginning and throughout the following twenty years, have presented an academic position towards the specificities and the different forms of school knowledge related to the curriculum component Physical Education, aiming at contributing to a legitimacy of the Physical Education itself in the academia. In the second phase, the question is properly and profitably addressed so to justify the seminar's time and social place, targeting the teaching and the building of different kinds of knowledge through it. In this last phase, it is noticed an increase in the number of participants and also in the number of presentations, showing that the path chosen with locus on the teaching was right. Finally, once the analysis of the editing of the XV Seminar of School Physical Education is finished, it is put in this essay the challenge to think and project seminars to the next decade.

Keywords: Physical education. Teachers' Autonomy. Teachers' Responsibilities.

Resumo: Este artigo tem como objetivo justificar e analisar as proposições temáticas do XV Seminário de Educação Física Escolar: autonomia e responsabilidades dos professores. Para tanto, o tema é historicamente contextualizado a partir de duas fases: 1) A busca pela legitimidade na academia e; 2) A busca pela aproximação entre professores e seus ensinamentos. No primeiro, é possível afirmar que os seminários organizados pela EEFUEUSP, desde o início e ao longo dos vinte anos seguintes, apresentaram uma posição acadêmica em relação às especificidades e às diferentes formas de conhecimento escolar relacionadas ao componente curricular Educação Física, visando contribuir para a legitimidade da própria Educação Física na academia. Na segunda fase, a questão é abordada de maneira adequada para justificar o tempo e o lugar social do seminário, visando o ensino e a construção de diferentes tipos de conhecimento por meio dele. Nesta última fase, percebe-se um aumento no número de participantes e também no número de apresentações, mostrando que o caminho escolhido com locus no ensino estava correto. Por fim, finalizada a análise da edição do XV Seminário de Educação Física Escolar, coloca-se neste ensaio o desafio de pensar e projetar seminários para a próxima década.

Palavras-chave: Educação física. Autonomia de professores. Responsabilidade de professores.

• Recebido em 16 de junho de 2020 • Aprovado em 31 de agosto de 2020 • e-ISSN: 2177-5796

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22483/2177-5796.2020v22n3p699-719>

Copyright © 2019. Conteúdo de acesso aberto, distribuído sob os termos da Licença Internacional da Creative Commons – CC BY-NC-SA – Atribuição Não Comercial (<https://br.creativecommons.org/licencas/>) – Permite distribuição e reprodução, desde que atribuam os devidos créditos à publicação, ao autor(es) e que licenciem as novas criações sob termos idênticos.

Resumen: Este artículo tiene como objetivo justificar y analizar las propuestas temáticas del XV Seminario de Educación Física Escolar: autonomía y responsabilidades del profesorado. Para ello, la temática se contextualiza históricamente a partir de dos fases: 1) La búsqueda de legitimidad en la academia y; 2) La búsqueda de la aproximación entre los profesores y sus enseñanzas. En el primero, es posible afirmar que los seminarios organizados por EEFUSP, desde el inicio y durante los próximos veinte años, presentaron una posición académica sobre las especificidades y las diferentes formas de conocimiento escolar relacionados con el componente curricular de Educación Física, con el objetivo de contribuir a la legitimidad de la propia Educación Física en el ámbito académico. En la segunda fase se aborda adecuadamente el tema para justificar el tiempo y lugar social del seminario, con el objetivo de enseñar y construir diferentes tipos de conocimientos a través del mismo. En esta última fase, hay un aumento en el número de participantes y también en el número de presentaciones, lo que demuestra que el camino elegido con locus en la docencia fue el correcto. Finalmente, una vez finalizado el análisis de la 15ª edición del Seminario de Educación Física Escolar, este ensayo presenta el desafío de pensar y diseñar seminarios para la próxima década.

Palabras clave: Educación física. Autonomía docente. Responsabilidad docente.

1 Introduction

Within the scope of research in education, there are immeasurable possibilities of topics of investigation based on epistemological approaches that are up to scientific elaboration. Amongst so many possibilities, many are the claims from interlocutors from the academic and professional spheres to produce knowledge about the teachers' protagonist role, innovative pedagogical practices, and institutionalized actions for the development of education public policies.

Situating the production of knowledge in the field of school physical education implies understanding the production of research as a result of wide-ranging processes that determine the making of science, as well as the specific movements that affect the area, especially its ways to learn (WIGGERS *et al.*, 2015).

Several studies have been carried out aiming at mapping the production of knowledge in school physical education. These works focus on identifying trends in terms of its questions, its relative weight concerning the general production in the field, the theories that guide investigations, etc., which propels the area to reflect upon its production (BRACHT *et al.*, 2011).

The research made on theoretical foundations is pointed as prevailing among the production on school physical education, and could be analyzed by taking into consideration the fact that the 1980s and the 1990s were marked by moments in which physical education declares its identity crisis while discussing its theoretical basis – first, the crisis was ideological-political; then, it was epistemological (LIMA, 1999). At the same time, it sought affirmation in the disputes happening in the field. The concentration of efforts and the emphasis on theoretical foundations were interpreted by Bracht and Caparroz (2007) as a movement of didactics (understood as a set of teaching techniques) toward pedagogy (understood as the theory of education). In the 2000s, such a situation began to change, since the research categories seem to be more balanced in percentage terms, highlighting the plurality of the field from the epistemological and, consequently, political points of view (BRACHT *et al.*, 2011).

In this regard, we bring to light an institutional project that has been innovating and, in a way, getting stronger in the Brazilian educational scenario, which is the “Seminar of School Physical Education”, promoted by the School of Physical Education and Sports from the

University of São Paulo (EEFEUSP). This article aims at justifying and analyzing the proposals of themes to the XI to the XV Seminars of School Physical Education: the issue of teachers' autonomy and responsibility, discussing the last ten years of the event. In order to do so, we choose to start with a brief historical contextualization.

The aforementioned project dates back to the beginning of the 1990s, happening twice a year. In 2019, the fifteenth edition took place, celebrating approximately three decades of existence (FERRAZ, 2011). According to Ferraz (p. 7), the event was created in order to “gather scholars, professors, and professionals who are concerned with school physical education. The objective of the event would be to discuss the role of Physical Education at the school”. The Department of Pedagogy of the Human Body is responsible for this academic-professional event, one of the most traditional endeavors at both EEFEUSP and the Brazilian School Physical Education – EFE. Since its beginning, prominent members of the academic community and those coming from the basic school, from initial and continued teaching education, from the state and the city education secretaries, the private education sector, and the Ministry of Education have been present in these historical events. International researchers have left their mark, especially the ones from the Ibero-American context and Portuguese speaking countries. In the turn of the 21st century, we counted on the participation of performers and emergent writers who showed their readings, re-readings, and propositions to the School Physical Education (DAOLIO, 1998), described by a few researchers as “Renovation Movements” (DARIDO, 2003).

Throughout the years when the fifteen editions of the Seminars were held, we notice an important change that can be traced back to 2011 - from the eleventh edition on, the editorial project of its annals (SEMINÁRIO DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA ESCOLAR, 2011) presents a reorganization in the format and theme of the seminars. This rearrangement was performed in order to recover the central premise of the first event, which was to promote the meeting of different players at school physical education (SPE) in our society, electing the SPE teachers as the focal point of discussions and interactions with the university.

At the very heart of those movements, presuppositions that came from areas such as Philosophy, Sociology, Biology, Anthropology, Semiotics, Psychology, Psychomotricity, and others have been mobilized to produce new senses and meanings to Physical Education as a curricular component, consolidating, as a result, the so-called teaching approaches or analysis

perspectives to the School Physical Education (CORREIA, 2012). Most certainly, public policies, teaching degree courses, and academic debates were all boosted and buzzed by those multilateral protagonists who, if we are not wrong, were searching for legitimacy and hegemony in the national scenario. Notwithstanding, the teachings were in an uneven, diffused, and upright, but not absolute way, surrounded by all this pedagogical-political spectrum of repertoires (CORREIA, 2014). The Seminar of Physical Education from EEFUEUSP, inexorably, was not immune or inert in face of the historical-cultural incandescence in vogue.

Thus, this article intends to answer the following main question: was the organization of the Seminars of School Physical Education, held in the past decade, able to get closer to the school and SPE teachers' daily practices as idealized when the event was first conceived? To accomplish that goal, we carried out qualitative research study based on the historical analysis of documents from the following sources: projects, annals, and reports that comprise different editions of the events as well as articles and accounts given by the educators who participated in the organization of the Seminars in 2011, 2013, 2015, 2017 and 2019 as opposed to the ones that took place in the period between 1991 and 2009. The last five editions were chosen to be studied rather than the other ten that preceded them because, during the elaboration of the project for the 2011 edition, there was the need to reformulate the Seminars in order to resume its initial mission (CORREIA, 2014) which was explicit in 1991: to bring the university, schools, and teachers together in the context of school physical education (FERRAZ, 2011).

2 Body

2.1 Seminar of School Physical Education: the search for legitimacy in the academia

The path taken while outlining this research consisted of analyzing the Seminar annals published in the period of 20 years, from 1991 to 2009. In such an analysis, we observed the number of participants, the lecturers' profiles, and the number of papers presented as a whole and divided into categories. After collecting the data, we related the results to the literature concerning scientific production in the field of school physical education.

From their very beginning, the seminars organized by EEFUEUSP have had a very clear academic position towards the issue of the specificities and different kinds of school knowledge

related to Physical Education as a curricular component. Taking into consideration the seminar throughout its three decades of history, one can verify that after the so-called period of “identity crisis in Physical Education”, the event organized by EEFÉUSP, one of the first events to discuss School Physical Education in Brazil, was responsible for expressing the search for the legitimacy of Physical Education itself in the academia.

During the first two decades of the Seminar's existence, these background questions were deeply developed throughout the different editions and resulted in the proposal of events and invitations to the academic and professional communities such as *School Physical Education: Perspectives to the last decade of the XXI Century* (1991); *Physical Education: Do We Have Anything to Teach?* (1993); *Physical Education: Knowledge and Specificities* (1995); *Physical Education at High School* (1997); *Assessment in School Physical Education* (1999); *Education at Elementary School* (2001); *Physical Education at Middle School* (2003); *School Physical Education: Epistemological Questions, Research and Continued Education* (2005); *School Physical Education: Pedagogical Practice* (2007); *Qualitative Research in School Physical Education* (2009) (SEMINÁRIO DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA ESCOLAR, 1991, 1993, 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009; FERRAZ, 2011). To ratify this struggle to perform an entwining of the epistemological and pedagogical dimensions, we highlight the participation we consider as emblematic to the aforementioned historical conjuncture of the time. A memorable text concerning the contribution from Oliveira (1991) who used allegorical and metaphorical resources to compare SPE to a “sandcastle” built on a “beach” called school. In this image, the thinker adverts that the bases of the castle are vulnerable, not clearly defined, subject to coming down due to the movements of the “tides”. Another manifestation worth mentioning because of the way it deals with the powerful question around the understanding of the nature of the curricular component is expressed by the firm impertinence of Tani (1991) who offers us the following inquiring:

Why do professionals in the area insist so much on convincing people that Physical Education is important? A: Fundamentally, because people are not convinced of it. Why are people not convinced that Physical Education is something important? A: Fundamentally because they do not know what Physical Education actually is. Many wrongly assume it is the same as physical activity. Why do people not know what Physical Education is? A: Fundamentally because the actions of professionals in the area were not able to touch people and to inform people of their actions. Why were professionals of Physical Education not able to touch and inform people? A: Fundamentally because the professionals themselves do not have a clear notion of what

Physical Education is. Why do professionals of Physical Education not have a clear notion of what Physical Education is? A: Because the course responsible for preparing those professionals was not able to transmit a clear identity to Physical Education. Why was the course responsible for preparing professionals not able to transmit a clear identity to Physical Education? Because Physical Education itself does not have a defined identity (p. 61, translation ours).

In this sense, it would not be too much to interpose a very brief plea, or using better words, provocation: how would the identity construction of the previously mentioned curricular component be? Which group, institution or epistemological and professional community would have the legitimacy to define the nature, function and development of the Brazilian SPE? Which presupposed knowledge would be necessary to define what is up to be Physical Education in school? How would a definition resist to the emergent hermeneutical of the broader educational spectrum, so clearly diverse and uneven from the point of view of the different kinds of knowledge in, to and by the formal education? More objectively, even if we consider the school system as a whole, what is the meaning of curricular and teaching identity in a universe of two million and two hundred teachers spread through a country made of unquestioning pluralities and cultural diversities? Would this polysemic dissonance be a “schizophrenic” anomaly (torn and fractured) specific from the Physical Education? Would identity be a phenomenon, practice, representation or imaginary of which elements are articulated in a complex way – multiple foldings – and, therefore, represent incommensurable realities of powerful entropic dimension? Would the identity debate be a false dilemma? Would this debate be a shadow of “non-knowledge” that differs significantly from an inexistence of knowledge, from a cultural artifact – curricular component – of which social premise is that a teacher and a school subject bare any presupposed knowledge?

Besides, it would also be important to think about the relevance of this search for the identity of the area. According to arguments Tani (2011) about the necessity of an academic identity, we can catch a glimpse that specific problems faced in the everyday practice of the SPE teacher could be softened or addressed more securely by those teachers when they come to choose their paths on the development of the school curriculum. Having a clear definition of the identity of Physical Education would generate other attributions, such as area of knowledge, professional preparation course, academic subject or professional intervention field. It is possible to observe through the last forty years the elaboration of different approaches to the SPE teaching

which when analyzed present wide discussion about the philosophical and ideological matrices (SILVEIRA *et al.*, 2013), but very few of those evolve in what concerns what, who, when and how to teach, also adding the question of how one can follow the students' learning. Perhaps, if more effort were directed to that concern, more advances would be observed in the knowledge making of SPE.

The necessity to consolidate Physical Education as an area in the academia seems to have taken their thinkers far from the school and thus from the SPE teachers as well. Possibly, a more rigorous and social care on this matter would make some effects over the making of pedagogical knowledge to the courses of initial and continued formation, in the public policies and last in the school. However, we cannot dismiss the already mentioned engraved doubt that underlies our precarious/incomplete reasoning: which effects would they be? Withal, prudence would come to surface to advert us or remind us of what we already know: reality does not admit simplifications nor arbitrariness in concepts and protocols.

Still concerning this scope, from the matrices and distinct epistemological communities, many elaborate methodologies were sent to the School Physical Education, such as the one with a Developmentalist (TANI *et al.*, 1988) inspiration, Anthropologist (DAOLIO, 1995), Phenomenologist (MOREIRA, 1991), Constructivist (SILVA, 1989), Critical-surpassing (SOARES; TAFFAREL; VARJAL, 1992), Critical-emancipatory (KUNZ, 2000), and some others. These protagonist roles are not only substantial part of the contents offered by the Physical Education seminars from EEFUSP, but also and above all, responsible for financing the formation courses, the scientific events, the mentality and the area's pedagogical rhetoric, the public policies and specially the Brazilian teachers. These movements consolidated political and pedagogical vectors that were fertilized in the (public) universities and in the technical offices responsible for formatting public policies that trespassed the public contest for magisterium, the teaching license degree classrooms, the teaching board pedagogical meetings, the pedagogical proposals of educational reformulation and, on top of it all, the school teachers. In this academic and professional bubbling, a historical and itinerant mosaic of School Physical Education pedagogical identity (we highlight the plurality of terms) is being composed. Hence, it is maybe pertinent to bring about the observations made by Saviani (1994) about the matter of the making of the specificity of school knowledge, for this is a very dear and essential matter on the seminars we are studying:

Spotting the essential, the “backbone” of each area of knowledge is more than a task, it is a challenge to be faced by the educators along their peers, along the whole school team. It is impossible to defeat it without this wholesome view in each part and whole, general and specific inter-relate, become codependent and determine one another mutually. That requires articulated, integrated, coordinated, unified workforce, in which teachers from different models, grades, levels, series, terms, and subjects can constantly plan, evaluate and reflect in groups about the general and specific terms of their jobs. From common basic guidelines (p. 23, translation ours).

According to the elucidations above, we can infer how the identity making of a curricular component or teachers' work are all surrounded by the potentialities, vicissitudes and local idiosyncrasies and specially are absorbed by the subjectivity of educator. Therefore, identities are human processes of difficult apprehension, mostly in their mutant and impermanent core. In this point, we can observe the social inequality present in the teachings representing a challenge to the understanding of the “State of Art” on the Physical Education curricular component. The hegemonic culture is the teachers' pedagogical “instructionism” (INBERNÓN, 2010), which needs to be updated to execute what has been interposed by an intellectual elite from the university or from the technical-state-owned bureaucracy, disregarding the teaching conceptions from the main actors (students, teachers, school community). Mizukami (1986) adds elements of complexity to this discussion by pointing out the multiple ways to conceive the teaching phenomenon:

There are several ways to conceive the educative phenomenon. On its very nature, it is not a completed reality that allows one to conceive it in only one precise way in its multiple aspects. It is a historical, multidimensional phenomenon. It carries the human dimension as well as the technical, cognitive, emotional, sociopolitical and cultural ones. It is not about a simple juxtaposition of the previously mentioned dimensions, but about the acceptance of its multiple implications and relationships. Different forms and approximations of the educative phenomenon may be regarded as historically possible mediations, which allows to explain it if not in its wholesome, at least in some of its aspects and hence must be analyzed, contextualized and discussed historically (p. 1, translation ours).

Admitting the considerations above about the multidimensionality of teaching, the matter of its contents occupies a patent place in the discussion of school objectives. It is not possible to presume an educational, cultural, human oriented project unequipped of cultural contents. They are the ones who legitimate the propositions from formal educational institutions and also justify the presence of curricular components and their respective representatives (teachers). It is not justifiable the schooling and the teaching lacking appointing and didactic and methodological

treatment for those contents which happen in a selective, intentional, systematical and critical/problematising way in the case of the formal education.

The curriculum as an artifact and cultural construction is not an abstraction or a rhetorical elaboration of the educative voices, but rather a project of culture and humanization with social and political implications that weigh over life. Overtaking a simplistic notion of juxtaposition of programs and teaching plans sent to teachers in specific schedules of the school routine, the curriculum is a collective experience made of objective and subjective dimensions, explicit and implicit, convergences and contradictions, of inclusion and exclusion, of certainties and uncertainties (SACRISTAN, 2013). Though, all this complex “web” is surrounded by the dynamicity between kinds of knowledge and powers, which means that what is chosen to be taught and to be hidden produce resonance on people’s existence and so in the social order, in the democracy, in the citizenship, in the work and in the inalienable rights of human co-existing. Even by reaffirming the imperious relevance of school contents that justify the presence or absence of interlocutors at schools, the notion or understanding of what content is, is not consensual:

The problem about defining what teaching content is and how to get to choosing it is one of the most quarrelsome aspects in the history of educative thinking and teaching practice, condition that is reflected in the most diverse highlights, perspectives and options. The concept of content on its own is interpretable, as we are bound to observe; and it is above all, because answering to the question and what content should deal with teaching time implies knowing what function we want it to perform in what concerns the individuals the inherited culture, the society we are part of and the one we long to be. To contrast those functions, there is not only one perspective; surrounding the determination of teaching contents, one can observe one of the most meaningful controversies of the schooling history and of the curricular thinking (SACRISTÁN; PEREZ GOMEZ, 2000, p. 149, translation ours).

Considering the nature of academic reasoning and of the historical context we refer to in the two first decades of existence of the seminars of School Physical Education promoted by EEFUEUSP, we can glimpse the hypothesis for the reason for the emphasis, obstinacy and persistence of its protagonists and proposers facing the problem of knowledge and specificity expressed on the teaching and learning contents, once knowledge is the criterion of legitimacy and identity not only of the component, but also of the individuals that represent it. Taking in consideration that the curriculum is a land of disputes and non-neutralities, finding a place on a beach (school) inside a sand castle (Physical Education), it is comprehensible the concerns about

their “basis” or “foundations” of justification, edification and pretended perpetuation/reaffirmation.

This theme of knowledge and specificity from SPE has been exhaustingly posted as agenda in different versions of the seminars of EEFUEUSP, living on for more than a decade of ongoing editions. Nonetheless, the distancing between the discussions inside the university and the ones that arise from the school routine needs reflected on the involvement of the professor from SPE towards the Seminar. It was possible to observe a professional emptiness from the seminars, with a shy resilience from members of the academia in the last editions in the end of the first decade of this century. It is important to say that we take responsibility over the arbitrariness on the reading made on this process being discussed; always having in mind that a point of view is a view perceived from a point and thus, an unquestioning bias is operating in this present argumentation. That being so, it was imposed the necessity to think institutionally about what is the reason for our academic work in and to society and concomitantly in and to School Physical Education.

2.2 Seminar of school physical education: the pursuit for the approximation with teaching

In the heart of these impertinent reflections, we have come to the point that justifying our time and social place anchored on the perspective – focus – of teaching would be meaningful and relevant. An extended period of time (a decade), a place (researchers and collaborative instructors) and a relevant agenda (teaching knowledge), in order to legitimate a dialogue with society, more precisely, with the teachers. Thus, we find it necessary to get rid of the boastful, absolute and scholar knowledge of the academia, which presumptuously believes that it instructs the “incautious” and “outdated” teachers with the “innovations” or theoretical updates originated from the departments or university laboratory.

Hence, it has been imperative to undertake an honest effort of approximation of the logical thinking, notions, images, conditions and protagonism upon which the teaching work is substantiated. Comprehending how teaching in very specific and unequal sociocultural and contextualized conditions is “translating”, or not, the approaches of teaching, the public policies, the notions of body, movement, body culture and, to the horizon of the Common Core Curriculum for the National Education, the significant “Corporal Practices”. Therefore, we are

able to undertake our epistemological and methodological resources derived from our academic labor in cooperation and accordance, but not in juxtaposition or overlapping, with teacher of basic schools along with the curricular component of Physical Education.

Thus, we have opted, for the current decade whose end is coming, a cleavage in relation to the former positioning, producing- from the theme "Teaching"- five editions with different "approaches": "School Physical Education: Teaching Knowledge (2011)"; *"The Practice of the School Physical Education: from inspiration to action (2013)"*; *"School Physical Education: value images for the teaching (2015)"*; *"Teaching: feeling, thinking and acting" (2017)"*; *"School Physical Education: teachers' autonomy and responsibility" (2019)"*.

Underlying the approaches and subtitles of the above-mentioned propositions, it has been foreseen to transcend and expand, but not avoid, the matter of the kinds of knowledge to teach (school contents). For this reason, it has been pulled out all the stops and emphasis in such important spectrums that compose not only the work of teaching planning, but also their anxieties and distresses, namely, the kinds of knowledge to teach (a mediation of the relations and the know-how of one self). In this direction, interlocutors of the philosophical field in communion with actors (professional and academic) have always been mobilized for tables and conferences of the School Physical Education. Additionally, in the usage of teaching as a thematic core, we seek to allow an atmosphere of meeting of teachers in these editions, in order to keep a conventional or typical ambience or an eminently academic congress. Briefly, we seek to strategically provide a range of actions in the scope of hospitality and welcoming of teachers and students of teaching license degree, simultaneously with the expansion of the spaces for the exhibitions of educational practices with preference for the testimonials of experience, besides those called "Highlight Awards", whose intentionality is to stimulate the protagonism and the sharing of the teaching accomplishments. In this sense, we have signalized the motto of the "Meeting of Teachers of Physical Education at USP". In the elaboration of one decade, we started in 2009 from a contingent of a more academic profile which reached the threshold of a hundred of participants to, currently, something above 500 participants of relatively balanced representation among the professional and academic domain. Meanwhile, we have come to the matter of teachers' autonomy and responsibility which is the scope of these essayistic undertaking and theme of the last edition of the decade and of the XV Seminar of School of

Physical Education. Therefore, we have presented some of the justifications of the theme and its potential vitality which, henceforth, we believe lies on a fertile terrain for signification.

The first justification is concerned with the premise that autonomy is a fundament of Education. The educative nature, in a last analysis, is turned to a process whose kinds of knowledge and powers, intentionally and systematically foreseen by the republican public policies, should achieve the pupils through the social mediation of the school, having the task of subsidize an autonomous citizenship. Discussing the autonomy of the school, according to Gadotti (2010), means discussing the very own nature of education. According to the same thinker, the school has been historically losing its autonomy and, for that reason, losing the capacity of educating for freedom. This understanding has its radicalism, that is, the root, in the prime years of Greek culture, whose meaning of the word autonomy is related to the capacity of self-determination and self-fulfilling, being “autos” (of one self) e “nomos” (law). It is still surmised from this logical thinking notion of self-government and self-determination:

Why discuss the autonomy of the school today? Because discussing the autonomy of the school is discussing the very own nature of education. The school which is losing its autonomy is also losing its capacity of educating for freedom. This is the thesis I intend to defend. Discussing the theme of autonomy is discussing the very own history of education, as far as we can see the history of fighting for the intellectual and institutional autonomy of the school, associated with the freedom of expression and teaching. Even though it is not the term which is often used, its essential content lies in the history of the Brazilian pedagogical thinking (GADOTTI, 2010, p. 13, translation ours).

Contreras (2002), while discussing the matter of the teachers' autonomy associated to the concept of professionalism, warns to the way how these two notions are vital for the field of education and, at the same time, are semantic and politically “kidnapped” by different social agents, including in these processes, the public policies and the State. In these analyses, the author shows the ambivalences and the contradictions of the managements in which professionalism and teaching autonomy are processed in the neoliberal ideology restrained in a context of intense precariousness of work conditions and the fraying of the symbolic function of the teacher. For these reasons, we have brought to light the matter of autonomy and, therefore, provocations: what does teaching autonomy imply in the Brazilian contemporaneity? What can you derive from the freedom of teaching, learning and researching? What can you assume as freedom of different pedagogical conceptions? What is this relation between autonomy and

personal freedom? Which relations can be established between freedom and teaching autonomy? Which implications does it produce in the formation of the pupils?

Both matters of freedom and autonomy do not submit themselves to the “cunning” of the “absolutism” or of the personal “spontaneity”. We have the freedom of expression, of identity, of teaching, of learning and of researching and, all of them, happen within the Rule of Law, of a republican culture, of an Ethos for coexistence. In this way, the exercises of self-determination and self-fulfilling are subscribed in a relational dimension, in the relation with people with whom we share our lives. When we take up the Pedagogy of Autonomy (FREIRE, 2011) and the Pedagogy of Indignation (FREIRE, 2000), it is indispensable to recollect the matter of respect for the other, the necessity of dialoguing, the rigorousness with the knowledge (epistemological) and the humility in the “compromise for the desire to change the world”! The Patron of National Education always warned about the differences between the pedagogical invasion and the pedagogical intervention.

About the above-mentioned aspects, it is not excessive to resume something inconsistent, that is to say, the teaching work implies in a mandatory, intentional, public work, of a deeply, immaterial, ambitious symbolic content of *engraving* (imprinting the other) in order to “transform” the act of feeling, thinking and taking action of the people with the socialization of concepts, procedures, attitudes and values, anyway, a profession of and for the human sciences (TARDIF; LESSARD, 2013). For this reason, it is still necessary to highlight that these processes, ambitions and political-pedagogical imperatives take place among real people, among subjectivities, above all, inside an environment, of a school, a community, an educational project, a public policy, in which the teacher should take a stand. Therefore, what are the horizons and limits of which it is defined the teachers' autonomy? What are the limits for the freedom for teachers?

Upon the polar political scenario established in the country, varied fronts of ideological conflicts have deepened, with an ultraconservative circumstantial prevalence, whose actions directed to the educational field have been casting suspicious on the autonomy of the universities, schools and educators. Publicly, representatives of the educational portfolio have urged the society to watch, report and, in the end, punish institutions, researchers and professors who proclaim certain contents, forms of expression and languages in their labor. In this sense, the

matter of teacher's autonomy and freedom of speech should bring to light the notion of responsibility (rights and duties about their praxis), once the kinds of knowledge to teach will be "under social surveillance" led by the State.

Many times, allocating the responsibility for the bad quality of education on the "shoulders" of the teachers spares the public organs of their co-responsibility before the duties which must be assigned to them for the educational development. The work conditions of a teacher of a public school, municipal, state or federal, are unfavorable for the fulfilling of the structured actions by the secretaries of education. How can one develop the act of learning in overcrowded rooms where there is a lack of supplies, equipment and appropriate and adequate spaces? How can the teacher dedicate him or herself to the work under the wage conditions they receive, needing to teach in two or more schools? Concerning the content, for instance, how can the teacher give classes which embrace medias and technologies if there was not any awareness for the theme during both early and continued stages of formation? Improving the work and life conditions of the teachers (work and autonomous practice) is the first step to rethink education of quality (autonomous).

The above-mentioned considerations contain a grander magnitude, considering that education has inherent relations with citizenship and democracy. During contemporaneity, many conservative movements have come to power and see, efficiently, the cunning opportunity of "manipulating" republican rules and norms towards an authoritarian control. For instance, as Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018) show us in the work "How Democracy Dies", such traces are recurrent: strategies of rejecting rules in the democratic game or the feeble compromise in relation to them; negation of the legitimacy of political opponents; tolerance for and encouragement to violence; tendency to restriction of the opponents' civil freedom and so on. The rhetoric policies of discredit and lack of value over intellectuals, researchers, actors, the press, universities, social movements and teachers are public and known. Budget preclude of educational institutions, surveillance and obstructions of certain contents in the national exams, questionings about consolidated scientific concepts are examples which bring an unmistakable relevance of undertaking and resignification of the concept of teachers' autonomy and responsibility in the current political and historical context of the Brazilian society.

Bringing the discussion more specifically for the teaching in Physical Education and considering the authoritarian, dogmatic and moralist tendencies in society and in the Brazilian

State, a curricular component, which has in its core the notions and values oriented to and from the body and human movement, will have to take a stand in relation to society, culture, school and, at last analysis, in the binomial of teaching and learning. Physical Education has incorporated themes of corporal culture and movement in their educational intentionalities. The former is considered as a component of the language area which, in turn, include cultural manifestations such as games, dances, fights, sports, gymnastics, circus art and so on. As language field, the matters of communication, expression, aesthetic, values, symbols and signs of and from the body gain focus and, for this reason, undoubtedly, questions will arise from social class, ethnicity, race and gender. Upon a controversial scenario with a moral agenda of a Conservative State (but not absolute) in a society surrounded by an intrinsic and constitutional cultural diversity – also by an intrinsic and constitutional inequality- we inquire: what do teaching autonomy and responsibility imply for the School Physical Education? What will the dynamics of announcement and report about the values of body and movement as content of classes of Physical Education be like? Will the gathering and the work between the teacher's and student's corporeality in the time and space of the so called Physical Education class be under governmental, communal and school suspicion? Raising more concerns, how are going to call tomorrow what, today, is called supervision and pedagogical coordination? Supervision and coordination over the bodies at school? What will be the criteria to stimulate, drive, watch or punish the body at school and, mainly, at the Physical Education classes? How will the relations between pedagogical conservation and pedagogical transgression work on the part of teachers, upon whom the “eyes” of morality have always been alert, that is, upon the body and its expressions or, why not say, its reasons!

Another topic which will rely on the autonomy of the teaching knowledge is concerned about the BNCC (BRASIL, 2017a, 2018) which structures the curriculum of Physical Education within the area of “Languages and their Technologies”. It is suitable to remember that the candidate for the admission exams of Physical Education enrolls in a selective process of a career which is part of the health area. About this aspect, once again, the matter of specificity/identity impose itself and, for that matter, it would not be difficult to speculate some controversial unfolding about the teaching knowledge, therefore, about the consistency of its autonomy.

One of the most inherent actions of the educational policies is expressed through the organization of the school curriculum. It is evident that a curriculum expresses educational

concepts of a group; however, it is necessary to keep open frontiers, dialoguing in diverse instances and social agents who allow the teacher to adequate his or her work according to the characteristics and necessities of the context of each school locality. Elaborating a curricular basis nationwide is an ambitious task, but the greater challenges will be the processes and conditions of their implementation along with the threat to the teachers' autonomy and their responsibility to teach a specific community, having in mind its peculiarities, differences, individualities, in short, complexities.

The space of the Seminar of School Physical Education had the compromise to offer an ambience for the meeting of teachers, in order to make possible the exchange of experiences and the production of the kinds of knowledge originated from varied protagonisms at SPE. The idea was centered on providing the teachers the empowering of the professional acting at SPE, considering the autonomy in developing their practice as an essential factor in the elaboration of the school knowledge.

3 Final considerations

The challenge of the next decade

According to what we have presented since the beginning of this essay, the Seminar of Physical Education of EEFÉUSP constituted an event throughout 30 years which assumed the mission of assembling the professionals of SPE represented by the academic, public and private managers and, essentially, the future teachers of SPE originated from the most varied Brazilian regions around this particular issue. It was possible to observe the chain surrounding two polarizations: 1) Two initial decades seeking to support directly with the consolidation of the very own physical education in the academia and its interfaces in the production and promotion of knowledge for the SPE and, 2) The last decade with the approximation of the University to the school context, highlighting this matter of acting and doing at school as a sociocultural place in which the interactions establish themselves as producing sources of teaching knowledge to be academically appropriate.

Because the XV edition of the Seminar of School Physical Education ended in 2019, it is up to us to analyze and project the challenges for the next decade. A starting point, surely, is

assuring the figure of the teacher of Physical Education and the production of different kinds of knowledge as a central core in the organization of the event. However, some questionings arise from this certainty: Will the motto on the production of teaching knowledge be enough to be established as a unique target within this next decade? With the changes originated from the actions of foreseen public policies, with a special highlight to the reorganization of High School for the next years (BRASIL, 2017b), it is possible to wait the ripple effects to be observed in the formation, early and continuous as well as the relation and interpretation of the SPE by the students of basic education. What will the kinds of teaching knowledge produced in relation to the SPE be? What will the outlines that the students of basic education unleash for the future comprehension of physical education and, that is to say, for the production of teaching knowledge be? What will the perspective of a student who is applying for the entrance exam of physical education be?

Thinking, rethinking and projecting a seminar which has become a big broadcaster of knowledge, especially, of the teacher of SPE requires a reflection about the above-mentioned matters. Expressing the field of SPE represents more than a challenge- it is a compromise that the Seminar of School Physical Education of EEFUEUSP has recognized since its first edition. The certainty that the function of the seminar has not drained itself was highlighted in the number of participants and presentations of works in the last ten years; yet, guaranteeing this function will be an exercise of all the community that participates and produces the seminar.

Referências

BRACHT, V.; CAPARROZ, F. E. O tempo e o lugar de uma didática da educação física. **Rev. Bras. Cienc. Esporte**, Campinas, v. 28, n. 2, p. 21-37, jan. 2007

BRACHT, V. *et al.* A educação física escolar como tema da produção do conhecimento nos periódicos da área no Brasil (1980-2010): parte I. **Movimento**, Porto Alegre, v. 17, n. 2, p. 11-34, abr./jun. 2011.

BRASIL. **Base Nacional Comum Curricular**: educação é a base. Brasília: MEC, 2017a. (Ensino Fundamental). Disponível em: http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/images/BNCC_EI_EF_110518_versaofinal_site.pdf. Acesso em: 5 mar. 2019.

BRASIL. **Base Nacional Comum Curricular**: educação é a base. Brasília: MEC, 2018. (Ensino Médio). Disponível em: http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=85121-bncc-ensino-medio&category_slug=abril-2018-pdf&Itemid=30192. Acesso em: 5 mar. 2019.

BRASIL. **Lei nº 13.415, de 16 de fevereiro de 2017**. Altera as Leis n.ºs 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996, que estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional, e 11.494, de 20 de junho 2007, que regulamenta o Fundo de Manutenção e Desenvolvimento da Educação Básica e de Valorização dos Profissionais da Educação, a Consolidação das Leis do Trabalho - CLT, aprovada pelo Decreto-Lei nº 5.452, de 1º de maio de 1943, e o Decreto-Lei nº 236, de 28 de fevereiro de 1967; revoga a Lei nº 11.161, de 5 de agosto de 2005; e institui a Política de Fomento à Implementação de Escolas de Ensino Médio em Tempo Integral. Brasília: Câmara dos Deputados, 2017b. Disponível em: <https://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/lei/2017/lei-13415-16-fevereiro-2017-784336-publicacaooriginal-152003-pl.html>. Acesso em: 5 mar. 2019.

CONTRERAS, J. **Autonomia de professores**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2002.

CORREIA, W. R. Educação física escolar: desafiando sua presumível imutabilidade. **Revista Brasileira de Educação Física e Esporte**, São Paulo, v. 28, n. 4, p. 691-700, out./dez. 2014.

CORREIA, W. R. Educação física escolar: entre inquietudes e impertinências. **Revista Brasileira de Educação Física e Esporte**, São Paulo, v. 26, n. 1, p. 171-178, jan./mar. 2012.

DAOLIO, J. **Educação física brasileira: autores e atores da década de 1980**. Campinas: Papirus, 1998.

DAOLIO, J. **Da cultura do corpo**. Campinas, Papirus, 1995.

DARIDO, S. C. **Educação física na escola: questões e reflexões**. Rio de Janeiro: Guanabara-Koogan, 2003.

FERRAZ, O. L. Seminários de educação física escolar (1991-2011). **Revista Brasileira de Educação Física e Esporte**, São Paulo, v. 25, suplemento especial, p. 1-24, nov. 2011.

FREIRE, P. **Pedagogia da autonomia: saberes necessários à prática educativa**. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2011.

FREIRE, P. **Pedagogia da indignação: cartas pedagógicas e outros escritos**. São Paulo: UNESP, 2000.

GADOTTI, M. **Educação cidadã**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2010.

IMBERNÓN, F. **Formação continuada de professores**. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2010.

KUNZ, E. **Transformação didático-pedagógica do esporte**. Ijuí: UNIJUI, 2000.

LEVITSKY, S.; ZIBLATT, D. **Como as democracias morrem**. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2018.

LIMA, H. L. A. **Pensamento epistemológico da educação física brasileira: das controvérsias acerca do seu estatuto científico**. 1999. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) - Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação da Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Recife, 1999.

MIZUKAMI, M. G. N. **Ensino: as abordagens do processo**. São Paulo: EPU, 1986.

MOREIRA, W. W. **Educação física escolar: uma abordagem fenomenológica**. Campinas: Unicamp, 1991.

OLIVEIRA, J. G. M de. Educação física escolar: construindo castelos de areia. **Revista Paulista de Educação Física**, São Paulo, v. 5, n. 1-2, p. 5-11, jan./dez. 1991.

SACRISTAN, J. G. **Saberes e incertezas sobre o currículo**. Porto Alegre: Penso, 2013.

SACRISTAN, J. G.; PEREZ GOMEZ, A. I. **Compreender e transformar o ensino**. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, 2000.

SAVIANI, D. **Saber escolar, currículo e didática: problemas da unidade conteúdo/método no processo pedagógico**. Campinas: Autores Associados, 1994.

- SEMINÁRIO DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA ESCOLAR, 1., 1991, São Paulo. **Revista Paulista de Educação Física**, São Paulo, v. 5, n.1/2, jan./dez. 1991. Tema: Perspectivas para a última década do século XXI. Disponível em: <https://www.revistas.usp.br/rpef/issue/download/10175/1112>. Acesso em: 5 mar. 2019.
- SEMINÁRIO DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA ESCOLAR, 2., 1993, São Paulo. **Revista Paulista de Educação Física**, São Paulo, suplemento n. 1, 1995. Tema: Temos o que ensinar. Disponível em: <https://www.revistas.usp.br/rpef/issue/view/10207/1138>. Acesso em: 5 mar. 2019.
- SEMINÁRIO DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA ESCOLAR, 3., 1995, São Paulo. **Revista Paulista de Educação Física**, São Paulo, suplemento n. 2, 1996. Tema: Conhecimento e especificidade. Disponível em: <https://www.revistas.usp.br/rpef/issue/view/10252/1154>. Acesso em: 5 mar. 2019.
- SEMINÁRIO DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA ESCOLAR, 4., 1997, São Paulo. **Revista Paulista de Educação Física e Esportes**, São Paulo, 1997. Tema: Educação física no ensino médio.
- SEMINÁRIO DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA ESCOLAR, 5., 1999, São Paulo. **Revista Paulista de Educação Física e Esportes**, São Paulo, 1999. Tema: Avaliação na educação física escolar.
- SEMINÁRIO DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA ESCOLAR, 6., 2001, São Paulo. **Revista Paulista de Educação Física**, São Paulo, suplemento n. 4, 2001. Tema: Educação física e a educação infantil. Disponível em: <http://www.revistas.usp.br/rpef/issue/view/10247/1151>. Acesso em: 5 mar. 2019.
- SEMINÁRIO DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA ESCOLAR, 7., 2003, São Paulo. **Revista Paulista de Educação Física e Esportes**, São Paulo, 2003. Tema: Educação física e o ensino fundamental.
- SEMINÁRIO DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA ESCOLAR, 8., 2005, São Paulo. **Revista Paulista de Educação Física e Esportes**, São Paulo, 2005. Tema: Questões epistemológicas: pesquisa e educação continuada. 1 CD-ROM.
- SEMINÁRIO DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA ESCOLAR, 9., 2007, São Paulo. **Revista Paulista de Educação Física e Esportes**, São Paulo, 2007. Tema: Prática pedagógica. 1 CD-ROM.
- SEMINÁRIO DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA ESCOLAR, 10., 2009, São Paulo. **Revista Paulista de Educação Física e Esportes**, São Paulo, 2009. Tema: Pesquisa qualitativa. 1 CD-ROM.
- SEMINÁRIO DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA ESCOLAR, 11., 2011, São Paulo. **Revista Paulista de Educação Física e Esportes**, São Paulo, v. 25, suplemento n. 6, nov. 2011. Tema: Educação física escolar: saberes docentes. Disponível em: <http://citrus.uspnet.usp.br/eef/?pagina/mostrar/id/508>. Acesso em: 5 mar. 2019.
- SEMINÁRIO DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA ESCOLAR, 12., 2013, São Paulo. **Revista Paulista de Educação Física e Esportes**, São Paulo, v. 27, suplemento n. 7, nov. 2013. Tema: A prática da educação física escolar: da inspiração à ação. Disponível em: <https://pt.slideshare.net/RBEFE/suplemento-v27n72013>. Acesso em: 5 mar. 2019.
- SEMINÁRIO DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA ESCOLAR, 13., 2015, São Paulo. **Revista Paulista de Educação Física e Esportes**, São Paulo, v. 29, suplemento n. 9, dez. 2015. Tema: Educação física escolar: sentir, pensar e agir na docência. Disponível em: <https://pt.slideshare.net/RBEFE/anais-do-xiii-seminrio-de-educacao-fsica-escolar-rbefe-suplemento-v-29-n-9-2015>. Acesso em: 15 dez. 2019.
- SEMINÁRIO DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA ESCOLAR, 14., 2017, São Paulo. **Revista Paulista de Educação Física e Esportes**, São Paulo, v. 31, suplemento n. 11, nov. 2017. Tema: Educação física escolar: imagens valores para a docência. Disponível em: <https://pt.slideshare.net/RBEFE/xiv-seminrio-de-educacao-fsica-escolar-2017-83678808>. Acesso em: 15 dez. 2019.
- SEMINÁRIO DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA ESCOLAR, 15., 2019, São Paulo. **Revista Paulista de Educação Física e Esportes**, São Paulo, v. 33, suplemento n. 12, nov. 2019. Tema: Autonomia e

responsabilidade docente. Disponível em: <https://pt.slideshare.net/RBEFE/anais-do-xv-seminrio-de-educacao-fsica-escolar>. Acesso em: 15 dez. 2019.

SILVA, J. B. F. **Educação de corpo inteiro**. São Paulo: Scipione, 1989.

SILVEIRA, S. R. *et al.* Aquisição da habilidade motora rebater na Educação Física Escolar: um estudo das dicas de aprendizagem como conteúdo de ensino. **Revista Brasileira de Educação Física e Esporte**, São Paulo, p. 149-157, jan./mar, 2013.

SOARES, C. L.; TAFFAREL, C. N. Z.; VARJAL, E. **Metodologia do ensino de educação física**. São Paulo: Cortez, 1992.

TANI, G. **Leituras em educação física**: retratos de uma jornada. São Paulo: Phorte, 2011.

TANI, G. Perspectivas para educação física escolar. **Revista Paulista de Educação Física**, São Paulo, v. 5, n. 1-2, p. 61-69, jan./dez.1991.

TANI, G. *et al.* **Educação física escolar**: uma abordagem desenvolvimentista. São Paulo: EPU, 1988.

TARDIF, M.; LESSARD, C. **O trabalho docente**: elementos para uma teoria da docência como profissão de interações humanas. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2013.

WIGGERS, I. D. *et al.* Um m “raio-x” da produção do conhecimento sobre educação física escolar: análise de periódicos de 2006 a 2012. **Movimento**, Porto Alegre, v. 21, n. 3, p. 831-845, jul./set. 2015.