

Evaluation of Higher Education: The Importance of Sinaes in Public Policies of Evaluations

Arcângelo dos Santos Safanelli

Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC)

Dalton Francisco de Andrade

Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC)

Viviane Regina da Silva

Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC)

Rafael Tezza

Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina (UDESC)

Luiz Salgado Klaes

Universidade do Alto Vale Rio do Peixe (UNIARP)

Florianópolis

Brazil

Abstract

This article aims to present the importance of educational evaluation in the context of the country's public policies. With regard to its development, the qualitative method was searched, the component of an exploratory research, being a basic research. It is hoped that through this literature review, educational institutions are aware of the importance of educational evaluation, as they can develop relevant measures in their respective higher institutions. The concept of evaluation that was constituted in the studies and reflections of the Special Evaluation Commission (SEC), had as main ideals the integration and the participation, since it is understood that they are fundamental concepts for the construction of an evaluation system capable of deepening the commitments and social responsibilities of institutions, as well as promoting democratic values, respect for diversity, the pursuit of autonomy and the affirmation of identity.

Keywords: Educational evaluation, Public policy, Educational planning

1 Introduction

To evaluate means to determine the value of something. Other meanings may also be added to the term, such as: price, use, usefulness, effectiveness, validity that is established of something or something. (HOUAISS, 2001). The words check, examine, verify, efficiency, effectiveness are common when we refer to evaluation and show how much the term, still faithful to its etymological origin, is linked to the idea of measurement and measurement, which makes evaluation a powerful tool control, supervision and exclusion. Education is, at the turn of the twentieth and early twenty-first century, a sector of the fundamental social structure to promote changes in the ways of thinking about society, the state and its complex relationships. To the extent that the world of work has been restructured, in the context and concepts in search of world public opinion, ideologically, a series of notions and concepts have been produced, trying to determine these new relations and the role of the State within them, as a kind of new international language, which is rooted in being a mouthpiece of the single mind. In this new language, we can highlight the terms: globalization, the minimum state, reengineering, the knowledge society, total quality, employability, among others; which together form the so-called neoliberal ideology. In this, one has the mistaken understanding that social policies are enslaving and would function as an element of accommodation of the individual, who would lose his freedom and the creative and entrepreneurial spirit. (Perry, 1996).

In this context, the evaluation of policies appears as one of the technical strategies for coping with the fiscal crisis and the public deficit that have limited the financing of social programs. (Oliveira & Haddad, 2001).

Technical reason becomes universal reason, depoliticizing the issues that put at stake and exacerbating pragmatism, through an immediate conception of the processes that cross such policies. And a set of practices, sometimes dissociated, is gradually shaping the new government discourse based on the meritocratic bias that distinguishes the elite from sages and legitimizes them in the processuality of social policies, reiterating the oligarchy characteristic of the Brazilian sociopolitical tradition. The concept of evaluation that was constituted in the studies and reflections of the Special Evaluation Commission (SEC), had as main ideals the integration and the participation, since it is understood that they are fundamental concepts for the construction of an evaluation system capable of deepening the commitments and social responsibilities of institutions, as well as promoting democratic values, respect for diversity, the pursuit of autonomy and the affirmation of identity (Sinaes, 2009).

In this way, the SEC sought to articulate an evaluation system with its own autonomy of educational-emancipatory processes, and the regulatory functions inherent in state supervision, in order to strengthen educational functions and commitments. In view of this, the proposal of a National System for the Evaluation of Higher Education (SINAES) ensures the integration of internal and external dimensions, particular and global, summative and formative quantitative and qualitative and the various objectives of evaluation in general. The purpose of this article is to verify the importance of an educational evaluation in the context of public policies of education in the country.

2 Theoretical Foundation

2.1 Society and Management of Knowledge

The need to study knowledge management is of great importance in the current context, due to the importance it represents. Studies on the subject are growing and significant.

Knowledge is the main element of organizational competitiveness, generating continuous innovation and competitive advantage (NONAKA & TAKEUCHI, 1997). Today, Drucker & Toffler (1984) have emphasized the value of knowledge, proclaiming the Society of Knowledge in the late 1990s, sharing the perception that knowledge generates value, change, and competitiveness for organizations. In addition, specialists in the areas of industrial organization, technology management, management strategy and Organizational Theory, presented their studies on knowledge management (NONAKA & TAKEUCHI, 1997).

Sabbag (2007) critically examines knowledge from an evolutionary perspective of agrarian, industrial, and knowledge societies. Using this hook, the study of the decline of industrial society has taken place since 1955. Globalization and information technology have given rise to post-industrialism, the question of services and the information society. This, raised to its greatest power, was brought to the Knowledge Society. The author, in this sense, argues that the Knowledge Society is at the forefront of the Information Society, since it is broader than the information society, human capacity. The table below shows a comparison between the two epochs, the Industrial Society and the Knowledge Society:

Table 1 - Analysis between the Industrial Society and the Knowledge Society

Industrial Society	Knowledge Society
Organization as a prevalent and massified institution, with knowledge being one of the elements.	Individual as a prevalent and networked institution, generating revenue, with knowledge being the main element of the organization.
Capital and technology are the main values	Competence and wisdom as key elements
Information as a control tool	Information as a communication tool for learning and knowledge
Power of the manager based on the hierarchy, coordination of subordinates	Power of the manager based on knowledge and teamwork
Orientation for the present	Guidance for the future in innovations

Source - Sabbag (2007); Sveiby (1998) & Girardi (2009).

According to Sabbag (2007), Brazil is in a transition between the mentioned models, gradually moving towards the Knowledge Society. The goal of knowledge management is undoubtedly to treat knowledge as the most important resource of the organization; therefore, should stimulate ideas that can be implemented. It is inferred, then, that knowledge management is concerned with the relevant factors of the organization aimed at developing a set of actions whose objective is to foster organizational knowledge.

These actions should stimulate the creation, explicitation and dissemination of knowledge within the organization, aiming at achieving its organizational excellence (SILVEIRA & DOMINGUES, 2010). In Girardi's thought; Benatti & Oliveira (2008), the Knowledge Society emphasizes the individual as a determinant factor of the organizational development, depository of knowledge.

2.2 Educational Evaluation

In the field of education, the new guidelines of the 20th and early 21st centuries have established a new management profile, especially in university organizations, in which a set of characteristics, such as flexibility, agility, efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and productivity. The university is seen not only as a center for the formation of knowledge and the production of knowledge, but as that which meets the basic principles of modernity, whether in relation to labor relations or the provision of services to society. In higher education, evaluation has been stimulated through direct actions by governments with the creation of national evaluation agencies to account for the expansion and diversification of this level of education. On the other hand, it tries to account for the importation of managerial cultures in the public sector, and in particular in education, translating changes in cultural and organizational patterns, being contacted or offering opportunities for improvement for educational institutions, besides stimulating a greater institutional knowledge and to be a resource for decision-making. (BRENNAN & SHAH, 2000).

In Brazil, new management paradigms, driven by the new world order, have led, in addition to the phenomenon of the massive expansion of new private higher institutions, to a new configuration of the organizational structure of educational institutions, the adequacy of curricula to business needs, and government interests. This has been one of the main determinants for the education sector to require institutional evaluation mechanisms and has provided federal government efforts to implement a National Assessment System (LORDÉLO & DAZZANI, 2009). Public assessment can be understood as the "... analysis and elucidation of the criterion or criteria that underlie a given policy: the reasons that make it preferable to any other" (FIGUEIREDO, 1986: 48). Important reasons for a better public evaluation would thus presuppose, at some level, the public debate as an instance of construction of the norms and approximate values by the various social sectors affected by politics (LORDÉLO & DAZZANI, 2009). According to Luckesi, the evaluation of educational learning has two objectives: to help the student in his personal development process, from the teaching-learning process, and to provide information to society about the quality of the educational work done. (LUCKESI, 2005).

In relation to the student, the main element of educational action, evaluation is seen as a continuous, systematic, comprehensive, comparative, cumulative, informative and global process that allows students to evaluate their knowledge (SANT'ANNA, 2004). In the institutional perspective, where assessment in the teaching process is more accurate in management, verification and analysis of the quality of results are primary factors in achieving learning objectives and goals, and are considered as elements of analysis for the decisions and review of school planning (ROCHA, 2017). The National Education Plan (NEP) presents some evaluation indicators for higher education, according to the provisions of the Law of Guidelines and Bases (LGB):

[...] diversification of the system through policies to expand higher education, non-expansion of resources linked to the federal government for this level of education, assessment of the quality of education through an evaluation system, expansion of educational credit involving resources the role of distance education (DOURADO, 2002: 243).

Evaluation has become a central element in education policies in Brazil. Since the 1980s, the debate about the importance of this theme and the procedures necessary for its implementation has been highlighted in the academic and organizational environments of universities. In discussing the evaluation trajectory, one can not fail to consider the complexity of the education system at the higher level and the formal and legal procedures involved in the evaluation (LORDÉLO & DAZZANI, 2009).

In the legal and institutional context, the evaluation is considered as constitutional precept in the quest for the quality of education. Article 206, clause VII of the Federal Constitution (FC) argues that, among the fundamental principles and norms of education in Brazil, there is the "guarantee of quality standard". In its article 208, it assures that the education is "duty of the State" and in its art. 209, that "education is free to private initiative", provided that it meets the following conditions: a) "compliance with the general norms of national education"; b) "authorization and quality evaluation by the public authority, including among the five goals to be achieved, improving the quality of teaching". (BRAZIL, 1988, article 214).

LGB, in turn, in article 9, section VI, points out that evaluation is an essential pillar of education. In order to do so, we must seek to implement processes, aiming at improving teaching, with a view to quality, under the responsibility of the Union to ensure the national process of evaluation of institutions throughout the national territory, with a view to quality (ANDRADE, 2009).

Law nº 10,172 of January 9, 2001, which approved the NPE, in its article 9, also established that the Union should implement a National Assessment System, which should define quality parameters for the monitoring of education systems, including the private, in addition to the goals of the NPE itself, establishing itself as a legal precept for the evaluation (LORDÉLO & DAZZANI, 2009).

Regarding the evaluation of undergraduate courses, as of October 1, 2001, the National Institute of Educational Studies and Research Anísio Teixeira (INEP) took over the coordination of the Assessment of Teaching Conditions (ATE), restructured on-site visits and expanded the bench of assessors in all areas of knowledge. In 2002, Portaria nº 990, dated April 2, 2002, was published, "[...] establishing the guidelines for the organization and execution of the evaluation of higher education institutions and the teaching conditions of undergraduate courses", and advising that on-site evaluation, having as a guide a specific instrument for each course, should be carried out considering the following criteria, presented in art. 2º:

Article 2. In order to evaluate the conditions and conditions of teaching of undergraduate courses, organized by the INEP that allow to evaluate:

- I - institutional organization or didactic-pedagogical organization of courses;
- II - faculty, considering mainly the titration, professional experience, the career structure, the journey and working conditions;
- III - adequacy of general and specific physical facilities, such as laboratories and other environments and equipment integrated into the development of the course; and
- IV - libraries, with special attention to the specialized collection, including the electronic, for the conditions of access to the networks communication systems and information systems, operation and modernization of the means of service.

In order to improve the evaluation system, in 2003, the SINAES document was sent to the Ministry of Education, which advocated the creation of a system that combines regulation with an educational system, which is the responsibility of the State and institutions, as well as the provision accountability to society. This proposal aimed, above all, at overcoming the evaluation focused exclusively on the supervision of the MEC and not constituting itself in an evaluation system (LORDÉLO & DAZZANI, 2009).

The social and political transformations provoked by globalization have reshaped the role of education and the new forms of management and organization of educational systems, in the face of neoliberal policies and the end of economic frontiers. Among the aspects necessary to respond to these changes is the evaluation (LORDÉLO & DAZZANI, 2009).

The SINAES was established through Law No. 10,861, dated April 14, 2004 and regulated by Administrative Rule No. 2,051, of July 9, 2004. The SINAES combines the two evaluation models: the evaluation of an educational nature, with the intention of radio graphing the operation of the HEI, pointing out its strengths and weaknesses, thus allowing the continuous improvement of its work; and the regulatory or summative evaluation, with the purpose of verifying the operating conditions of the HEI, requiring a minimum quality standard for its permanence in the System. The coexistence of these two functions seems to indicate an attempt to solve problems observed in previous evaluation processes to SINAES, when the emphasis on one model or the other produced gains, but also presented great difficulties. However, the combination of these two functions, which are not mutually exclusive, does not seem to be easy. Firstly because of the difficulty of training the evaluators, as pointed out previously. Second, because of the characteristics of our Federal System of Higher Education: composed of large HEIs, almost all public, whose maintainer is the federal government; a small percentage represents non-profit denominational and community institutions; and a large amount of small and medium-sized HEI, usually private, for-profit colleges. In this case, since regulation is exercised by the State itself, which is also the maintainer of the large educational institutions, the consequences of any negative evaluation will not have an effect on the functioning of these HEIs. And even if the effects of the evaluation affect your reputation, they will not jeopardize the continuity of your operation. Likewise, the large private HEIs, whose main stakeholders are large economic groups, even with the image shaken by an eventual negative evaluation, will have enough cash flow to reverse their image through advertising.

The effects of a negative evaluation of small and medium-sized HEIs maintained by households or small business groups can be devastating and jeopardize their own institutional survival. Therefore, regulatory effects are much more intense for small private HEIs. As these HEIs make up the greater part of the Federal System of Higher Education, the regulatory function of evaluation ends up surpassing itself, to the detriment of the educational function. The SINAES, therefore, constituted as a public policy directed to the small HEIs spread across all regions of Brazil. Insofar as the effect of evaluation is more intense on these HEIs, as mentioned, the simple implementation of the SINAES in these institutions, following the guidelines and guidelines established by the public power, would be capable of promoting a model compatible with its size and its possibilities (SINAES, 2009).

One can think of the implementation of SINAES considering two points of view: first, in the scope of the Higher Education System; second, in the context of HEIs. These two points of view constitute two stages of implementation, which take place in two consecutive moments, under the responsibility of different agents, who use specific strategies and means to achieve their objectives, and consequently do not offer the same monitoring possibilities and control of the implementation process, by the SINAES formulators. The implementation of SINAES within the scope of the Brazilian Higher Education System was successful in some aspects: the proposal presented by CEA was approved in all governmental instances, with some changes and adjustments; despite the changes, the principles and rationale of the evaluation concept defended by the CEA have been preserved; Finally, the evaluation processes, components of SINAES (ENADE, ACG and AVALIES), were regulated separately and put into operation gradually (SINAES, 2009).

Despite the uncertainty that this strategy produces, because at some point new procedures and old procedures coexist in a transitional phase and the position of government agencies seems dubious, the possibility of rejecting the new procedures is mitigated. Before each SINAES component comes into operation, government agencies responsible for its implementation have published guidance documents and have promoted workshops for the training of institutional researchers, evaluators, and evaluation committee coordinators. Notwithstanding this effort, two aspects in particular were obscure: how does the articulation between the evaluation processes components of the SINAES; and how the formative and regulatory functions are established concomitantly.

One can think of the implementation of SINAES considering two points of view: first, in the scope of the higher education system; secondly, in higher education institutions. These two points of view constitute two stages of implementation, which take place in two consecutive moments, under the responsibility of different agents, who use specific strategies and means to achieve their objectives, and consequently do not offer the same monitoring possibilities and control of the implementation process, by SINAES formulators (BRASIL, 2006).

Despite the uncertainty that this strategy produces, because at some point new procedures and old procedures coexist in a transitional phase and the position of government agencies seems dubious, the possibility of rejecting the new procedures is mitigated. Before each SINAES component comes into operation, government agencies responsible for its implementation have published guidance documents and have promoted workshops for the training of institutional researchers, evaluators, and evaluation committee coordinators. Notwithstanding this effort, two aspects in particular were obscure: how does the articulation between the evaluation processes components of the SINAES; and how the formative and regulatory functions concomitantly establish evaluation as a public policy: aspects of SINAES implementation. The implementation of SINAES in the context of HEIs, on the other hand, the National Commission for the Evaluation of Higher Education (CONAES), the INEP and the Ministry of Education (ME).

The document Guidelines for the Evaluation of Higher Education Institutions (INEP, 2006b), prepared by CONAES to subsidize the work of the CPAs and the other actors of the academic community involved in the institutional evaluation, presented as one of its main objectives, establish the guidelines for implementation of the institutional evaluation. There is a concern, expressed in the document, with the organization of the evaluation process, to be undertaken by the CPA - the self-evaluation, in order to allow the comparison of the results among the institutions that are part of the Federal System of Higher Education. Another concern expressed in the document is the preparation of the external evaluation to be undertaken by the External Evaluation Commissions, defined by INEP. The implementation of self-assessment in HEIs must observe some aspects, much emphasized in the texts on SINAES. One of these aspects is the need to involve the entire academic community in order to ensure broad participation.

In addition, the CPA should always have as a guiding principle of its work, the idea of academic quality, defined in the CONAES document (INEP, 2006b) as the closest possible relationship between what is placed in the IES project and the daily reality institution. That is, to bring as close as possible to what is said in the institutional documents about the work of HEI and what actually happens every day when the HEI is in operation. The CPA should construct a proposal of evaluation, capable of producing a broadest possible view of the institution, in order to allow institutional planning, with actions aimed at the continuous improvement of its academic quality.

To fulfill this objective, the document suggests that the evaluation process be able to analyze the different levels of the institution, namely:

- a) declaratory level: it analyzes the texts that underlie the institutional project, which is generally stated in the form of coherent principles, although there may be contradictions between the objectives and the project;
- b) training level: assesses the coherence between institutional norms and the practical management of HEIs;
- c) level of the organization: it assesses if the institution counts on instances that promote the quality compatible with the modalities of teaching, research and extension and its academic and social effectiveness;
- d) level of results: evaluates the effectiveness and academic and social effectiveness of the processes developed: training of professionals, academic, artistic and cultural production disseminated in the technical-scientific and social sphere, among others (INEP, 2006b, p.17).

Once these aspects are observed, it is expected that the evaluation proposal elaborated will be adjusted to the specific characteristics of the institution, thus guaranteeing the evaluation of the actual operation of the institution and avoiding the evaluation based on quality standards and external references, applied indistinctly to any type institution. The CPA is considered the link between the HEI and the Public Authorities, and its proposal for self-evaluation will establish a link between HEIs and all of them, the Federal System of Higher Education. For this reason, the implementation of SINAES in the context of HEIs is of fundamental importance, since the way in which each HEI will organize itself to comply with the guidelines established by CONAES will produce very different results, from the point of view of the objectives and purposes of the evaluation of higher education, as set forth in Law 10,861 / 2004. In addition, the implementation within HEI does not allow monitoring and supervision of the process. The procedures that occur between the time the HEI starts the SINAES implementation process at the HEI until the IES presents its Evaluation Project to the INEP, are invisible. Of the same the evaluation as a public policy: aspects of the implementation of SINAES - Law n° 10.861, of April 14, 2004, and Administrative Rule no. 2,051, of July 9, 2004, establishes and regulates, respectively, the SINAES in the HEI members of the Federal System of Higher Education (SINAES, 2009).

However, there was a commitment by the Federal Administration to extend the action of SINAES to the HEIs linked to the state system, through a cooperation agreement. In this way, the procedures that occur in the HEI during the self-evaluation process (internal evaluation) are also invisible.

2.3 Evaluation Bodies

They are actors involved in the authorizing processes of higher education, among which: CONAES; the Secretariat for Regulation and Supervision of Higher Education (SRSHE); the Technical Commission for Evaluation Monitoring (TCM); the CNE, in addition to the INEP, among others. CONAES is the collegiate body of SINAES, instituted by Law 10,861 of 2014. It has the following attributions: a) to propose and evaluate the dynamics, procedures and mechanisms of institutional evaluation, courses and student performance; establishing guidelines for the organization and designation of evaluation committees, analyzing reports, developing opinions and submitting recommendations to the competent bodies; formulate proposals for the development of HEIs, among other functions. SERES is the MEC unit responsible for the regulation and supervision of HEIs, public or private, belonging to the Federal Education System; and undergraduate courses in undergraduate, bachelor and technological degrees, and graduate *latu sensu* in face-to-face or distance learning. It was created by Decree No. 7,480 of 2011. The CTAA is the collegiate body to follow up the periodic processes of external institutional evaluation and evaluation of the undergraduate courses, within SINAES for the purpose of accreditation of the quality of undergraduate courses. It was created by Ordinance ME 1027 of 2006.

3 Methodology

For the elaboration of the present article, methodologies were used to assist in the preparation and to demonstrate the modes that were used. According to Andrade (2003: 11), methodology is "the set of methods or paths that are pursued in the pursuit of knowledge".

The most complex part in the writing of a research project for the elaboration of an article is generally constituted by the specification of the methodology to be adopted. Several items can be considered, depending on the length and complexity of the research, such as data collection technique, sampling, data analysis, report form, among others (GIL, 2002). For the elaboration of the article, the inductive method was used, because according to Bacon (apud ANDRADE, 2003, p. 111) "... the inductive method privileges observation as a process to reach knowledge. The induction consists in enumerating the statements about the phenomenon that one wants to research and, through the observation, to try to find something that is always present in the occurrence of the phenomenon ". In the induction, the inverse path is followed by that of deduction, that is, the chain of reasoning establishes an upward connection, from the particular to the general. In this case, the particular findings are that they lead to general theories and laws (ANDRADE, 2003). Exploratory research will be used, being the first step of all scientific work, in order to provide more information about a certain subject, as well as to help define objectives, delimit the subject, collaborating to develop a good research on the subject (ANDRADE, 2003). The qualitative method was used in the development of the research, since it guarantees the accuracy of the results, preventing distortions of analysis and interpretation (RICHARDSON, 1989).

4 Expected Results

It is expected that the quality of education in HEIs will be continuously improved by developing these educational evaluation policies.

5 Conclusion

The research evidenced the importance of evaluations in HEIs, as a form of public policy. The concept of evaluation that was constituted in the studies and reflections of the CEA had as main ideals the integration and the participation, since it is understood that they are fundamental concepts for the construction of an evaluation system capable of deepening the social commitments and responsibilities of the institutions, as well as promoting democratic values, respect for diversity, the pursuit of autonomy and the affirmation of identity. Clear notions of current higher education are established as something potential, fueled by the relaxation of the time it is allowed to use in learning and dissemination of knowledge. What is already done in many courses, however, to deny the participation of the name of educational institutions and people circulating in communities is to leave the context in which people live today. It is unnecessary to remember that human capacities are more inclusive and consider the human being as a whole in their culture, in their values and habits, in short, in their context. HEIs are expected to be aware and prepared to develop these assessment tools in their institutions, as this will bring benefits to themselves and to society.

References

- ANDRADE, M. M. Introdução à metodologia do trabalho científico: elaboração de trabalhos na graduação. 6. ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 2003.
- ANDRADE, M. A. B. Avaliação como instrumento de gestão da qualidade da educação superior. [S.l.: s.n], 2009. Trabalho apresentado no 19º. epenn, João Pessoa, 05 a 08 de julho de 2009.
- BRASIL. Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil, de 05 de outubro de 1988. Brasília, DF: 05 de outubro de 1988.
- Lei nº 9.394/1996, de 20 de dezembro de 1996. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. Available in: <<http://www.mec.gov.br>>. Access in: 20 jul. 2016.
- Plano Nacional de Educação - Lei Nº 10.172, de 9 de janeiro de 2001. Brasília: Câmara dos Deputados, Coordenação de Publicações, 2001. Available in: <http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/leis_2001/110172.htm>. Acesso em: 05 abr. 2014.
- Ministério da Educação. SEED. Avaliação e planejamento. 2006. Available in: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/secad/arquivos/pdf/eja_caderno4.pdf>. Access in: 30. jun. 2016.
- Portaria nº 990, de 02 de abril de 2002. Estabelece as diretrizes para a organização e execução da avaliação das instituições de educação superior e das condições de ensino dos cursos de graduação. Available in: <<http://www.mec.gov.br>>. Access in: 10 abr. 2017.
- Lei nº 10.861, 14 de abril de 2004. Estabelece o Sistema Nacional de Avaliação da Educação Superior – SINAES. Available in: <<http://www.mec.gov.br>>. Access in: 20 jul. 2016.

- Portaria nº 2.051, de 09 de julho de 2004. Regulamenta os procedimentos de avaliação do Sistema Nacional de Avaliação da Educação Superior (SINAES), instituído pela Lei nº 10.861, de 14 de abril de 2004. Available in: <<http://www.mec.gov.br>>. Access em: 20 jul. 2015.
- BRENNAN, J. & SHAH, T. *Manging Quality in Higher Education: an Internacional Perspective on Institutional Assessment and Change*. [S.l.]: Open University Press, 2000.
- DANTE, D. M., BENETTI, K. C. & OLIVEIRA D. C. (Orgs). *Gestão de recursos humanos: teoria e casos práticos*. Florianópolis: Pandion, 2008.
- DOURADO, L. F. Reforma do estado e as políticas para a educação superior nos anos 90. *Educação e Sociedade*, Campinas, sp, v. 23, n. 80, p. 235-253, set. 2002.
- FIGUEIREDO, M. & FIGUEIREDO, A. M. B. *Avaliação política e avaliação de políticas: um quadro de referência teórica*. Cadernos IDESP, São Paulo, n. 15, 1986.
- GIL, A. C. *Como elaborar projetos de pesquisa*. 4. ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 2002.
- GIRARDI, D. M. *O Compartilhamento dos Processos de Recursos Humanos: uma contribuição para o conhecimento organizacional*. Tese de Doutorado. 166 f. Florianópolis, SC, 2009.
- HOUAISS, A. *Dicionário eletrônico Houaiss da língua portuguesa*. São Paulo: Objetiva, 2001.
- INEP. *Censo da educação superior, 2006*. Brasília, DF, 2006a. Available in: <www.inep.gov.br>. Access in: 02 mar. 2015.
- LORDÊLO, J. A. C. & DAZZANI, M. V. (Org.). *Avaliação Educacional: desatando e reatando nós*. Salvador: EDUFBA, 2009.
- LUCKESI, C. C. *Avaliação da aprendizagem na escola: reelaborando conceitos e recriando a prática*. 2ª ed. Salvador BA: Malabares Comunicação e Eventos, 2005.
- NONAKA, I. & TAKEUCHI, H. *Criação de conhecimento na empresa: como as empresas japonesas geram a dinâmica da inovação*. Rio de Janeiro: Campus, 1997.
- OLIVEIRA, A. C. & HADDAD, S. *Organizações da sociedade civil e as ONGs de educação*. Cadernos de Pesquisa, São Paulo, n. 112, p. 61-83, mar. 2001.
- PERRY, A. *Balanco do neoliberalismo*. In: SADER, Emir; GENTILI, Pablo (Org.). *Pós-neoliberalismo: as políticas sociais e o estado democrático*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1996.
- RICHARDSON, R. J. *Pesquisa Social: Métodos e Técnicas*. Colaboradores José Augusto de Souza Peres. São Paulo: Atlas, 1989.
- ROCHA, E. F. *Avaliação na EaD: estamos preparados para avaliar?* Available in: <http://www.abed.org.br/arquivos/Avaliacao_na_EaD_Enilton_Rocha.pdf>, 2017. Access in: 07 jan 2017.
- SABBAG, P. Y. *Espirais do conhecimento: ativando indivíduos, grupos e organizações*. São Paulo: Saraiva, 2007.
- SANT'ANNA, V. M. *Recursos educacionais para o ensino: quando e por quê?* Petrópolis: Vozes, 2004.
- SILVEIRA, A. & DOMINGUES, M. J. S. (Coord). *Reflexões sobre administração universitária e ensino superior*. Blumenau: Edifurb, 2010.
- SINAES. *Sistema Nacional de Avaliação da Educação Superior: da concepção à regulamentação* / [Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira]. – 5. ed., revisada e ampliada – Brasília: Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira, 328 p. 2009.
- SVEIBY, K. E. *A Nova Riqueza das Organizações: gerenciando e avaliando patrimônios de conhecimento*. Rio de Janeiro: Campus, 1998.