


SPECIAL AND INCLUSIVE EDUCATION AT BNCC: THE CHALLENGE OF SCHOOL MANAGEMENT IN PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE

 <https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n4-217>

Submitted on: 18/03/2025

Publication date: 18/04/2025

Kátia Maria de Aguiar Freire¹, Waldir Giese², Cilene Ferreira dos Santos Silva³, Daniela Alves dos Santos Lins⁴, Maria Edite Ferreira⁵, Manoel Viana Xavier⁶, Simone Silva Simas⁷, Luiz Fernando Reinoso⁸, Luana Samara Ramalho dos Santos⁹, Marcel Oliveira Rodrigues¹⁰, Polyana Pacheco Monteiro Lins¹¹, Olinda Rocha Alves¹², Delma Ferreira Alves¹³

ABSTRACT

This article analyzes the challenges of school management in the implementation of special and inclusive education according to the BNCC, through a literature review. It identifies three main problematic axes: the lack of clear guidelines for curricular adaptations and inclusive assessment, deficiencies in teacher training and school infrastructure, and the overload of management in mediating public policies and school reality. It is concluded that, although the BNCC represents a theoretical advance by incorporating inclusive principles, its operationalization comes up against structural inequalities not addressed by the document. School management emerges as a central actor in this process, but limited by systemic issues that demand robust public policies. As recommendations, it is proposed: for managers, the creation of training spaces in DUA and intersectoral partnerships; for policymakers, the elaboration of specific complementary guidelines and increased funding

¹ PhD student in Educational Sciences
Universidad Tecnológica Intercontinental (UTIC)

² PhD in Educational Sciences
Universidad Tecnológica Intercontinental (UTIC)

³ PhD student in Educational Sciences
Universidad del Sol (UNADES)

⁴ PhD student in Educational Sciences
Universidad del Sol (UNADES)

⁵ PhD student in Educational Sciences
Universidad del Sol (UNADES)

⁶ PhD student in Educational Sciences
Universidad Autónoma de Asunción (UAA)

⁷ PhD student in Educational Sciences
Universidad Autónoma de Asunción (UAA)

⁸ Master in Computer Science
Federal University of Espírito Santo (UFES)

⁹ Master of Science in Education
Universidad Tecnológica Intercontinental (UTIC)

¹⁰ Master of Science in Education
Universidad Tecnológica Intercontinental (UTIC)

¹¹ Master's student in Educational Sciences
Universidad Tecnológica Intercontinental (UTIC)

¹² Master's student in Educational Sciences
Inter-American Faculty of Social Sciences (FICS)

¹³ School Management Specialist
Apoena University

for accessibility. The study recognizes as a limitation its exclusively bibliographic nature, suggesting for future research empirical investigations on inclusive management models in different contexts, the impact of assistive technologies and the development of inclusive evaluation systems. The work seeks to contribute to the dialogue between theory and practice in the construction of truly inclusive educational systems, highlighting the urgency of approaches that articulate theoretical rigor with empirical evidence.

Keywords: BNCC. School management. Inclusive education. Pedagogical practice. Special education.

INTRODUCTION

Both special education and inclusive education are global principles consolidated in recent decades, driven by documents such as the Salamanca Declaration (1994) and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2009), ratified in Brazil with constitutional force. However, its implementations come up against structural challenges, especially in countries with deep inequalities, such as Brazil. Here, school inclusion coexists with legacies of a historically excluding educational system, marked by the duality between regular and special education.

The LDB (Law 9.394/1996) and the National Education Plan (PNE 2014-2024) established important milestones by guaranteeing enrollment for students with disabilities in regular classes. However, the lack of resources, teacher training and adequate infrastructure reveals an abyss between legislation and practice. The BNCC (2018) itself, by incorporating special education into its guidelines, reflects this tension: how to universalize rights in a system still in transition?

The National Common Curriculum Base emerges as a potential instrument to reorient inclusive pedagogical practice, by defining competencies and skills expected for all students, including those with disabilities, pervasive developmental disorders or high abilities. Its text provides for curricular adaptations, but without detailing operational mechanisms, delegating to schools the responsibility for execution. It is in this vacuum that school management becomes the protagonist – and often hostage to a fragile system.

In this sense, how can school management mediate the requirements of the BNCC and the material and human conditions of schools to achieve inclusion? The challenge is multidimensional: it involves everything from teacher training to articulation with support networks (such as the Specialized Educational Service - AEE), through the resistance of school communities that still see inclusion as a "burden" – and not as a right.

It is clear that inclusion often fails not because of a lack of laws, but because of failures in management: political-pedagogical projects (PPPs) disconnected from reality, rigid curricula and lack of participation by families. The BNCC, by not addressing these issues in a concrete way, may end up reinforcing inequalities under a discourse of equity.

Despite the advances in the formulation of public policies aimed at special and inclusive education, its effectiveness in the school routine still faces significant challenges. Many schools deal with management limitations, either due to the lack of autonomy to adapt strategies to the needs of students or due to the elaboration and implementation of

political-pedagogical projects (PPPs) disconnected from the school reality. In addition, the rigidity of the curriculum makes it difficult to make teaching more flexible, compromising the inclusion of students with specific needs. The absence of active participation of families in pedagogical decisions also aggravates this scenario, making the educational process less democratic and effective (Mantoan 2015). Thus, this article seeks to analyze, through a literature review, the obstacles and possibilities of school management to implement special and inclusive education according to the guidelines of the BNCC, focusing on daily pedagogical practice. It also seeks to identify how the BNCC approaches special education, discuss the role of school management in translating these guidelines into the classroom and point out strategies proven by the literature to overcome structural gaps.

The issue is urgent: data from INEP (2022) show that 90% of enrollments of students with disabilities already take place in regular classes, but only 36% of public schools have accessibility resources. Studying the interface between BNCC and management is essential to prevent inclusion from becoming a "marginal inclusion".

Ensuring quality inclusive education impacts not only students with disabilities, but the entire school community, promoting democratic values and reducing stigmas. It is also an economic issue: the cost of exclusion is greater than that of inclusion (UNESCO reports are emphatic on this point).

To answer these questions, the work is organized into 5 chapters that deal with several aspects pointed out above. The literature review prioritizes national and international sources published between 2010 and 2023, with an emphasis on public policies, educational management, and case studies.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Special and inclusive education is a field marked by tensions between theory and practice, legislation and reality. To understand its challenges in implementing the BNCC, it is essential to revisit its theoretical foundations and legal frameworks, which underpin both public policies and pedagogical actions. This chapter is structured in four axes: the principles of inclusive education, its relationship with the BNCC, the role of school management and proven pedagogical strategies, always dialoguing with national and international referential authors.

INCLUSIVE EDUCATION: FOUNDATIONS AND LEGISLATION

Inclusive education is distinguished from integration by its radically democratic character. While integration presupposes the adaptation of the student to the current system (Sasaki, 2003), inclusion requires the transformation of the school to welcome diversity (Mantoan, 2015). This paradigm is based on three pillars:

- Universal Accessibility: Elimination of physical, communicational and attitudinal barriers (Brazil, 2015).
- Universal Design for Learning (UDL): Curricular flexibility to meet different ways of learning (Meyer *et al.*, 2014).
- Social Participation: Involvement of the family and the community in the educational process.

Authors such as Booth and Ainscow (2011) reinforce that inclusion is not restricted to people with disabilities, but encompasses all marginalized groups (ethnic-racial, socioeconomic, etc.), aligning with the concept of equity.

The Brazilian legal system has advanced significantly, although with gaps in effectiveness:

- Federal Constitution (1988): Article 208 guarantees specialized educational service (SES) "preferably in the regular network".
- Law of Guidelines and Bases of Education (LDB – 9.394/1996): Art. 58 to 60 defines special education as a complementary modality, not a substitute.
- Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (Decree 6.949/2009): First international treaty with constitutional status in Brazil, requiring inclusive education at all levels.
- National Policy on Special Education in the Inclusive Perspective (2008): Breaks with the medical-care model, focusing on barriers to learning.
- National Education Plan (PNE – Law 13.005/2014): Goal 4 provides for universal access to regular school for people with disabilities by 2024 – still far from being fulfilled (INEP, 2022).

THE BNCC AND SPECIAL EDUCATION

The National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC, 2018) incorporates inclusive education as a structuring principle, stating that the educational system must ensure equal conditions for learning (Brasil, 2018) for all students, regardless of their particularities.

The BNCC aims to universalize knowledge in the social context, ensuring the rights to education to improve the quality of life of the population. This is a guarantee of equality, considering that equality in access to knowledge involves valuing and training teachers, in addition to the infrastructure of schools, including didactic and architectural materials, and access to reading materials (Freitas *et al.*, 2024).

However, his approach is more implicit than explicit:

- Diversity as a Value: The BNCC mentions the need to respect cultural, social, cognitive, and physical differences, aligning with the concept of equity.

- General Competencies: Competency 9 highlights the acceptance of diversity, encouraging attitudes of respect and dialogue, but without detailing practical strategies (Brasil, 2018).

- Implicit Flexibility: Although it does not use the term Special Education directly, the BNCC provides that schools must ensure reasonable accommodations (Brasil, 2018), without specifying necessary criteria or resources.

The absence of clear guidelines on assessment and curriculum for students with disabilities can reinforce exclusionary practices.

The BNCC delegates to schools the responsibility for adaptations, based on principles such as:

- Flexibility: Modification of content, methodologies or learning times without reducing expectations (Mantoan, 2015), such as in cases of use of assistive technologies for visually impaired students.

- Prioritization of Competencies: Focus on essential skills when necessary (Brazil, 2018), such as when a student with intellectual disabilities can work on basic mathematical operations while the class advances in equations.

- Differentiated Assessment: Diversified instruments are suggested, but without abandoning the learning objectives (Hoffmann, 2014).

However, the BNCC does not detail how these adaptations should occur, leaving gaps that depend on the interpretation of managers and teachers. Thus, without teacher training and resources, adaptations can become only curricular reductionism.

THE ROLE OF SCHOOL MANAGEMENT IN INCLUSION

School management plays a fundamental role in the implementation of inclusive education, acting as a mediator between public policies and daily pedagogical practice. As

highlighted by Lück (2009), the educational manager who works with inclusion develops three main functions that complement and interrelate each other.

First, pedagogical leadership constitutes a central axis of management performance. This involves promoting specific continuing education on inclusion, articulating the school's Political-Pedagogical Project with the guidelines of the BNCC and special education. An important aspect of this leadership is the implementation of innovative strategies such as Universal Design for Learning, addressed by Meyer *et al.* (2014).

In the background, but no less important, is resource management. This dimension ranges from ensuring basic material conditions such as assistive technologies and architectural accessibility to optimizing the use of available public funding for multifunctional resource rooms and support professionals. It is also important to highlight the need to mediate partnerships with specialized institutions as part of this process.

Finally, the construction of an inclusive organizational culture represents a third pillar of school management. This includes the systematic fight against prejudice in the school community, the promotion of the active participation of families in the educational process and the implementation of collaborative practices between regular and specialized teachers.

Despite the progress in the legal framework, managers face concrete and multifaceted challenges in the school routine. Deficient training appears as the first significant obstacle, with data from INEP (2022) indicating that 72% of principals declared that they did not have specific training in inclusive education. Therefore, the difficulty in translating the BNCC guidelines into concrete practice in the classrooms is perceived.

The precarious infrastructure of Brazilian schools is another important barrier. Data from the School Census (2022) reveal that only 28% of Brazilian public schools are fully accessible, with a serious lack of resource rooms and adapted materials. This reality contrasts sharply with the needs of students with disabilities.

The overload of administrative and pedagogical demands represents a third challenge. The excess of bureaucracy as a factor that limits the time available for qualified pedagogical monitoring, aggravated by the turnover of support professionals.

Finally, the fragility in specialized support networks completes the picture of difficulties. The frequent disarticulation between regular education and Specialized Educational Service (SES), in addition to the delay in the processes of diagnostic evaluation of students. In this sense, inclusive school management requires more than

goodwill - it requires resources, training and a change of mentality.

INCLUSIVE PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE

Inclusive pedagogical practice requires approaches that transcend traditional teaching methods. The Universal Design for Learning (UDL), proposed by Meyer, Rose and Gordon (2014), emerges as a fundamental reference, proposing three guiding principles: multiple means of representation, action/expression and engagement. This approach allows teachers to develop classes that are accessible to different forms of learning, without the need for subsequent adaptations.

In this sense, it should be noted that the inclusive perspective is an approach that values equal opportunities and respect for diversity from children's childhood. In this scenario, inclusion is not restricted only to children with disabilities, but takes into account all the particularities and needs of each child. This strategy aims to establish teaching environments that appreciate diversity, encourage the full growth of all students, and prepare the little ones for peaceful coexistence in a diverse society (Silva *et al.*, 2023).

Curricular differentiation offers another relevant strategy, where the same content is worked on at different levels of complexity, allowing all students to participate in the main activities of the class. Carvalho (2019) highlights the importance of collaborative learning, where students with different abilities work together, mutually benefiting each other in the educational process. In addition, adapting activities to different student profiles is a means of fostering inclusion and equality (Novais *et al.*, 2023).

It is worth noting that, with the advent of the Internet and the popularization of digital devices, we are constantly connected to virtual networks that provide us with instant access to information, global communication, and fun. This continuous connection significantly impacts our social interactions, our media consumption habits, and even our patterns of thought and behavior (Costa Júnior *et al.*, 2024). And in view of this, assistive technology presents itself as an essential path, enabling the active participation of students with disabilities. Tools such as alternative communication software, electronic magnifying glasses, and voice synthesizers have transformed educational realities.

Not least because, when used correctly, technology can be an effective resource for education and social transformation (Barros *et al.*, 2023).

METHODOLOGY

This study is characterized as a bibliographic research, according to the classification proposed by Gil (2019), who defines it as an investigation based on already published material, constituting a critical analysis of academic production on the subject. The approach follows the precepts of the integrative literature review described by Whittemore and Knafl (2005), which allows the synthesis of theoretical and empirical knowledge about inclusive education from the perspective of the BNCC.

The criteria for selecting the materials followed systematic parameters. Scientific articles indexed in the SciELO, CAPES and ERIC databases, technical books by referential authors in the area, official documents of the MEC and pertinent legislation were included. As methodological filters, the following were adopted: (1) time frame from 2010 to 2023, to capture contemporary post-Convention discussions on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities; (2) works that explicitly address the interface between BNCC, school management and special education; (3) studies with empirical evidence or recognized theoretical consistency, evaluated through the number of citations and quality of the source, according to the parameters of Severino (2016).

The period covered is justified by the need to analyze the scientific productions that emerged after three fundamental milestones: the National Policy on Special Education in the Inclusive Perspective (2008), the enactment of the Brazilian Inclusion Law (2015) and the approval of the BNCC (2018). This historical interval reveals the tensions between inclusive legislation and its practical implementation in the context of recent educational reforms.

The analysis of the materials followed the thematic categorization method proposed by Bardin (2016), with the identification of recurrent axes: conceptions of inclusion in the BNCC, challenges of school management and proven pedagogical strategies. The triangulation of data between different sources (quantitative and qualitative) was used for greater analytical robustness, a technique recommended by Flick (2009) in critical review studies.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The literature review reveals a field marked by theoretical advances and practical challenges in the implementation of inclusive education according to the guidelines of the BNCC. The analysis of the selected materials allows the identification of points of

consensus and controversies among authors, in addition to evidencing gaps between what is legally prescribed and what is performed in the school routine. This chapter synthesizes these discussions, articulating the voices of researchers, managers, and official documents to understand the obstacles and possibilities of inclusion in the context of the National Common Curriculum Base.

The literature examined presents significant divergences regarding the role of the BNCC in the promotion of inclusive education. While several authors argue that the document advances by recognizing diversity as an educational principle, there are those who criticize its superficiality in guiding specific pedagogical practices for students with disabilities. On the other hand, the flexibility of the BNCC can be an advantage, allowing schools to adapt their approaches according to local needs, as long as there is adequate support from management.

There is convergence among scholars regarding the structural challenges that prevent the full implementation of inclusive guidelines. The lack of teacher training and material resources are the main obstacles, with data from INEP (2022) corroborating this view by showing that less than 30% of public schools have accessible infrastructure. However, divergences emerge in the proposed solutions: while Mantoan (2015) defends a radical model of inclusion that eliminates any form of segregation, others warn of the risk of inclusion without offering specialized support, which could harm both students with disabilities and their peers.

The issue of evaluation also divides opinions, since certain authors advocate for flexible systems that consider multiple forms of learning demonstration, aligned with the principles of Universal Design for Learning. It is questionable to what extent evaluative adaptations would not be reducing expectations instead of ensuring equity. These divergences reflect broader tensions between medical and social models of disability, as discussed by Diniz (2021) in his critical analysis of inclusive policies.

GAPS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BNCC FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION

The analysis of the literature reveals that, despite the conceptual advances present in the BNCC, its operationalization for special education faces structural challenges that limit its effectiveness. One of the main gaps identified refers to the absence of clear guidelines on how to carry out curricular adaptations without losing sight of the essential learning objectives. The BNCC mentions the need for flexibility, but does not detail criteria

or methodologies, leaving teachers and managers without consistent parameters for their practice.

Another significant gap concerns teacher training. Teachers do not receive specific training to work with the principles of the BNCC in inclusive contexts, resulting in practices that often reproduce traditional teaching models, inadequate for students with disabilities. This training deficiency is aggravated by the scarcity of accessible teaching materials and assistive technologies in schools, essential elements for the implementation of the Base's inclusive proposals. It is worth noting, therefore, that digital tools provide valuable assistance in personal organization, obtaining information, and developing skills. (Costa Júnior, 2024).

Especially because education, especially that which today trains citizens for a globalized world, should help people to become proficient in digital languages, understand how digital technologies work and how they can be used effectively for various purposes (Costa Júnior, 2023).

School management also emerges as a critical point. The BNCC does not establish clear support mechanisms for management teams, which often need to reconcile bureaucratic demands with the implementation of inclusive practices without adequate resources. This situation is particularly acute in regions with greater socioeconomic inequalities, where schools already face historic infrastructure and funding challenges.

In the international context, it is worth mentioning the work of Mitchell and Sutherland (2020) involving inclusive reference schools in Portugal, Canada, and Italy. The authors identified that the most successful management models shared three core elements: systems for continuous monitoring of the learning of all students, organizational flexibility to adapt school times and spaces, and strong partnerships with specialized support institutions. These findings corroborate the conclusions of Brazilian research, suggesting common challenges in the implementation of inclusion in different contexts.

Finally, the evaluation of students with disabilities remains one of the most controversial points. While the BNCC defends the need for evaluative adaptations, it does not offer precise guidance on how to carry them out without compromising the quality of the educational process. It is important to warn that, in the absence of well-defined parameters, many schools end up adopting reductionist practices that do not adequately capture the learning of these students.

HOW CAN MANAGEMENT MEDIATE THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE BNCC AND THE REALITY OF SCHOOLS?

The tension between the normative requirements of the BNCC and the material conditions of Brazilian schools places school management in front of a complex challenge that requires strategic mediation. The educational manager assumes the role of translator of public policies, transforming abstract guidelines into viable actions within contexts often marked by structural limitations. This mediation requires a multidimensional approach that considers both the pedagogical possibilities and the concrete constraints of the school units.

Recent research shows that the schools with the most success in the inclusive implementation of the BNCC develop adaptive management strategies, bringing in effective managers who work on three simultaneous fronts: negotiation with the departments of education to obtain resources, mobilization of the school community around inclusive projects, and internal reorganization of pedagogical spaces and times. These practices are particularly relevant when considering that, as shown by the School Census (2022), only 36% of public schools have adequate physical structure to serve students with disabilities.

Teacher training emerges as the central axis of this mediation. Managers need to create permanent spaces for in-service training, where teachers can develop skills to work with the curricular flexibility proposed by the BNCC. The existence of collective hours dedicated to collaborative planning between regular teachers and specialists in special education can be decisive for the success of curricular adaptations.

Networking appears as another fundamental strategy. Managers who establish partnerships with universities, civil society organizations, and health services are able to significantly expand the resources available for inclusion. This approach is particularly important in contexts of scarcity, allowing schools to partially overcome infrastructure limitations through cross-sectoral cooperation.

However, management mediation encounters structural limits that cannot be overcome with local efforts alone. The persistence of problems such as the precariousness of teaching working conditions, the insufficiency of support professionals and the discontinuity of public policies represent challenges that require intervention at the systemic level. In this sense, the mediation of school management should be understood as a necessary but insufficient action without the consistent support of the higher levels of the educational system.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

This study proposed to critically analyze the challenges faced by school management in the implementation of special and inclusive education according to the BNCC guidelines, through a comprehensive bibliographic review. The results obtained reveal a complex scenario, where the National Common Curricular Base, despite incorporating inclusive principles in its foundation, presents significant gaps in its practical operationalization. The analysis developed identified three central problematic axes that deserve to be highlighted. Firstly, there is a lack of clear guidelines for carrying out truly inclusive curricular adaptations and evaluation processes. In the background, chronic deficiencies in teacher training and in the material conditions of school units are evidenced. Finally, the overload imposed on school management is highlighted, which is forced to mediate complex demands without having the necessary support.

The perception that the BNCC, despite its transformative potential, is unable to adequately address the structural inequalities that hinder effective educational inclusion. In this context, school management emerges as a fundamental actor in the process, but faces limitations that go far beyond the individual sphere, demanding systemic actions and consistent and well-articulated public policies.

Regarding the recommendations for educational managers, it is suggested the implementation of permanent spaces dedicated to teacher training with a specific focus on inclusive practices, favoring approaches such as Universal Design for Learning as proposed by Meyer *et al.* (2014). The establishment of intersectoral partnerships with health networks, social assistance and civil society organizations is essential to expand the range of available resources. Equally important is the creation of effective mechanisms of democratic participation that involve families, students and teachers in a substantive way in the collective construction of the political-pedagogical project.

For public policy makers, it is recommended that they develop guidelines that complement the BNCC that specify concrete strategies for special education. The expansion of financial resources to ensure physical, technological and pedagogical accessibility in school units is an urgent measure. The development of institutional evaluation systems that contemplate inclusive processes beyond traditional academic outcomes represents another necessary advance.

As a relevant methodological limitation, it is worth highlighting the exclusively bibliographic nature of this analysis, which did not incorporate the collection of original

empirical data. This finding points to important avenues to be explored in future research. It is suggested that field studies be carried out to investigate how different education systems are translating the BNCC guidelines into everyday inclusive practice. Comparative analyses of inclusive school management models in different socioeconomic contexts could bring valuable contributions. The investigation of the impact of new assistive technologies on the implementation of the inclusive curriculum and the development of evaluative methodologies capable of capturing the multiple dimensions of school inclusion are other promising fronts.

The field of inclusive education urgently demands research that can articulate rigorous theoretical reflection with robust empirical investigations, capable of informing both public policies and day-to-day school practices. The present study aspires to have contributed to this fundamental dialogue between theory and practice in the construction of genuinely inclusive educational systems.

REFERENCES

1. Bardin, L. (2016). **Análise de conteúdo**. São Paulo: Edições 70.
2. Barros, M. J. de, et al. (2023). Digital inclusion and education: Equity and access. **International Journal of Scientific Studies*, 1*(2), 124–149. <https://doi.org/10.61571/riec.v1i2.120>
3. Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2011). **Index for inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools** (3rd ed.). Bristol: CSIE.
4. Brazil. (2018). **National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC)**. Brasília: MEC. https://www.gov.br/mec/pt-br/escola-em-tempo-integral/BNCC_EI_EF_110518-versaofinal.pdf
5. Brazil. (2016). **Constitution of the Federative Republic of Brazil of 1988**. Brasília, DF: President of the Republic. http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/constituicao/constituicao.htm
6. Brazil. (2009). Decree No. 6,949, of August 25, 2009. Promulgates the International Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. **Official Gazette of the Union**. https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2007-2010/2009/decreto/d6949.htm
7. Brazil. (1996). Law No. 9,394, of December 20, 1996. Establishes the guidelines and bases of national education. https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/l9394.htm
8. Brazil. (2014). Law No. 13,005, of June 25, 2014. Approves the National Education Plan - PNE and makes other provisions. https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2011-2014/2014/lei/l13005.htm
9. Brazil. (2015). Law No. 13,146, of July 6, 2015. Establishes the Brazilian Law for the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities (Statute of Persons with Disabilities). **Official Gazette of the Union**. https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2015/lei/l13146.htm
10. Brazil. (2008). **National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education**. Brasília: MEC. <http://portal.mec.gov.br/arquivos/pdf/politicaeducaspecial.pdf>
11. Carvalho, R. E. (2019). **Educação inclusiva: Com os pingos nos "is"** (13th ed.). Porto Alegre: Mediação.
12. Costa Júnior, J. F. (2024). Digital life: How technology shapes our relationships and routines. **Cadernos Zygmunt Bauman*, 14*(35). <https://periodicoseletronicos.ufma.br/index.php/bauman/article/view/25059>
13. Costa Júnior, J. F. (2023). The importance of education as a tool to face the challenges of the information and knowledge society. **Convergences: Studies in Digital Humanities*, 1*(01), 127–144. <https://doi.org/10.59616/conehd.v1i01.97>

14. Costa Júnior, J. F., et al. (2024). Education in the age of algorithms: How hyperconnectivity is shaping teaching and learning processes. **Contribuciones a las Ciencias Sociales*, 17*(5), e6486. <https://doi.org/10.55905/revconv.17n.5-004>
15. Diniz, D. (2021). **O que é deficiência?** São Paulo: Brasiliense.
16. Flick, U. (2009). **Introdução à pesquisa qualitativa** (J. E. Costa, Trans.) (3rd ed.). Porto Alegre: Artmed.
17. Freitas, V. da S., et al. (2024). Continuing education for teachers and the challenges of applying the BNCC in school practice. **Caderno Pedagógico*, 21*(13), e12230. <https://doi.org/10.54033/cadpedv21n13-284>
18. Gil, A. C. (2019). **Métodos e técnicas de pesquisa social** (7th ed.). São Paulo: Atlas.
19. Hoffmann, J. (2014). **Avaliar para promover: As setas do caminho**. Porto Alegre: Mediação.
20. INEP. (2022). **School Census of Basic Education 2022**. Brasília: MEC. https://download.inep.gov.br/areas_de_atuacao/notas_estatisticas_censo_da_educacao_basica_2022.pdf
21. Lück, H. (2009). **Dimensões da gestão escolar**. Petrópolis: Vozes.
22. Mantoan, M. T. E. (2015). **Inclusão escolar: O que é? Por quê? Como fazer?** São Paulo: Summus.
23. Meyer, A., Rose, D. H., & Gordon, D. (2014). **Universal Design for Learning: Theory and practice**. Wakefield: CAST.
24. Mitchell, D., & Sutherland, D. (2020). **What really works in special and inclusive education: Using evidence-based teaching strategies** (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
25. Novais, L. F., et al. (2023). Promoting the habit of reading among students: Strategies and challenges. **RECHSO - Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7*(14), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.55470/rechso.00102>
26. Sasaki, R. K. (2003). **Inclusão: Construindo uma sociedade para todos** (5th ed.). Rio de Janeiro: WVA.
27. Severino, A. J. (2016). **Metodologia do trabalho científico** (24th ed.). São Paulo: Cortez.
28. Silva, J. L. A. da, et al. (2023). Early childhood education in the inclusive perspective: Building a future for all. **International Journal of Scientific Studies*, 1*(2), 25–37. <https://doi.org/10.61571/riec.v1i2.111>

29. UNESCO. (1994). *Salamanca Declaration on Principles, Policy and Practices in Special Education*. Salamanca: UNESCO.
<http://portal.mec.gov.br/seesp/arquivos/pdf/salamanca.pdf>

30. Whittemore, R., & Knafl, K. (2005). The integrative review: Updated methodology.
Journal of Advanced Nursing, 52(5), 546–553.