

Evaluation of the Graduate Program in Education:
an interview with Ângelo Ricardo de Souza (UFPR/CAPES)

Avaliação da Pós-Graduação em Educação:
entrevista com Ângelo Ricardo de Souza (UFPR/CAPES)

Fábio Lopes Alves¹

Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná (Unioeste)
fabiodu@hotmail.com

Claudia Barcelos de Moura Abreu²

Universidade Federal de São Paulo (Unifesp)
claudia.abreu@unifesp.br

Adrian Alvarez Estrada³

Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná (Unioeste)
adrianalvarez.estrada@gmail.com

Valdecir Soligo⁴

Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná (Unioeste)
valdecir_soligo@yahoo.com.br

Abstract: Prof. Ângelo Ricardo de Souza, Deputy Coordinator of Academic Programs in the Education Area with CAPES and professor of the Graduate Program

¹ Postdoctoral student in Education at Universidade Federal de São Paulo (Unifesp). Professor in the Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Society, Culture and Borders at Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná (Unioeste).

² PhD in Education from Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo (PUC – SP). Professor in the Graduate Program in Education at Universidade Federal de São Paulo (Unifesp).

³ PhD in Education from Universidade de São Paulo (USP). Professor in the Graduate Program in Education at Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná.

⁴ PhD in Education from Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos (Unisinos). Professor in the Graduate Program in Education at Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná (Unioeste).

in Education at the Federal University of Paraná, makes an assessment and presents the main challenges that the Education field will need to face in the next evaluations. The interviewee's academic background, questions about paradigmatic changes that are occurring in the evaluation of Brazilian Graduate Studies, self-assessment, internationalization, Qualis/CAPES, impact factor, among other issues are discussed throughout the text.

Keywords: CAPES; Graduate program evaluation; Qualis.

Resumo: O prof. Ângelo Ricardo de Souza, Coordenador Adjunto de Programas Acadêmicos da Área de Educação junto à CAPES e docente do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação da Universidade Federal do Paraná, faz um balanço, bem como apresenta os principais desafios que a Área da Educação precisará enfrentar nas próximas avaliações. Desse modo, o percurso acadêmico do entrevistado, questões sobre as mudanças paradigmáticas que estão ocorrendo na avaliação da Pós-Graduação no país, autoavaliação, internacionalização, Qualis/CAPES, fator de impacto, entre outros assuntos são discutidos ao longo do texto.

Palavras-chave: CAPES; Avaliação da Pós-Graduação; Qualis.

Academic background:

Interviewers: Currently, together with prof. Robert Verhine (UFBA), you are the Deputy Coordinator of Academic Programs in Education, with CAPES. It is important to note, however, that formerly you also held other relevant positions in the national academic agenda, such as: Research Director of the National Association of Education Policy and Administration (ANPAE), Journals Editor, Coordinator of Graduate Program, among others. Please comment a little on your academic background.

Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: I started to work at the University after working for 10 years in Basic Education as a Physical Education teacher. I have a degree in Physical Education, and I was a School Principal in Elementary Education of the municipal network of Curitiba for a few years. What led me to the University was a contest, precisely in the area of school planning and administration – name of the department where I work at the university today – as a result, I would say, from having made a decision, while I was still in Basic Education, to get a Master's in Education rather than in Physical Education. I imagined that, as I took a *stricto sensu* graduate course in Education, I would leave the world of Physical Education behind for a while. I did it with a tight heart. And somewhat regretting it, because it is an area that I cherished and still cherish, but I knew that at that moment I was delighted with the issues of school management and my work as a school principal. I took the master's and the contest to enter the university. At the time, contests that required doctoral training were uncommon. My contest only asked for an undergraduate degree. It was a contest to hire teaching assistants, even

though I was already taking my master's. I entered the university in the School Administration Planning Department, linked to the field of educational policy and education and school management subjects, because that was also my professional training, professional background and academic training. I completed my master's already at the university, studying school management and, later, I went on to take my PhD. There I did one of the first, if not the first, school management profiles in Brazil, one of the first quantitative studies. This, added to my previous experience in basic education, brought me even closer to the management field, including university management. I like management, I like to study it and I like to do it. It is not by chance that I am in the Adjunct Coordination of Education at CAPES. At the university, however, I went through practically everything, I was not a Dean, I will never be, I think, nor a Pro-Dean. But I was the coordinator of the undergraduate course in Pedagogy, I was the coordinator of the research center of the Faculty of Education, I was deputy head and then head of department, I was in the coordination of the Graduate Program, I was the editor of two journals, founder of one, I coordinated numerous specialization courses, *lato sensu* graduate studies too, I was head of the undergraduate coordinators forum and, therefore, I was seated on the university's higher boards, the university's Teaching, Research and Extension Council and the University Council. I would say that I have accumulated a set of experiences in the professional academic path at the university, which allows me, with some tranquility, to say: that I experienced the university and that, in some way, I contributed with its organization and functioning. However, I have no political aspirations, I never had political aspirations internal to university politics. Not that I have an aversion to it, quite the opposite, politics enchants me, but I like studying it much more than doing it. Outside the university, I started to act, although linked to academic work, in WG 5 (State and Educational Policy) of ANPED. I was still in my PhD, about 15 years ago, and I got closer to that academic world. It was a world that I was already studying. Once the doctorate was concluded, I presented a work at ANPED, precisely in that same WG, in some way also because there was a certain novelty to the production. Eventually I was invited, sometimes, to hold a conversation session, a special thematic session at ANPED, linked to the WG. Within the WG I accumulated other functions. I was an *ad hoc* evaluator at several times, and I was a member of the scientific committee. Since I entered the university, I have worked at the National Association for Education Policy and Administration (ANPAE). At ANPAE I was, in the state of Paraná, for two terms. Then, when João Ferreira de Oliveira – who was president of ANPAE, in the past administration – took over the presidency, he invited me to take over as research director, where I stayed for 4 years, until last year. In this interval I assumed the Adjunct Coordination of Education at CAPES and, therefore, I could no longer continue at ANPAE. As for area coordination, I was a candidate, because I had been accumulating some graduate evaluation experiences. I've been on some of Prof. Clarilza Prado de Souza's committees, who was Coordinator of Education in the last triennial, from 2010 to 2012. I was also on several committees during Prof. Romualdo Portela de Oliveira administration, from 2013 to 2016 (the period you are studying)⁵, participating in the four-year evaluation committees, both for professionals and academics, in the evaluation committee for books

⁵ Reference to the postdoctoral research developed by Fábio Lopes Alves at the Universidade Federal de São Paulo, entitled, "The four-year evaluation of CAPES (2013-2016) and the challenges of Graduate Programs in Education of the South region," under the supervision of Profa. Dr. Claudia Barcelos de Moura Abreu, which had financial support by the Araucária Foundation – Fundação de Apoio ao Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico of the State of Paraná.

and journals, and I was on the CAPES TESE Award committee, about four times. This made me believe that I could take over this position, since there would be a replacement in 2018. I was fairly well voted, I mean, even more than fairly, I got quite a vote. But for the choice, the CAPES Superior Council indicates three names for the presidency, I was one of those. The chosen one was my dear friend and colleague, Robert Verhine, who is, in my opinion, the most experienced and knowledgeable person in the evaluation of Higher Education in Brazil. I was very happy that he was chosen as Education Coordinator. He invited me to be his assistant, I was very honored with the invitation and I could not refuse it, especially since I have known Robert Verhine for many years. He was in my master's examination board, he has always been a reference for me. I have no intention of making a career out of it. My career is teaching. I teach, supervise students, and do research. That's what I like to do. But all of this added in this path. I will not leave my classes or my students, but I have accumulated these experiences over these 20 years of university.

Assessment, challenges and perspectives for Graduate Education

Interviewers: From your experience as Deputy Coordinator of Academic Programs in Education with CAPES, what is your assessment of the current stage of graduate training in Education in Brazil?

Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: We have progressed a lot, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Today, the area of education comprises more than 190 Graduate Programs. At the end of the three-year evaluation, by Clarilza Prado de Souza (2010-2012), there were about 110 professional and academic programs. I do not have the precise number, but it has grown a lot in the last 8 years. It really soared. Of course, this was all driven by a set of national graduate policies to create training programs and expand the higher education offer through the Federal University Restructuring and Expansion Program (REUNI) and the University for All (PROUNI) and other policies of this nature. Qualitatively, I also believe that we have come a long way. The area is well recognized, highly respected in CAPES and in the scenario of graduate research in the country, along with all other areas of the humanities. However, it is much less respected than it deserved to be. Still, much more than it used to be. I have traveled a lot, accompanied many Programs in Brazil, and I have found innovation, creativity and quality work, done by both teachers and students. My expectation is that, although the signs are not favorable to research, Graduate training in Education is giving and will bear exemplary fruit, even though it is the product of the low or almost no investment now, from the federal and state governments. But, in any case, I believe we have contributed to the country's scientific, technological and cultural development.

Interviewers: When considering the current profile of Graduate Studies in Education in Brazil, what are the main impasses, as well as the main challenges that the Education Area will need to face in the next evaluations?

Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: I believe that not only in the evaluation, because we have a complex problem in Graduate Studies in general, especially in the humanities, and in Education in particular.

We do not talk to the outside. Our dialogue with foreigners is very fragile and small. It could be bigger. We are able to do more and better, from the point of view of relations with the outside world. And we need to do this out of a commitment to disseminate knowledge, to take the results of research to the world and to know, in the world, the production of research in Education conducted by researchers from other countries. There we have a barrier, a challenge, essentially and strongly linked to the language barrier. Students do not master a second language, neither do teachers. At most, professors have some reading skills, but for communication, for writing, and/or speaking and/or understanding, we are very weak. Just go to international events, not necessarily events in English, but in Spanish, we see many Brazilians struggling, not only to speak Spanish, but also to be able to understand and, therefore, this is a problem. If I am not able to tell my friend, my Argentinean neighbor, the result of my research, or to know the result of their research, how can I tell this to the rest of the world? This results in a problem, which is shutting off research, in the humanities and, particularly, in Education, by thinking that Education is a matter to be solved in Brazil. That is to say, you do not see good examples, you do not see bad examples, you do not see history, you do not see politics, you do not see strategies built elsewhere, because you do not read what others write. And we get used to it, which is very bad. I would therefore say that the challenge of internationalization, in the broadest sense of the word, is a very big challenge for our area. UNIOESTE is implementing the first doctoral class. Ideally, in a few years' time, when someone tries to pursue a doctorate at UNIOESTE, they are already able to contribute to the internationalization process. I think we should not demand this from the master's candidate, but the doctoral candidate must have a good command of a foreign language, and more than that, an internationalized culture, because more important than the language is the willingness to learn it. Just look at the bibliographic reviews present in theses and dissertations. They are completely national. I do not mean the literature that supports theory, which researchers love to seek in the classics and international authors. However, the bibliographic review on what is being produced is restricted to Brazil, because we are not able to say what is being published abroad. Our students, for example, will not carry out a comprehensive bibliographic survey. They will search Scielo instead of Scopus; they will search Educ@ instead of Redalyc. Therefore, they do not know what other researchers are talking about on a given subject. Here we have complex and difficult challenges to face because this implies a more comprehensive education than linguistic education. There are others, but I would say that, perhaps, this is the main challenge that we need to face today.

Interviewers: Currently, the role of the university and its relationship with society has been the subject of several debates, both within and outside the University. In your view, how can Graduate Studies in Education get closer to society?

Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: I would say that it is part of our vocation, of our primary mission, because the object we study is very much linked to every arrangement of the social fabric. Education crosses everyone's life, either because it is mandatory or because of the social recognition that Education is important. But what can we do to make what we developed in graduate school reach society as a whole, or Basic Education itself? It is in this sense that the evaluation of graduate studies has to demand from the Programs, so that they can think of strategies to come closer to Basic Education and to think about social impacts. I believe that we have a large set of research that clarifies,

that solves problems, that overcomes Fake News, about how and why educational phenomena occur. People say, for example, “*a teacher is very poorly paid, a teacher does not earn anything, a basic education teacher only does it for a mission, because it is the worst career in the world.*” This is common sense. In fact, it is an exhausting profession, teachers take the job home at the end of the week, they keep thinking about their students and school, we know what that is. But is being a teacher the door to hell? The other day I turned to graduate students, a doctoral class, and said: is being a teacher today in Basic Education worse than it was twenty years ago? Is the teacher undervalued? Twenty years ago it was the year 2000. It was the late 90s, perhaps the worst period to be a teacher in life, the end of Fernando Henrique Cardoso government. Since then, in addition to the national wage floor, we have had a career enhancement process. There is a fund policy established for Basic Education, but based on what data? Research can do this. That is, it helps to demystify this idea. This is a simple example, but it could be used for Environmental Education, Teaching methods, Teacher Training, Educational Psychology, any area. Our area is a problem because everyone thinks they understand Education. It is not uncommon to see a Secretary of Education who knows nothing about Education. He is a curious person, sometimes a well-meaning person, who wants to do his best, but he is no more than a curious person. Research can help and Graduate Studies can help to unveil these phenomena. Today there is an association of educational journalists, called “Brazilian Association of Education Journalists.” Fábio Takahashi, from *Folha de São Paulo*, is the president of the association, which gathers journalists from the main Brazilian periodicals that focus on Education. It is a fantastic job that they do to prepare the journalist not to write nonsense, and that is very important. Every now and then Fábio writes to me asking, “Don’t you have any research that I can use in the material I am doing?” He wants to put it on *Folha de São Paulo*, on UOL’s website. We do not normally care about that, the important thing is my A1 article. An A1 Article is important, but it is clear that the interview on the UOL page is essential, you can reach people where Article A1 does not reach, you can talk about the school management profile, about the result of the research, to ordinary citizens. I would say that the Graduate Program’s role here is to innovate contact paths, either by creating the most formal mechanisms, through agreements with municipal and state education networks, continuing education, debate cycle, perhaps, through these other, I would say, less orthodox mechanisms, such as different social networks or contacts with newspapers, etc.

Interviewers: At this moment, a paradigmatic change is taking place in the four-year evaluation process of Graduate Programs. What are the main changes in the new assessment?

Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: In December 2018, we had the approval of the new assessment form, which modifies the set of requirements and items evaluated. The modification is more formal and aesthetic than content-related, because, in the end, most of the items were already evaluated, albeit with a different name. We sought to standardize the evaluation form for all areas and modalities. It does not matter if the Graduate Program evaluated is in Education or in Veterinary Medicine. It will have the same standard form, from the point of view of requirements and items. It doesn’t matter whether you are an academic or a professional, it is the same. There are three items evaluated now: 1) Program; 2) Training and 3) Impacts on society. The notion of training is a change that seems emblematic to me, that is, the adoption of this terminology for a requirement, because it gives

centrality to one of the most important aspects of Graduate studies, which is to provide good training for masters and doctors. The idea of impacts on society is also very important, because it starts to concern the evaluation system, with the results of the Graduate Programs in the social organization, in society. What we do here and what we manage to take out there. Also what we manage to get to the academic world itself, plus what I managed to get to the market, civil society, politics, the culture of our country and the world. I would say that the new form brings more objective elements for the assessment, in this direction. There is also a technical sophistication to the evaluation process. The *Sucupira* platform, which is the information feed tool of the system as a whole, is more operational, with few failures, accumulating a very large set of information that will potentially help us in the evaluation. Now this tool has the opposite effect, which is that today we have accumulated a lot of information to evaluate, and little evaluation with a lot of information, both are problematic. With little information, it is not possible to make the necessary value judgment for the evaluation process. Too much information can make the evaluator get lost. For this reason, the changes constituted in the system put us under the obligation to establish very objective and transparent evaluation criteria. That is why, at this moment, we are in the process of preparing the criteria for the evaluation of authorial books. The idea is to build the evaluative criteria with the area itself, we already did for journals in 2019, and now we intend to do it with books. So that the evaluated thing, which is the Program, understands under what perspective, criteria, indicators, with which ruler it is being measured or evaluated. And also for us to be able to select, from that large set of information, those that are relevant for a more appropriate assessment.

Interviewers: The self-assessment process is one of the key indicators in this new process. How do you think it will affect the programs in the next evaluation?

Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: In this four-year period (2017-2020) it will have little effect, because it is an item that has 3 or 4 evaluation indicators, which should weigh between 2 and 2.5% in the total grade, that is, self-assessment will not have a strong weight. However, it is essential to emphasize that self-assessment is very important. Although it does not have a significant weight in this evaluation cycle, it is essential that Programs begin to develop a self-assessment policy, which transcends specific actions. I am sure that, from the next four-year period and the next, self-assessment will take a very large proportion in the evaluation process. I would venture to say that the evaluation of Graduate training will, within a decade, be predominantly self-evaluation, with very little external evaluation, given the path that Graduate Studies is taking in the world. Those who want to see far, should start to develop self-assessment policies. Policy is not just a set of actions, it is about articulated actions. Therefore, self-assessment implies a reflection of the Program about itself. Taking into account what is proposed, what can change, the objectives of the Program that can change from time to time. More than being able to allow looking inside the Program, it should allow getting action guidelines for what to do with the problems we detect, that's why it cannot be one action or another, it has to be a set of policies.

Interviewers: Several researchers have criticized the weight of academic productivism in defining the grade attributed by CAPES to Graduate Programs. In the new evaluation, what are the spaces that

the Qualis periodical and Qualis book instruments will occupy in the definition of Graduate Programs' grades? Is it possible to say that academic productivity will remain?

Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: I believe so. I understand this concern that the area has and I also carry it. I share it to some extent. The concept of productivism means to produce beyond measure and is unrelated to a *raison d'être* of the product itself. That is, one writes to be read. I believe that whoever writes must write because they want to be read. And it is very pleasant to write, but it is doubly pleasant to be read. So the issue is not the idea of productivism. The fact is that production, the effort of academic production, was being measured with a ruler that demanded increasingly more to be done inordinately, without worrying about what was being done, about the quality, etc. Now, one thing is Dermeval Savia writing a book, because we will not be able to write like Dermeval, as we are not a genius like him. The point is not to write 20, 30 or 40 products, but rather, the quality of what is produced. But it implies doing something, because on the other hand, everyone who does research has to be committed to the socialization of results. Research, especially at the public university, but not just there, has an investment by the nation, by the people, by the subjects who walk by it and do not even know what a university is, they are paying us to work here. The result of this research is meant for them, although they will not read my article. In some ways, it is a little like what we discussed before in relation to research and society. Graduate training has to return to society in some way. That's why we write, that's why we produce. I understand the criticism of productivism and I share it. This new way of evaluation has two virtues in this regard: a) first, it establishes a ceiling for intellectual products to be evaluated by professors. A maximum of four products per professor in the four-year term. It seems reasonable to me to expect that a graduate professor to have an average production of one bibliographic product per year. Why? Because he does research! Of course, in one year he may have none, but in the next he may have two or more. So, on average, one a year seems reasonable. If he has none, in 4 years, it is a problem. It means that he is not doing research, or if he is doing research, he is not giving it publicity, he is not disseminating his research results. This is one of the strengths of this model that we have created, which is to have a product ceiling; b) the other has to do with what was raised in the question itself, which is the intensification of Qualis periodicals and Qualis book. Qualis is a good idea that CAPES had back then and that the evaluation system developed, but which is reaching its limit. Qualis Periodicals has become a much larger and deformed thing, considering what it was meant to be. CAPES has received lawsuits, universities have lawsuits, because of Qualis. The idea of a Qualis reference is now strongly linked to this. Someone is going to take a public contest in a university, for example, he fails, or he is not in the first place because his article, which was A1 in one area, but he is applying for a position in another area, which is B2, and he loses the position because of that low score. He sues CAPES. But CAPES Qualis was only meant to evaluate Programs. It ended up on the network though, and it is the only tool we have, with such dimension, in the country. So what do we do? Everyone uses it beyond the Graduate Programs. I would say that today it is reaching a point that, first, it can be replaced by other evaluation instruments and, second, it is not adding much. The indicator of professors' bibliographic production, which is associated with this idea of productivism, had its weight reduced in our evaluation form, from 24%, in the last 4-year period to 13.5% in this period. In this sense, the importance of Qualis Periodicals has been reduced and relativized. I have heard, from the evaluation director herself, that she would like to

create a model where Qualis was unnecessary. They think it is not possible now, but it may soon be. It remains to be seen what model this is. This worries us a little, because Qualis has strengths and weaknesses, I even think it has more strengths than weaknesses. Look, journal editors get very angry, especially when the result is not good. It is curious that they do not get happy, do not express happiness, when the result is positive, but express anger when the result is negative. I mean, negative, in fact it is not negative, it is the fact that a journal is rated as B1, for example. It does not mean anything to the journal. Of course, for the editor, and I understand it, because I was myself an editor, this can be important. The curious thing is that this has no consequences for the Program, as it should not be published in the Program's journal. You do not publish in the Journal of your own Program. You will publish in the other, if you publish in your Program's journal it will be bad for you and for the journal. You must not publish. We make the journals for others, because others will make them for us, it is something like that. We have a huge proliferation of journals. I do not have a precise number, but I would guess, without fear of making a mistake, that we have something like close to 20% of academic journals in Education, with a quote equal to zero. It means the following: all that effort by the editor, to spend the weekend reviewing an article, carefully, DOI, and all that, to publish and for no one to read. And if someone read it, they did not quote it. These are articles that have zero quotes, not even the author himself has quoted it, because if he had quoted, Google Scholar, despite occasional errors, would have detected it. There are many journals where H is equal to zero. An H equal to 1 means that you have an article in that journal that was cited at least once. An H equal to 2 means that there are two articles that received at least two citations, in geometric progression, which goes further to about 8 or 9, and from there it gets more difficult. An H10 means that there are 10 articles and that each of them received at least 10 citations. The most quoted Brazilian journal, with the highest H, is *Cadernos de Pesquisa* of the Carlos Chagas Foundation, which has an H 105, which means that it has 105 articles that received at least 105 quotes. To jump to 106, it is not enough to have one more, all the others must have at least 106 quotes. That's when it becomes difficult. Now, an H equal to zero means that none of all published articles ever received any quote on Internet as a whole: it is not found in academic journals, it is not found in a dissertation, in any thesis, on Google Scholar. Of course, we can argue that the Google algorithm has problems, but if there is someone who knows how to do an algorithm, it is them. Qualis Periodicals is an object of concern for editors. However, despite understanding its importance, it currently has more problems than virtues. About Qualis Books, we made a decision, a right one, in my opinion. First, I tried to convince Robert Verhine and Luiz Sousa Junior, our deputy coordinator of the professional Programs, but I failed to convince them. I lost two to one in the vote. I think we had to get the books out of that count. Books are too important a thing for our area to be given such scores. For me, book evaluation had to be a qualitative indicator. I still cannot think of a design, but this thing about giving scoring points to a book induces, on the one hand, a low quality publishing industry, forces people to write anything, there is no scrutiny, the collections do not have a quality scrutiny, some are very good, but most, unfortunately, do not undergo this quality criterion, and therefore we build up this production of books that will never be read. The decision we made, to accept, at most, one book chapter among the four bibliographic products, I think was correct, and to give a fixed score. It is 60 points per chapter, regardless of merit. Since we will have to evaluate books, then only authorial books, based on criteria that we are creating for the area at the moment, thereby we are also inducing something. What is the message we are sending to the Education area? You want to write a book, then write an authorial book, a good authorial book. It will

be harder to write an authorial book than an A1 article, for example. So, indeed, and because of that, I think we should not score, but as we will score, so let it be better scored. Where are the authorial books? With graduate professors, in the vast majority. They are new professors who recently presented their doctoral thesis and converted it into a book. There are researchers, of course, who make authorial books, but sequentially making authorial books, these are a smaller proportion. I would say that the discussion of productivity associated with the question of Qualis is indeed more complex and I believe that, at this moment, we are headed in an interesting direction, we shall see the result of this at the end of the 4-year term.

Interviewers: With the new evaluation model, in order to attain grades 6 and 7, is it necessary to have performances equivalent to those of international centers of excellence? Or will the new evaluation model allow a program that does not have the seal of international excellence, but, on the other hand, is recognized for its local and regional impacts, to be able to receive grades 6 and 7?

Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: No, it will not, for the second part of the question. In fact, a Program that is six or seven, look, first, all of the Programs are evaluated in the ruler that goes from 1 to 5. It is rated as: *insufficient 1; weak 2; fair 3; good 4; very good 5*; all of them are distributed in that ruler, first, in that classification. It has been two evaluation rounds, in the three-year evaluation, back in 2013 for the previous period, in the four-year evaluation 2017 for the previous period, we did not have, in Education, any grades 1 and 2, which is very good. All the programs got between 3, 4 and 5, (fair; good and very good). Only very good Programs (5) are reconsidered, and they can become Programs 6 and 7. In other words, it is first and foremost a Grade 5 program. This means that, at the end of the evaluation period, all Programs grade 5 go through a reassessment process based on another evaluation rule, which is the rule of: *internationalization, nucleation, production and solidarity*. To be a Grade 5 Program it has to be very productive and have good production. But to be 6 and 7, it has to be among those who produce even better. That is, it has to be at the tip of the tip. So, generally, what is done? The grade 5 Programs block is taken and reassessed based on criteria, for example, of productivity. High impact production, A1 articles, L1, L2 books, things like that, and from these, the group is sorted out. Let's say we have 40 grade 5 Programs, hypothetically in a certain area, in ours. There will be a sorting of about 15 or 20, which have the highest impact production, and these will be considered to be upgraded to 6 and 7. Taking into account its internationalization potential and its nucleation capacity, the Program will be, then, a center of excellence. What characterizes a center of excellence? Being a national reference; being a reference or being in an international reference standard and have the ability to form other programs. Not only to train masters and doctors. What other Graduate Program has this Program formed? This is what we call nucleation capacity. I am going to take the UFMG Program, which is grade 7, as an example. UFMG formed: Juiz de Fora, Alfenas and Ouro Preto. These Graduate Programs are puppies, they are the young of that. Why do we consider the University of São Paulo as a center of excellence for Higher Education in Brazil? Because it nucleates everything and everyone, in all areas of knowledge, although in one area it may be a little weaker. As we consider grades 6 and 7, we are looking for that. We are also looking for the element of internationalization, and it is decisive. On the one hand, to be a center equivalent to international centers and on the other, to be and have the capacity to attract. This is the most complicated part, attracting researchers and foreign

views, not to say only researchers. That is, what do I do here in this Grade 7 Program, and which is observed by researchers from other parts of the world, do people pay attention to what we do here? Then they visit the website of the Program, write looking for contact, come to take sandwich degrees, postdoctoral degrees, as visiting scholar, senior research mission, or are interested or invite people to go there. That's it, they seek partnerships, they form partnerships for co-authorship, for research collaboration, sharing. These Programs naturally live with a production standard that is international. Local or regional placement is very important. Now it will make it possible for the Program to reach grade 5, but it will not provide the conditions for a Program to be a center of international excellence. Occasionally a Program may have both, it can be a center of international excellence and at the same time have a very strong regional position, one thing does not prevent the other, but it will not possibly be grade 6 or 7 if it does not have a good internationalization.

Interviewers: For researchers who are interested in submitting a new course proposal, how do you define and differentiate the area document, the evaluation form and what recommendations can you make?

Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: Creating a new course is different from evaluating an existing course. For example, according to our New Courses Proposal Assessment document (APCN), a proposal for a new doctoral course, for example, must count at least 80% of the number of professors in the master's program. This is not a criterion that will be used in evaluating the Program later. In the doctoral proposal, the Program has 20 professors in the master's program and, of these, 16 are presented in the doctoral proposal, which corresponds to 80%, meeting the evaluation criteria. The doctorate is approved, it starts to work. Later, in the four-year assessment, is this an indicator that will be checked out? No! No one will look at that. Because when we asked in the evaluation of the APCN, we asked between us as evaluators: *Is this Program able to sustain itself?* When approving a new course, it is assumed that it can sustain itself. It cannot be approved and then be disqualified in the first assessment. It has to give us guarantees that it will work, and that element, this indicator, is one of those that give us this guarantee. Now, if I have 80% of the teaching staff of a master's degree, look at our area, in order to advance to the doctorate, the master's must have grade 4, so at least it has undergone two four-year evaluations. It got grade 3, then grade 4, so it has been on a cycle of 6-8 years or more. As a Program, it exists, but is it consolidated for a doctorate? Is it mature? It's easy to know, let me look at 80% of its professors. Do they meet the criteria for the area? If they do, this is more than a master's degree 4, it is a solid master's degree for a doctorate. However, once constituted, this solidity, unless all the professors were dismissed, it may eventually happen, but experience does not show that this is how it works. In theory, this is an indicator for which there is no need to worry about looking later. In the assessment for APCN, this may be the decisive element, for both master's and doctorate degree. The proposal needs to be able to show that there is an organized and organic group, with a production and training profile, around an academic or professional proposal, in Education, that is: the professors study Education, do research in Education, and will train masters and doctors in Education. What I am saying may seem obvious, but it is not. A significant number of proposals that arrive every year look like "shooting in all directions" of the areas of knowledge. Ten professors from very different backgrounds come together, some who have never seen Education from the point of view of the

knowledge field, as an object of research and are placed together. Why? Because that's what is possible in that context! It can't be, it cannot be like that, it does not hold up! It may eventually be approved, if only some things were formally considered, but later on it would not hold up. The key to a new proposal is this: it is more than a combination of people or documents, it is a formative project. Whoever is going to propose a new course has to know how to say it very well: what they intend to train, what they expect from their graduates, and what will be added in their education, what profile they must have, this is crucial. For the current evaluation form, and compared with the APCN document, CAPES made a recent modification, which is: they are evaluated, but they do not receive a grade. New Masters' do not receive a grade in the first four-year assessment. They enter the system with what we call grade A. "A" means approved. Therefore, they will be evaluated, they will have a report, with the opinion of the evaluator, but this has no grade, it is only at the end of the other 4-year period that the Masters' for APCN's 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020, will all be evaluated, but none of them will get a grade. It is different with doctorates, because they already come from Programs with grade 4 and, therefore, were approved and are, again, being evaluated in this master's and doctorate package.

Interviewers: What is the conceptual difference between Area Document and Evaluation Form?

Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: The area document was published last year, I think for all areas. It is a document that, first of all, makes an assessment of Graduate studies in the area, looks at the previous 3 or 4 periods. It makes a brief assessment of the last two 2-year and last 4-year outcomes, looking a little at the graduate design in the area from the geographical point of view, from the offer profile, from the quantity of offer. The area document will discuss, besides the history, a larger evaluation of the area, it will focus on important, emerging or historical themes for the evaluation area. There we will discuss, among other subjects: the academic/professional relationship; the issue of distance education; internationalization; social insertion; which are major themes for the area. But this document is rather meant as a reflection about the area. Done by area coordination for the area. The evaluation form is an evaluation tool. It is a document that has three requirements: Program, Formation and Impact. Twelve items, where each item is broken down into 3-4 items, and each of these unfolds into a large set of indicators. Currently we have forty indicators in the area. These are the indicators that the evaluator will take to analyze the information in the form, which has a mathematical element. Each indicator has a weight, each item has a weight, each requirement has a weight, depending on the Program's performance in a given indicator, this will weigh more or less, and will make up the Program's final grade.

Interviewers: Impact and social insertion are significant indicators in the current evaluation document. How do you define them?

Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: Social insertion is the Program's capacity to overcome its geographical and organizational limits, leave the university and reach society in a broader sense. As a rule, in Education, we think almost automatically in Basic Education networks. Indeed, our preferred audience, especially masters, is teachers of Basic Education, from public schools, but not only from

public schools. When it comes to social insertion in the Graduate Programs, we are immediately reminded of the strong association with Basic Education, but it need not be. Other areas of knowledge will look elsewhere in society and we need to do the same. Insertion is the ability of the program, as the name suggests, to insert and bring to society the results of its research work, but also at the same time, to hear society's demands, claims, suggestions etc. Impact is an element that results from insertion, which has changed in the social context, either in the social fabric or in the actual lives of people. Let me give you an example: the Program reports that it has a strong insertion with Basic Education through an agreement, signed with the Municipal Department of Education, for the continuing education of teachers, through cycles of lectures organized by professors of the Program. This is insertion. However, what impacted this insertion? What was the result? Therefore, impact necessarily implies a change in the state of the impacted, of society, in the basic education network, whatever it may be. This is an element that we pay little attention to in our area, or at least not as an area. Occasionally one Program or another did it, but the area never paid attention to this, it paid attention to insertion, not impact. There is no impact without some degree of insertion. The impact is strongly linked to the Program's greater capacity to open its way into society. The greater the program's potential, the greater its capacity for integration. However, just the fact of integrating itself does not guarantee impact, it may even integrate itself without bringing novelty, without bringing innovation, without bringing creativity, without bringing problem solving, without bringing problematization, sometimes our impact is not solving problems, it is creating problems, isn't it?! Calling people's attention to pay attention to a very complex issue, for example: training teachers showing how machismo and racism cross our lives on a daily basis is not giving a solution, it is giving a problem, by the way, a good one. But it does impact! What happened from this? A change in behavior, potentially.

Interviewers: Thinking about the programs that are in the process of consolidation, and those already consolidated, how to define leadership and nucleation? How can it occur?

Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: Nucleation is the ability of a Graduate Program to generate a nucleus of researchers. A Program that trains others. Of course, every trained master is a trained researcher, every trained doctor is a trained researcher. More than that, I want to know the nucleus of researchers. Look: I can look at Unicentro's Graduate Program and say: this Program was nucleated by UFPR and UEPG. Because most of its doctors were trained at UFPR, and also at UEPG. Whether it was intentional or not, whether it was programmed or not, is a different story. Interinstitutional Masters (MINTER), Interinstitutional PhDs (DINTER), associated groups, agreements play part of this role. What is a DINTER? It is bringing together two institutions, so that the one with the doctorate graduates doctoral students from another institution. What is the purpose of training a doctor in an institution? Either for the academy or for the market. UFPR, where I work, has a DINTER with the Federal University of Acre, to train doctors in Education in Acre, what for? They are professors at UFAC. In order to nucleate a Graduate Program in Education there. So, there is already a Graduate Program in Education there, but in a while these doctors, graduates from the doctorate here, may be professors in the Graduate Program in Education of UFAC, which was nucleated, to some extent, by UFMG, which did a DINTER first, and now by UFPR. Leadership is linked to this. Leadership is the ability to nucleate,

or to be more solidary, because it is also about an element of solidarity, which means helping the other Program. For example: a Program with more experience, with a higher grade, with more resources, helps another Program that is starting. Leadership is not something given, it is earned. Programs 6 and 7 have good leadership. There are many Programs 5 that have very good leadership, and others that, despite grade 5, lack leadership. They have already reached a very good quality level, but they should become leaders, or else will hardly attain grade 6. The Program does not reach 6 if it does not have a recognized leadership and nucleus. It is about the Program catching opportunities, creating conditions, but it has to develop actions of nucleation and solidarity, otherwise it does not become a leader.

Qualis/CAPES: assessment, challenges and perspectives

Interviewers: What is your assessment of the changes and parameters defined by the CTC, in December 2018, regarding Qualis (mother area, stratification in 8 levels, etc.)?

Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: CAPES made a decision in 2018 that I consider as a whole to be very positive. It decided to create a concept that was initially called *Qualis Único* (Unified Qualis). And it changed to *Qualis Referência* (Reference Qualis), because it is not unified in the sense that areas are not obliged to adopt it. It is a reference. It is the idea that journals would have a unified evaluation. We had journals, e.g. *Revista Dados* is a journal that was evaluated in 46 of the 49 areas. Because it is a super/multi-thematic journal, it deals with research with quantitative data from any area. Therefore, it was mentioned in 46 of the 49 areas and had assessments ranging from A1 to C. At the time, it had an assessment in the 8 levels of the stratification. Which was absurd, how is it that a journal is A1, B1 and B2, all at the same time, depending on where you look. It was complicated! In this sense, the idea of Qualis Referência puts an end to this. A journal now has a single evaluation. For this purpose, the concept of mother area was created. A journal must be evaluated by the area that most publishes in it, quantitatively speaking. We are responsible for evaluating Education journals. However, we have a sister area, which is the Teaching Area, and some journals that are not evaluated by us, were left for the Teaching Area to evaluate. This caused some journals to be underestimated or overestimated from the perspective of the evaluative criteria of the Education Area. For example: *Revista Bolema – Boletim de Educação Matemática*. It is a very important journal in our field. But it was evaluated by the Teaching Area, I suppose, or by the Mathematics Area. Because they are areas that publish more in this Journal than we do and, therefore, it was up to them to evaluate. The opposite is also true. Some other journals ended up in our hands that, occasionally, other areas would also be interested in evaluating. We evaluated 834 journals in this process, which were distributed over eight levels of stratification. There is also a change in this regard, in the past the levels were A1, A2, B1, B2, B3, B4 and B5, and C. C was a non-academic journal. Now there are four levels A and four levels B. There were seven levels, now there are eight: A1, A2, A3, A4 and B1, B2, B3 and B4. This – although it may have created some confusion in the meantime, because of the evaluation period – is a change that comes for the better, it is easier to find and organize things in a more balanced way. I never understood why there were two levels A and five levels B, for example. It is easier for you to think of four and four! So I believe that this solves the problem a little. Now, we have to understand that, behind this,

there is a much more complex issue that will have different consequences in the sequence. CAPES has an interesting project. The idea is: the researcher, when preparing an article to be submitted for evaluation, should have previously known the Qualis of a journal, before it is evaluated. How is this possible? If I knew the evaluation criteria, I would know. This was done during these changes, for the areas linked to the life sciences college, and the exact sciences college. It works more or less as follows: Journals are evaluated based on the impact factor they have on two major bases. Which are two large indexing repositories, which is *Web of Science* and *Scopus*. Do you want to know the grade of a journal, imagine a journal that does not have Qualis, because it is a foreign journal, it was never evaluated, what is its Qualis? Just visit *Scopus* and look at which group it will be in your area, *Scopus* already classifies by area. Go to Education, which of the *Scopus* groups it will be in, you divide that into eight fractions, and then you have A1, A2, A3, A4 and B1, B2, B3 and B4. It's solved. If it is in the upper eighth, it is A1, the second eighth is A2, it is easy. Even though it does not have a Qualis, if I look at its *Scopus*, it is done. This is easy when the journals are on *Scopus*. The problem is that ours are not! Our journals, most of them, are not on that base, nor are they on the *Web of Science*, so we need another mechanism. This was adopted as a rule for all areas comprising the Exact Sciences and Life Sciences in this midterm assessment in 2019. The 19 areas of the humanities college did not adhere to this model. However, they will have to build a standard model now, for the end of the 4-year period, which may be the same as adopted by the other areas. We can adopt it, or, we can create another unified model. The unified model because it is applied in the 19 areas that make up the College of Humanities, and this model seems to be more or less the following: Google Scholar H index will be used, because this is a universal and democratic index. Universal, unlike *Scopus* where the journal needs to apply for, and where the process can take at least two years to complete, in the case of a good quality journal. It is not enough for the editor to want it. Not the H Index. Google calculates, regardless of whether the journal wants to have that connection. As long as it exists, has ISSN and has an article that it publishes, this is enough, I can track, through Google Scholar, what is the number of articles that had any number of quotes, which is the H index. The H index is this, working with the following logic: the best journal is the one with the highest number of quotes. The best H index. Indeed, so, what is the idea? A journal that has 10 articles that received at least 10 quotes tends to be better than one with 5 articles with 5 quotes. Why? Because it was the most cited journal, and why is this better? Because it was more successful in reaching the reader. The journal's role is to do two things: 1) select, that is, choose quality works that the reader should read. That is why we have peer review; and 2) making that product available to the reader. If it does not do those two things, it is not a journal. Therefore, the best journal is one that manages to select well and reach the reader. Acceptance is directly linked to this. It was only quoted because it reached the reader. And it was only mentioned because the product had quality, because they talk with the scientific community, that is the concept of quality. Even though it was cited to be put down, as a friend of mine says: *"Do you want to be cited a lot? Speak ill of everyone, everyone will answer your article, it will be widely cited."* Here there is, therefore, an element that is very important: people do not look at the H Index properly, thinking that it is just something else in the same industry, it is productivism. Of course, it is not enough. Each area will have to define a certain distribution of the H index by extract. For example: for a journal to be A1 in Education, it must have an H equal to or greater than X. To be A2, it is between X – 1 and Y, to be A3,

it is Y – 1 and Z, and so on. Thereby I have an *a priori* classification. Anyone can calculate the H of a journal. Anyone, just download a program from internet, Harish *Publish or Perish*⁶, and calculate H per professor if you want, per article, or whatever you want. It is free. But this is not enough, the fact that a journal has a high or low H index cannot be enough in Education or the humanities. This model is promoting the notion that other criteria, more qualitative and complementary, can be used, with the following idea: 10% of the set of journals I am going to evaluate, I can go up two steps, or down two steps. An A3 journal could go to A1, but I can do that only with 10% of the set, and/or with 20% of the journals I can go up one step or go down one. 10% I can go up two and down two, with 20% I can go up one and down one, based on criteria that the area will have to define. The H index criterion is for the whole world. But the area's criteria would serve for this, let's say, finer assessment that we would do at the end. That is the proposal. I will definitely be looking into it, I do not know if it will pass. But that's what's on the agenda at the moment. This set of arrangements is interesting, but it will bring some modification, it is possible that some journal will go up or some journal will drop a little, but I do not believe that we will have drastic changes, no A1 journal will turn B2, no B4 will jump to A3, in one shot. This will not happen. We had already been monitoring the citation index in previous periods, and we found a strong correlation between citation index H and Qualis. Well-rated journals in Qualis have a high H. Poorly rated in Qualis have a low H. Of course there are exceptions, well-rated journal with a low H or the other way around.

Interviewers: Wouldn't we have here a question of cause and effect, in which the journal is cited because it has a good Qualis and not the other way around?

Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: Perhaps, but the question is this: you have a well-written article, and you want it to be read by a lot of people. Are you going to submit it to a minor journal? You are going to submit it to a widely cited journal. Why submit it to a widely cited journal? Because you know it will reach the reader. You want it to reach the reader, you will send it, in the Brazilian case, to a journal that is in Scielo. There are only 18 Brazilian journals on Education in Scielo. If you want to reach the reader, it need not be Scielo either, it could be Educ@, there are 45 journals in this base. But if you just want to publish, then send it to any other. And of course, this one might have a good citation index. But it may not. For example: *Revista Brasileira de Política e Administração da Educação* (RBPAE) is not in Scielo, it should be. I have already spoken to João and recently to Romualdo, you have to submit RBPAE to Scielo because it has a much higher H than many journals that are in Scielo. RBPAE is highly cited because it is a journal of an association, the oldest one, and second to ANPAE, the largest association of researchers in Education in Brazil. ANPAE was founded in 1961. And therefore, due to this solidity of ANPAE, people read the journal, quote the journal. RBPAE has an H index of 42, which is very rare for journals that are not A1. Now, on the other hand, you can publish in an A2 journal, I will not mention the name, but there is an A2 journal that is well organized, plays the game well, the publisher is very careful, but its H is equal to 8. It is a journal that nobody reads. It was not in any repository, it has now joined Educ@, and so it went up to A2. So, it may now start to be more accessed. It is more or less like this, but you are right, there is a vicious and virtuous circle

⁶ See at: <https://www.pucsp.br/sites/default/files/download/posgraduacao/programas/administracao/uso-do-publish-or-perish-pop-marcia-barleta-jose%20luiz-silva-%20julio-rosa-dias.pdf> Access on March 15, 2020.

process at the same time. On the one hand, you harm those that are already at the bottom, and benefit those who are above. That's the way it is!

Interviewers: In the case of Programs that have journals, does the Qualis of these journals interfere with the grade obtained by such Programs?

Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: Not at all! On the contrary, it can interfere negatively. If you publish a lot in the journal of the Program, or of the college, of the university, this adversely affects the Program. One such case happened in Education in the past 4-year period: a journal that was more or less well rated, if I am not mistaken, it was A2 at the time, but it published many articles, at the same time, it published articles by all the Program's professors. And it was not a very large Program, it was a program with 20 teachers, that is 20 articles, but it published 100 articles in the year. A fifth of the articles have been from the Program itself. It was still well rated, but it published an article by all the professors, and the professors' high production was that one, and only that, in the A2 journal of the Program itself. When the area coordination realized this, it found that there was an explicit game. This is an easy process to identify. Just take the ISSN of the journal published by the Program or college and cross it in the database, and say, look, clean, remove all articles with this ISSN. In that case there was nothing left! The program, which was rated 5, scored 3 on that indicator and therefore dropped to 4. They appealed. They appealed and won. But they won because that indicator only weighed 5% within the bibliographic production item. You see, back then, even until the last three-year period, there was an indicator that asked like this: does the Program have a strategy for disseminating knowledge? Like journals, etc.? It was good for the Program to have a journal to disseminate the knowledge produced by it, but that in the pre-internet time, there were few journals, there was no endogenous concern. Over time this proved to be absolutely inadequate. To have or not to have a journal, regardless of its Qualis, does not interfere with the Program's grade, unless the Program publishes a lot in its own journal, then it will interfere negatively.

Interviewers: What would be “predatory periodicals” and how to address this issue?

Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: Predatory periodicals are those that go about hunting authors and charge for production. The vast majority of predatory journals is free to the reader, but charge authors. In Brazil, academic credit is free at both ends, normally, you do not pay to publish, the reader does not pay to read, so who pays to maintain it? Universities, funding agencies. Journal is a problem for us, which is why our journals are very amateurish. Outside the country, especially in the northern countries, journal is business, it is business for both the author and the publisher, and, as a rule, the big publishers, the big journals, charge the author high fees, because they pay, for example, for each opinion I give. Not here, we make two hundred in a month and do not receive a penny, we receive a declaration. But we do it because we understand that it is important to do it. There, they pay, only they usually charge the author, it is the author that pays this amount. That done, given the fact that they charge the author, the author is charged either to give the profit to the publisher, or to pay for the process, and some of these, charge the reader as well. They charge a lot, they even charge for each article. These are good journals, expensive journals, but they are very good. Predatory ones are usually

not like that, they are free for the reader, because they need to increase the citation index. They have to increase the impact factor, so they must be cited, they have to be read, what attracts the author is the impact factor, so, for the author to publish with it, it has to guarantee an impact factor, so they publish and disseminate it to the whole world and do not charge anything to read. Predatory periodicals will vary from U\$ 300 to U\$ 1000 per article. With the guarantee that once paid it is published, so there is no peer review, they are slot machines, you pay and they publish. These, when identified, are downgraded to C or B4. It is not always identifiable, sometimes it takes a while.

Interviewers: In 2018 you defended⁷ that it was necessary to build an indicator, (provisionally called the Index for Qualis in Education – IQE) that contained at least four criteria: a) update/periodicity; b) origin and geographical distribution of the authors; c) internationalization; and d) impact factor. With the recent change in Qualis, do you still defend this methodology for measuring Education journals?

Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: I do. For me the main thing is the following: A1 journal or the concept of A1 journal, should not exist *a priori*. A1 are the best of a set of journals, the best we could do. Like B4, they are serious academic journals, but they are the least good, so to speak, not to call them the worst, that we managed to do within a set of journals. Now, how do you rank what is best? This implies a classification, the basis of this methodology is a classification, a ranking, of all journals, I would have to put, based on a rule like this, the one that performs best, the second, the third, until the last, which is 874, for example. What is A1? It is the top 7%. What is A2? From 7.1 to 14%, anything like that. Therefore, this implies some mobility, because there is another evaluation, one that plays a better model that can substitute and replace the next one. The problem is that we have historically worked with the idea that A1 is an *a priori* concept. This brings an illusion to the area: If everyone meets the A1 criterion, will everyone be A1? No! CAPES does not allow. Half of the half can be A, and the number of A1 must be less than that of A2, that is, the Qualis rule is: no more than half can now be A4 upwards. Of that 50%, half, at most, can be A1 and A2, and A1 must necessarily be less than A2. Therefore, the A1 could account for, at most, 12.4%, of the group. Will everyone that meet the A1 criteria be A1? No! There will come a certain moment reaching 12.4%, “*sorry, but you will be below the criterion,*” but based on what criterion? There is none! Because we do not have this classification, we never did that classification, I believe we could do it. There is a component that, at the time, we had not thought about, but that still worries me, which is the number of articles. We always think about the evaluation of reviews taking into account the number of journals, but the number of journals is misleading, because there are many journals that came to the base, of those 800 and so evaluated, with only a single article that was cited. The journal may have more than one article, but it was only mentioned once in the reports. It appeared only once, because there was only one article by a graduate professor there. There is a journal called *Chão de Escola*. It is published by the professors’ union of Curitiba, rated in Qualis as C. It became C, because some graduate professor

⁷ SOUZA, Ângelo Ricardo; SOUZA, Gisele de; BRUEL, Ana Lorena; FERRAZ, Marco Alexandre. Qualis: a construção de um indicador para os periódicos na área da Educação. **Revista Práxis Educativa**. Ponta Grossa, v. 13, n. 1, p. 219-231, jan./abr. 2018. Available at: <https://www.revistas2.uepg.br/index.php/praxiseducativa/article/view/11775/209209209756> Access on: Feb 18, 2020.

published, put it in the *Lattes*, and it got to *Sucupira* and came to be evaluated, it has a single entry, it cannot enter the count of the percentage that must be A1 or A2, what matters is the number of articles that they publish. Today we have less than 14% of A1 and A2 journals, but more than 33% of articles are A1 and A2 in the area, because they are journals that publish many articles. If we take into account only the number of journals, we will no longer be able to discriminate. There will be a lot of A1 and A2 journals, and if everyone is A1 and A2, what is the point of this assessment? It has to be able to discriminate, to sort, to differentiate, if everyone is A1, then none is. So I cannot discriminate. I do not think Qualis, or that this classification should be the most important thing in the evaluation, on the contrary, I think there are many other aspects that should be considered, but, in the case of doing a Qualis, I think that this would be an interesting strategy. I presented this at CAPE S, the idea was praised, but people thought that, at the moment, it would not be possible.

Interviewers: What are the necessary challenges for the bibliographic production of the Education Area to occupy more space in internationalization?

Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: This is a very important point. First, we have to build a culture of telling the world what we write. Now, in order to have a dialogue with international production, we need to read international production. More than writing, we have to read it. This means the following: I am writing an article on “school board,” the participation of parents of students in school boards, studying comparative cases from four different municipalities. During this research, I need to carry out an international bibliographic review, rather than looking at what national production says about school councils, it would be useful to look at what North American literature says about school boards, what Chilean literature says about *Consejos Escolares*, what the Buenos Aires literature, etc. In Buenos Aires, Argentina, for example, there is a very strong school board policy, but what have they said about the topic? And bring these studies, during my review, so that, when I write up the article, this content, both in the analysis and before, in the bibliographic review part of the article, is included. This facilitates a dialogue of content. Now, there is also the format part, in order to make the bibliographic production take more international space I need to prepare my article, sure for international journals, and that implies a good translation, obviously. But it is more than a technical or academic translation, into the English language, or with the Spanish language, or whatever language it is. Preparing means choosing the appropriate journal, dialoguing with the format, not just with the standards that journals provide for authors. It is familiarization with citation models, with a bibliographic reference model, with the idea of what an article means. For instance, I am organizing a dossier on the management of compulsory education in Iberian America. In a University of Arizona journal, *Arquivos Analíticos de Política Educacional*. We received contributions from authors from all over Iberian America, some nine countries. It is very curious to note that, outside of the content, there is a difference in form, for example: an article came from a Spanish author, which has: presentation; introduction; materials and methods; discussion and conclusion. These are the items from the formal point of view. The journal of the dossier that I am editing does not charge, it does not have a model for that, but in other articles by Brazilian authors, there will be: an introduction; the headings of intermediate topics, and conclusions. It is another format. There is another one from an Argentinean author, a very famous one, by the way, Mariano Narodovsky. This article by Mariano has,

say, 12 or 13 pages and some 6 of annexes, because it has to do with another formal perspective of what it means to prepare an article. What I mean is that, preparing an article to be published abroad implies knowing the publishing culture, or at least the journal's, or the country's culture in question. Otherwise, you will not be approved, and if you are, you will not be read. It will be to no avail. Because the meaning of writing for a journal in English, for a foreign journal that publishes in English, is to ensure that the journal's readers can read, understand, like and quote. To enjoy dialoguing in the academic sense, with what you have produced. It has a cultural element that neither master's and doctoral students nor professors of our Programs are, for the most part, familiar with. We have people who are already familiar, fortunately the number has increased, but I believe that we are still years away from being able to universalize an academic education of master's and doctoral students and, especially, of professors, to converge their publications with high acceptance abroad. Finally, some universities have established policies to support this type of publication and they are interesting Programs. The university I work for has created a system called Support Coordination for Academic Publication (CAPA). They provide the entire support structure to publish abroad. These are internal public notices, which will offer translation into a foreign language, adaptability to the form, terminological revision beyond technical issues, I mean, linguistic translation, support for submission. It's a really cool work. Of course, this is the researcher's task. A colleague disagrees with this conception, he thinks that *"the university should provide support and my task is to do the research and write the article"*. I think it's the researchers' job to get their product to the reader. But such support makes it easier. Universities could institutionally create conditions for researchers, so much so that the CAPES internationalization document, recently approved for the evaluation of internationalization, will cover four dimensions: research; mobility; intellectual production and institutional support. That is, we should evaluate a Graduate Program in relation to internationalization, taking into account what the university offers to support its internationalization as well. It is more than an effort by the Program Coordinator, or professors. What is the university's effort to make this group, this Program, internationalize? Policies like this, of CAPA, which I mentioned, strongly contribute to this.

Received on: 23/04/2020

Accepted on: 23/06/2020