

Assessment and self-assessment as formative technology applied to the Pedagogical Residency Program

Acassia dos Anjos Santos **ROSA***
Gildete Cecília Neri Santos **TELES****
Juliana Pereira Souto **BARRETO*****

*Ph.D. in Language Studies from the Federal University of Minas Gerais (2018). Teacher at Federal University of Sergipe. acassiaanjos@academico.ufs.br

**Ph.D. in Languages from the Federal University of Sergipe (2023) – Teacher at SEDUC-SE - gcecilianeri@hotmail.com

***Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics and Language Studies from the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (2016). Teacher at Federal University of Sergipe. jpsbarreto@academico.ufs.br

Abstract

This research aims to analyze the impacts and contributions of the Pedagogical Residency Program – PRP in the education of future foreign language teachers, in Sergipe, during the Covid-19 Pandemic, based on students' self-assessment. To this end, the study starts from the perspective of the ones involved in the program, linked to the Federal University of Sergipe – UFS, between 2020 and 2022. It is a qualitative, interpretive research, which, through the analysis of questionnaires, sought a more accurate understanding of the meaning built by the undergraduate students, linked to the Spanish and English cores. Here, we consider self-assessment and continuous assessment as systematic, critical, reflective, permanent, and, therefore, formative processes, which enable diagnoses and monitoring with the function of redefining initial goals. The aim is, therefore, to redefine meanings of knowledge production, of preliminary proposed actions, paying attention to the weaknesses and potentialities of the process, and, thus, turning our attention to the redefinition of priorities established in the foreground. The results show that the PRP provided teachers, in pre-service education, a good relationship with those involved in the project, as well as the construction of a self-reflective pedagogical approach, recognizing strengths and weaknesses during their participation in the program, given the diversity of scenarios caused by the pandemic period.

Keywords: Pedagogical Residency Program; pre-service teacher education; self-assessment and ongoing assessment.

Resumo:

Esta pesquisa objetiva analisar os impactos e contribuições do Programa Residência Pedagógica – PRP na formação de futuros professores de línguas estrangeiras, em Sergipe, durante a Pandemia de Covid-19, a partir da autoavaliação dos discentes. Para isso, o estudo parte do olhar dos sujeitos envolvidos no programa, vinculados à Universidade Federal de Sergipe – UFS, entre 2020 e 2022. Trata-se de uma pesquisa qualitativa, interpretativista, que, por meio da análise de questionários, buscou uma compreensão mais apurada dos significados construídos pelos licenciandos, vinculados aos núcleos de espanhol e inglês. Aqui, consideramos a autoavaliação e avaliação contínua como processos sistemáticos, críticos, reflexivos, permanentes, e, portanto, formativos, que possibilitam diagnósticos e monitoramentos com função de ressignificar objetivos iniciais. Busca-se, com isso, redefinir os sentidos da produção de conhecimentos, das ações preliminarmente propostas, atentando para as fragilidades e potencialidades do processo, e, assim, voltar o olhar para a redefinição de prioridades estabelecidas em primeiro plano. Os resultados evidenciam que o PRP oportunizou aos professores, em formação inicial, uma boa relação com os envolvidos no projeto, como também, a construção de um fazer pedagógico, autorreflexivo, reconhecendo pontos fortes e frágeis durante sua participação no programa, frente a diversidade de cenários causados pelo período pandêmico.

Palavras-chave: Programa Residência Pedagógica; formação inicial; autoavaliação e avaliação continuada.

Signum: Estudos da Linguagem, Londrina, v.27, n.1, p.39-52, april. 2024

Received on: 20/11/2023

Accepted on: 27/02/2024

Assessment and self-assessment as formative technology applied to the Pedagogical Residency Program ¹

Acassia dos Anjos Santos Rosa
Gildete Cecília Neri Santos Teles
Juliana Pereira Souto Barreto

INTRODUCTION

Teacher education in Brazil has undergone various transformations over the years. According to Gatti (2010), the establishment of Normal Schools in the late 19th century became a milestone for teacher preparation, as they started to work with "first letters" education. In the 20th century, this preparation began to be carried out by high school-level institutions. It was only with the 1996 Law of Guidelines and Bases that teacher education became mandatory at the higher education level.

Between 2003 and 2012, the implementation of the Restructuring and Expansion Plan of Federal Universities - REUNI fostered the expansion of higher education throughout Brazil, directly impacting the increase in teacher education at the higher level. Among the policies adopted by the federal government, we highlight the Institutional Program for the Initiation of Teaching Scholarships - PIBID, which offers scholarships to those involved in the program in order to enhance teacher education nationwide, placing teacher candidates in schools before the mandatory supervised internships of undergraduate teaching programs.

In 2018, the PIBID underwent a restructuring, coexisting with the Pedagogical Residency Program - PRP. The latter became responsible for the education of teaching degree students in the second half of their course, while the PIBID was intended for undergraduates enrolled in the first half of their education. Following this restructuring, students in teaching programs began to experience different environments for a period of up to 18 months in each program, based on their academic knowledge. This provided them the freedom to create, execute, and reflect on the lessons taught, always seeking to improve teaching practices.

In the year 2020, the Covid-19 pandemic had widespread impacts on global education at all levels. Face-to-face classes were suspended as a health protection measure. Consequently, teacher education programs needed to be reformulated in response to the rethinking of schools and their classes. According to previous studies related to this period in education (Teles *et al.*, 2022a, 2022b), classrooms were replaced by virtual rooms using Google Meet, printed activities were substituted with virtual files organized in Google Classroom, and daily interactions and messages were conducted through WhatsApp groups. These substitutions are part of what is referred to as emergency remote teaching (Hodges *et al.*, 2020), as they were measures taken in a special and temporary period, not planned and tested beforehand. Thus, "emergency remote teaching becomes a possible means for teacher education programs to take place during the Covid-19 pandemic" (Rosa; Barreto, 2023, p. 154).

Given this situation, this work sought to highlight the impacts and contributions of the Pedagogical Residency Program in the pre-service education of future foreign language teachers in the context of the state of Sergipe during the Covid-19 pandemic. To achieve this, we analyzed

¹ Translated by: Gildete Cecília Neri Santos Teles e Juliana Pereira Souto Barreto.

assessment and self-assessment questionnaires used by students in training who participated in the Pedagogical Residency Program between the years 2020 and 2022. These students were affiliated with the English and Spanish language departments at the Federal University of Sergipe.

EXPERIENCE, OBSERVATION, ASSESSMENT, AND RECONSTRUCTION

The Pedagogical Residency Program (PRP), implemented by the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - CAPES), starting from the public call 01/2020 (CAPES, 2020), was formed by disciplinary action nuclei composed of: 1 (one) supervising teacher, university professor; 3 (three) pedagogical supervisors, basic education teachers - referred to as preceptors - and up to 30 (thirty) teaching degree students, with 24 (twenty-four) being scholarship holders and 6 (six) volunteers - called residents. For this public call, the Federal University of Sergipe had 18 (eighteen) nuclei, covering various teaching degrees, for a period of 18 (eighteen) months, organized into 3 (three) consecutive modules, each lasting 6 (six) months.

Upon the start of the edition, each resident, whether a scholarship holder or a volunteer, needed to develop their Activity Plan, which was to be carried out throughout the module. Thus, at the beginning of each new module, a semester cycle, residents were required to draft their activity plans according to the current module. The Activity Plan, constructed by the resident under the guidance of the supervising teacher and preceptor, aimed to organize the actions to be developed by them in the school setting.

Suggested by CAPES (2020) in the public call 01/2020, the plan proposed a distribution of a minimum workload of 138 hours/month to be fulfilled by the resident. This plan also required the resident to create a schedule in which they should allocate their minimum workload, 138 hours/month, necessarily covering the following activities: (a) School Teaching; (b) Activities Developed in/for the School; (c) Activities Developed in Higher Education Institutions - IES; and (d) Activities Developed in Other Spaces.

At that moment, we were experiencing a state of alert, panic, and fear caused by the Covid-19 pandemic, which seemed relentless. The residents in education now had to deal not only with the insecurity caused by the initial experience of developing a plan but also with a new remote educational reality caused by a deadly virus sweeping the entire world. In this context, activity plans were devised, generating a sense of insecurity about the results to be obtained. All these emotions, combined with the state of alertness experienced, suggested a constant reassessment of adopted practices, as it was an unprecedented scenario for everyone involved in the program. Thus, we felt the need to assess the situation we were in, aiming to redirect planned actions and, subsequently, to understand the impacts and contributions caused by the program.

According to Luckesi (2011), the act of assessment serves as a tool to diagnose the learning situation. In this sense, we can consider that the reflection provoked by the self-assessment questionnaires analyzed here reaches both pre-service and in-service teachers, from both the perspective of Basic Education and Higher Education. This is facilitated through the supervising teachers of the nuclei involved in the development, application, and analysis of the questionnaires. The assessment had a diagnostic function, serving to support the maintenance or revision of pedagogical practices adopted up to that point in the pre-service teacher education. Thus, pre-service teachers were given the opportunity to evaluate the project's execution process while conducting a self-assessment of their practices.

In the second case, in continuing teacher training, the evaluation functioned as a revisit to practices already consolidated in Basic Education or Higher Education by professionals who were

already in service even before the program began. In this way, these teachers could self-evaluate their choices, as well as beliefs imprinted on what they do in the classroom, accessing, in turn, emotional states based on their subjective perception, as Luckesi points out,

Self-assessment is a form of evaluative practice where the presence of the evaluator's subjectivity - evaluating oneself - is intense [...]. After all, self-assessment is permeated by multiple emotional states, as well as the personal beliefs of the evaluator, which can blur the possible clarity of the qualitative judgment (Luckesi, 2016).

This movement provides reflection on its contribution to the initial training of residents, since in the self-evaluation process everyone involved in the process has the opportunity to revisit their practices and actions, based on their subjective perceptions. As the problematization of the pedagogical path in the program is improved through continuous evaluation and self-assessment, those involved provide space for the unexpected (Zacchi, 2015), which is done not with a character of improvisation in the middle of the process, but as recognition of the complexity of human relationships that impact pedagogical choices in the teaching-learning of foreign languages in the form of gaps (Duboc, 2012), and, thus, through training technologies such as the adoption of a questionnaire aimed at formative assessment.

At the end of the first module, we believed it was necessary to reassess the proposed activities to observe the experience, analyze what had been possible or not, and then reevaluate strategies before moving on to the construction of the Activity Plan, at that time, focused on Module II. In this way, we considered that an evaluation leading residents to critically reflect on their own practice would be necessary, especially since we had initiated PRP activities during a completely adverse period.

It is important to note that the first module of PRP in 2020 did not coincide with the start of the school year – schools had experienced an initial in-person start to the academic year, which was interrupted in the first semester by the onset of emergency remote teaching. Therefore, the arrival of residents in the school environment and the work proposed during the program occurred at a time when relationships between preceptors and Basic Education students had already begun.

In this context, the idea of creating a questionnaire for assessment and self-assessment focused on the initial proposal of the Activity Plan emerged since that had been the starting point. Similarly, at the end of the second module, we chose to administer a second assessment and self-assessment questionnaire, this time related to the Activity Plan designed for Module II. The second questionnaire contained the same questions as the first, with the purpose of prompting the respondent to reflect on the initial questions and their developments up to that moment.

Just as pointed out in the Activity Plan, we recognize that the evaluation questionnaire for each module should be at the student's service, that is, the evaluation questionnaire should fulfill the function of, in addition to collecting data, leading the resident to reflect on their practices. It was in this sense that the questions were constructed, with the purpose not only of evaluating actions, but also of provoking self-reflection and construction of critical thinking, a fact that can be enhanced by self-assessment. Therefore, aware of the function established for evaluation, we understand that,

“Self-assessment is not yet part of Brazilian school culture. However, if we want autonomous, critical individuals, we must be aware that such a practice should be incorporated into the daily planning of teachers and, ultimately, into the curriculum” (Fernandes; Freitas, 2008, p. 35).

We have seen in self-assessment a possibility of questioning the relationships that emerged during the execution of the program despite this practice of not being part of Brazilian school culture. Self-evaluation then demands an action of construction, deconstruction and reconstruction of meanings that calls for active listening that recalls the path taken in a critical-reflective way

(Menezes de Souza, 2011). Seeking to incorporate the practice of self-assessment into the PRP, we developed questions, which were applied at the end of the first and, again, at the end of the second module of the program, in force between October 2020 and March 2022. The questionnaires were applied to residents and preceptors, however, for this article we only focus on the responses of the residents involved. Below, we present the methodological path followed for this work.

METHODOLOGY

This research is characterized as interpretative qualitative research within the field of Applied Linguistics. According to Telles (2002), qualitative methodology allows educators to study educational phenomena, emphasizing the importance of the human dimension that may be lost in the quantification of analyses. We also characterize this research as interpretative, as Moita Lopes (1994) explains that interpretative research captures different aspects of social facts, contributing to the choice of this method by applied linguists in their investigations. While the positivist scientific model values the researcher's detachment from the study object to ensure the objectivity of analyses, interpretative research focuses on subjectivity, or rather, "intersubjectivity, the meanings that people, by interacting with each other, construct, destroy, and reconstruct" (Moita Lopes, 1994, p. 4). Through intersubjectivity, we can approach the reality constituted by social actors, avoiding standardizations and recognizing the subjectivities of participants.

The questions comprising the assessment questionnaire were chosen as data generation instruments, among other reasons, due to their suitability for application to multiple participants and locations simultaneously. Additionally, there is greater freedom in responses as it allows for anonymity (Lakatos; Marconi, 2003, p. 201). In the case of our questionnaires, participants had the freedom to identify themselves or not, so we were not able to identify all responses in relation to the participant's name.

In this way, the "PRP DLES Assessment and Self-Assessment Questionnaire" was designed with five sections of different information. The first section, named 'Identification', deals with the space where respondents should provide information such as name (optional), course, period, etc. The second section, titled 'Project Aspects: activities developed at UFS', asked informants questions related to the day, time, and frequency of training meetings with subproject coordinations, the topics covered in these meetings, and communication channels between the supervising teacher, preceptors, and residents. The third section, named 'School Aspects: activities developed in/for the school, outside the classroom, and meetings with preceptors', inquired about meetings between preceptors and residents, the frequency and quality of guidance, as well as planning, activities produced for teaching, and monitoring the execution of the activity plan in the school field. Finally, the fourth and last section, named 'Interpersonal Aspects', prompts preceptors and residents to reflect on and evaluate their production and performance in the program, as well as the relationships established between them.

For the analysis in this work, we focused on the data generated in the 'Interpersonal Aspects' section, consisting of four questions, two objective and two subjective, that focus on the evaluation and self-evaluation of the resident in their journey in the program, aiming to incorporate the practice of self-reflection into the daily lives of the residents for a better understanding of their formative path. For the analysis of the subjective questions, we separated the questionnaires in which participants identified themselves, allowing us to understand the contrast in responses between Module 1 and Module 2. In the table below, we present the questions from the 'Interpersonal Aspects' section, the focus of analysis in this work.

Table 1 - 'Interpersonal Aspects' section

Question	Question details
<p>20. How do you assess the relationship between project participants?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Resident <-> Resident (pairs) ·Resident <-> Preceptor ·Resident <-> Supervising Teacher ·Preceptor <-> Supervising Teacher ·Resident <-> Basic Education Student ·Preceptor <-> Basic Education Student 	<p>For this question, residents had to choose from the options: Excellent; Good; Regular; Poor; or Very Poor. Thus, they were able to measure and reflect on the relationships established among themselves and the people around them, as well as evaluate relationships involving third parties.</p>
<p>21. How were these relationships for you? Tell me in more detail.</p>	<p>This open question made it possible to detail the relationships assessed in question 20.</p>
<p>22. According to the following points, how do you assess yourself throughout this module?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ·Proactivity (not waiting for others) ·Commitment (responsibility) ·Organization (ability to plan) ·Flexibility ·Sociability ·Availability ·Communication ·Productivity (focus and objectivity when carrying out actions) ·Humility (recognizing mistakes) ·Systemic view (understanding the system of which we are part, that is, perceiving others and oneself) 	<p>This question allowed an objective self-assessment about their conduct, behaviors and attitudes in the program. To do this, students were able to choose between the options: Excellent; Good; OK; Bad or Terrible.</p>
<p>23. What is it like to do this self-assessment at this moment? What are your high points and where do you think you can improve? Tell me a little more.</p>	<p>In this last question, students were able to report their subjective opinions regarding their process in the module, detailing the aspects evaluated in question 22.</p>

Source: Developed by the authors.

The platform chosen for the application of this monitoring technology was the Google Form for two reasons: 1. it is a tool specifically designed for research purposes, that is, data collection for analysis, and 2. the tool also met the prerequisite regarding the logistics of reaching the participants and, therefore, needed to be, for health measures, conducted remotely, just like classes and meetings.

The evaluation questionnaire, containing the sections and questions described here, was administered by the supervising teachers of the two subprojects during the validity of the public call nº 01/2020 (CAPES, 2020) one for English and the other for Spanish, linked to the Department of Foreign Languages-DLES, at the end of the first two modules. Thus, both preceptors and residents from both the Spanish and English nuclei were requested to answer the questionnaire after six months and again after completing one year of activities in the program. Each nucleus operated in three state schools in the state of Sergipe, totaling 6 schools served by the 2 nuclei.

In total, 55 undergraduate students, 10 volunteers, and 45 as scholarship holders, participated in the application of the questionnaires divided into two stages, one applied at the end of the first module and the other applied at the end of the second module. All participants were undergraduates, between the 5th and 9th semesters, belonging to DLES/UFS, enrolled in undergraduate courses in Spanish and English, as well as in double major courses in

Portuguese/Spanish and Portuguese/English. The questionnaires aimed not only to monitor the activities of those involved in the program in question but also to exercise the continued practice of assessment and self-assessment in order to impact the meaning-making process regarding teacher education. Next, we present the analysis of the chosen excerpt for this work.

FROM EVALUATION TO CRITICAL REFLECTIVE RECONSTRUCTION

In our experience, and based on the data analyzed below, we perceive that the relationship built between the university and the school, in the context of the PRP, enhances a close connection with the school environment throughout the 18-month program. Thus, the graduate who undergoes the PRP experience encounters didactic situations beyond the classroom, which are not possible in the established practice when receiving trainees who fulfill the mandatory supervised internship. We can list some differences, but we emphasize here the workload, which, being greater in the program in question, allows pre-service teachers to experience situations within an extended school environment, such as monitoring the entire school year, participating in annual planning, and developing and implementing projects, among others.

The confidence and security that students feel in an environment with people they are familiar with is very different from that experienced when they are new among their peers, when they carry fears and shyness with them. These feelings emerge not only from teachers in initial training, inserted in a space, whose management must be assumed, but they deal with sensations that, sometimes, can also be assumed by the school teacher who, by imagining his practice outdated, feels judged and evaluated by those who arrive in your classroom updated on the new theories presented at the university. Therefore, one of the objectives of the project is to bring together the research that takes place at the university, and which generates updates to old actions, with those practiced in everyday school life, highlighting that it is possible to carry out research in and for the Basic Education school.

“There is a myth that research only occurs at the university and that schools should be mere receptacles of the results of investigations carried out in higher education institutions. In this line of thinking, the university produces knowledge, and schools use it” (Telles, 2002, p. 95).

We take a stance that is far from this myth, understanding that the construction of knowledge involves teachers in training and teachers in service at Higher Education and Basic Education institutions. Thus, by establishing as a relationship culture the possibility for everyone involved to carry out research collaboratively, we were able to notice differences between the answers given in the questionnaire in the first module compared to that in the second module.

For a better understanding of the mentioned context, the first evidence we found was the good relationship established among the project participants. We took question 20, from the questionnaire, as our initial analysis. In it, we asked “How do you assess the relationship between project participants?”, the students measured the relationships in the PRP as excellent, good, regular, poor, or very poor. These include: 1. Resident - Resident (pairs); 2. Resident - Preceptor; 3. Resident - Supervising Teacher; 4. Preceptor - Supervising Teacher; 5. Resident - Basic Education Student; 6. Preceptor - Basic Education Student. In the first module, the average of the relationships was evaluated as excellent or good by 94.3% of the participants, while in the second module, the residents pointed out between excellent and good for 97.4% of the items evaluated. In other words, as the program progressed, and even with the emergence of new challenges to be faced, the relationship among participants was perceived as improving.

We highlight relationship 5. Resident - Basic Education Student, which increased from 76.9% of responses indicating between excellent and good in the first module to 93.3% in the second. This perception may be linked to more time in the classroom, where undergraduates have more contact with students, fostering a good relationship, especially during the period of social distancing caused by Covid-19, which physically distanced the classroom relationship. Another possible factor that contributed to the improvement in the perception of the relationship between resident and Basic Education student was the good relationship established with the preceptor, a Basic Education teacher. To illustrate this analysis, we took the answers to question 21, where residents could subjectively detail how the relationships were assessed.

For this subjective question, we took the response from resident 1 – identities and school names will be preserved for ethical research reasons – in which he evaluates his relationship, at the end of the first module, with the preceptor who received him in Basic Education: “The preceptor has been present and helpful” (Resident 1's response, question 21, module 1). Although the feedback is positive, the student does not provide many details about the impact of the preceptor's presence and helpfulness on his formation. However, when the same student is questioned after another module of work at the school, his response is “We have an excellent relationship, information is conveyed in advance and clearly” (Resident 1's response, question 21, module 2).

It is worth noting that, even though it is not a long answer, the undergraduate student focuses his response on concrete actions to establish a connection between the preceptor's conduct in dealing with him and his pedagogical practices. Being in an environment where information is shared in advance and assertively reflects on the education of the involved teachers, as it mobilizes reflection in the exercise of social practices.

The feeling of commitment and organization helps residents connect with the project, as emphasized by an excerpt from resident 6: “Everyone involved in the project is very committed to what they do, and this makes everyone strive, discuss, reflect, and respect each other's space. Everyone is open to learning and teaching, with a lot of patience and understanding. I believe that all relationships are excellent because there is good communication, respect, and affection”. (Resident 6's response, question 21, module 1). In the following module, the same resident details her relationship with each project member, as we can read below: “I have nothing to complain about; everyone in the PRP team, from the supervising teacher to the students, is very charismatic. I have an excellent relationship; I've never had any problems. About the preceptor and the supervising teacher, they are very attentive, responsible, and organized. The girls are also welcoming and helpful”. (Resident 6's response, question 21, module 2).

Being professionals from the foreign language nuclei at UFS, another discussion arises when we bring evaluative aspects into consideration. When we view language as a social practice (Silva Júnior; Matos, 2019), we are led to reflect that language teaching from this perspective should involve the education of a critical citizen – both student and teacher – in an ongoing process. Hence the need for problematization regarding what the teacher understands by language, as this response defines the paths of their classes and their attitude in the environments and with the people in the school context.

In the quest for problematizing self-assessment, question 22 asked residents to reflect on their conduct in the project based on the following points: 1. Proactivity (not waiting for others); 2. Commitment (responsibility); 3. Organization (ability to plan); 4. Flexibility; 5. Sociability; 6. Availability; 7. Communication; 8. Productivity (focus and objectivity in actions); 9. Humility

(acknowledging mistakes); and 10. Systemic view (understanding the system we are part of, i.e., perceiving others and oneself). Graduates had to choose between the options: excellent; good; okay; bad; or terrible.

Between one module and another, there was an improvement in the self-assessment indices of the evaluated items, as the average of residents who marked excellent or good in the first module was 83.86%, and in the second module, it was 98.82%. We highlight item 5. Sociability, which went from 78.7% of responses as good and excellent to 100% in the two best evaluations offered, with 35.3% marking as good and 65.7% marking as excellent. Once again, we highlight how the passage of time in the program makes students feel more confident and interact better with others involved in the project, even during times of social distancing.

Analyzing critically and analytically our own performance and relationships with peers helps us trace the path that required – and still requires – deconstruction of the notion that we always need to learn to listen, to listen to ourselves, and “learn to hear oneself by listening” (Menezes de Souza, 2011, p. 132). Therefore, when residents are asked about their own professional action, at first, resident 1 responds that “The regency classes have contributed every day to my professional development” (Resident 1's response, question 23, module 1). But when he responds at a moment when greater pedagogical and professional maturity is expected compared to his entry into the program, the second module, he states that “Each teaching session is an opportunity to see how we are evolving professionally. A reflection of the preparation we are having at the university and in our preparation meetings. Certainly, direct contact with the classes will have a relevant impact on my professional life and that of my colleagues” (Resident 1's response, question 23, module 2), expanding the scope of his analysis.

Recognizing the impact of their choices and interactions, students realize that practical work is intertwined with theoretical and planning work, in building connections between what is discussed at the university and in the school, in an endeavor that requires dialogue and negotiation (Jucá, 2018). Having the autonomy to decide how each class would be conducted and/or adapted based on the teaching material, while respecting not only the local context of the students but also the fact that classes were remote, the students can prepare for the unexpected (Zacchi, 2015), and the act of self-assessment gauges the reach of the program in their education.

At the same time, some residents identified specific points that could be improved over the course of the project: “The point I can improve is to give more to the project. My strong point is the way I deliver the content at school...” (Resident 8's response, question 23, module 1). In the following module, the same resident objectively points out what he feels needs improvement: “My strong point is recognizing that I don't know everything 100%; I have room for improvement, and the area I should improve is in lesson planning” (Resident 8's response, question 23, module 2). Thus, the resident highlights a vulnerability, demonstrating a capacity for self-criticism.

As an act that can put those involved in a state of vulnerability, self-assessment requires humility and frankness, which is best utilized when immersed in an environment that leads to collaborative planning and teaching. This ensures that the definition of the next steps builds rich and affectionate practices, especially in a social period of distress and uncertainties.

By stating that “The mentor has always been very accessible to listen to our inquiries and to seek solutions to the problems that arose. He gave us total freedom in the production of learning guides, allowing us to choose the cross-cutting theme that we found most appropriate and the way we would work in the classroom” (Resident 2's response, question 21, module 1), resident 2 points

out how partnership work opens up space for democratic dialogue in which all voices resonate in consensus and dissent (Menezes de Souza, 2011).

The fact that the mentor respects the autonomy of the residents in planning and conducting classes problematizes the need for the teacher to abandon control of every pedagogical situation. Teaching indeed involves interaction and self-revisiting, questioning one's beliefs, and it is in the immersion provided in the school through the program that pre-service teachers develop and refine such a dynamic action.

After all, the insecurity of being judged by a more experienced teacher - the preceptor - was shared with the insecurity of having the 'doors' of the classroom open for those - residents - who arrive in an environment where the teacher defines the paths to follow without major interventions from colleagues. The ideas proposed by the residents could bring new tools to the mentors, and at the same time, the mentors could present paths of reflection that enthused the residents to expand their worldviews and weaken totalizing and binary truths.

Together, in an invitation to questioning absorbed by all who composed the program, pre-service teachers did not focus on predicting all situations that could happen during language learning moments. Instead, they understood that the nature of teaching is dealing with the unknown, the uncertain, and the unexpected (Zacchi, 2015), thus taking advantage of the rich context in which they were immersed.

A teaching practice that privileges and respects the repertoire of all involved recognizes the diversity of epistemologies that everyone possesses and their implications. Moreover, the desired outcome of language teaching also directly influences the choice of paths in the lessons. Thus, several questions arise for discussion, among which we highlight those related to our role in foreign language classes and, more than that, our goal in Brazilian public schools through work in a program that strengthens the relationship between Higher Education Institutions and Basic Education, like the PRP.

For resident 2, self-assessment is seen as a possible path towards teaching that does not privilege hierarchical and segregative notions, seeking to avoid silencing social groups whose existence is questioned and marginalized. In his words, “this self-assessment is very important for a good understanding of the main challenges and difficulties that everyone involved in the program is facing. I believe that my strengths relate to dedication and the fact that I am always open to dialogue for the better performance of teaching activities. I believe I could improve in terms of organization. I always deliver everything on the stipulated deadline, but I believe I could organize myself even more to fulfill tasks with even more speed” (Resident 2's response, question 23, module 2).

Resident 7's response makes us realize that the proposed self-assessment fulfilled its function of generating reflection on themselves: “I see self-assessment as a necessary and fundamental item. It makes us look inward and develop self-criticism. It helps me a lot to recognize flaws and always strive to improve and do better” (Resident 7's response, question 23, module 1). Thus, the resident began to look at himself, finding obstacles that go beyond theoretical and methodological barriers, especially during the pandemic when the program took place: “I am a very anxious person, this often hinders me, making my performance lower than my real potential” (Resident 10's response, question 23, module 1). Here, we emphasize the human and personal dimension that the teacher may face in their daily life.

The language teaching constructed in the interactions reported by resident 2 and resident

10 was based on the belief that

[...] the desired critique is not ready-made in the teaching materials, the teacher, the students, or the institution, but rather in the **relationship** that emerges between all these instances. It is up to the teacher to practice this problematizing attitude/stance in the gaps of their teaching practice, whenever they encounter them and find them relevant (Duboc, 2012, p. 96).

Thus, the recognition of weaknesses and strengths in their actions denotes a reflective and problematizing stance of someone who sees themselves as an eternal learner, ready to engage in the exchange of experiences for new meaning-making that the program can provide. The delineation of shared objectives among peers shows that, through access to the Spanish and/or English languages, all participants in the class are responsible for transforming worldviews through the social perception of collectivity and the formation of social commitment to others in various ways of constructing meanings.

Assessment and self-assessment can be seen, from this analytical perspective, as formative technologies that contribute to the pre-service teacher education of foreign language teachers. The systematic, critical, and reflective nature facilitated by the use of instruments such as the questionnaires applied at the end of two modules of the PRP at UFS reshape and monitor our choices and actions, aiming to recover successful actions and reflect on areas for improvement. This prompts reflections that prioritize the diversity of scenarios and opinions, especially in the new and uncertain context in which we were immersed during the Covid-19 pandemic.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS AND POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENTS

Despite all the limitations imposed by the pandemic, the program maintained its objective in pursuit of a situated pre-service teacher education, as pre-service teachers were challenged to teach remote classes, exploring the available digital resources. Another challenge encountered relates to the difficulty of evaluative follow-up after the completion of the residents' teacher education course, impacting the scope of our data.

However, from the analysis of the data generated by the questionnaires, pre-service teachers had the opportunity to self-assess and emphasized that the difficulties that arose were transformed into learning, as it amplified the experiences of teaching practice. The variability of responses in each module also points to the improvement of the reflective practice of those involved through readings and interactions provided by the program.

With the presented analyses, it is possible to affirm that we achieved the goal of having pre-service teachers exercise the continued practice of assessment and self-assessment in order to impact the construction of meanings regarding teacher education, as these residents were able to identify their achievements and weaknesses throughout the program. We highlight that sociability and relationships were enhanced throughout the project, showing that dialogue and negotiation,

advocated by Jucá (2018), were possible. Through the analyses, we were able to identify weaknesses and vulnerabilities pointed out by the residents themselves, such as needing to improve lesson plans or even anxiety hindering the progress of program activities. In any case, we can point out that the residents were supported by the preceptors, as well as the coordinating teachers of the nuclei, in a way that respects the autonomy of the residents and their construction of teaching practices in the classroom.

In accordance with all that has been exposed, we emphasize that the PRP has become a fundamental part of the teacher education process, as we observed the importance of the presence of programs like this for future teachers to gain not only more experience but truly meaningful experiences, experiences that result in meaning, confidence, and autonomy to teach their classes. Furthermore, the evaluative process also fell under our purview in order to create strategic alternatives for monitoring the residents, to seek to meet their needs, whether they are more objective or encompassing their intersubjectivities.

REFERENCES

- CAPES-COORDENAÇÃO DE APERFEIÇOAMENTO DE PESSOAL DE NÍVEL SUPERIOR. *Edital N° 1/2020*. Processo N° 23038.018770/2019-03. Programa de Residência Pedagógica. Brasília, DF: CAPES, 2020. Disponível em: <https://www.gov.br/capes/pt-br/centrais-de-conteudo/06012020-edital-1-2020-resid-c3-aancia-ped-ag-c3-b3gica-pdf>. Acesso em: 1 mar. de 2024.
- DUBOC, Ana Paula Martinez. Atitude curricular: letramentos críticos nas brechas da formação de professores de Inglês. 2012. 246f. Tese (Doutorado em Letras) - Faculdade de Filosofia, Letras e Ciências Humanas, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, SP, 2012.
- FERNANDES, Cláudia; FREITAS, Luiz Carlos. Indagações sobre currículo. *In: BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Currículo e avaliação*. Brasília, DF: Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Básica, 2008. p. 17-41,
- GATTI, Bernardete A. Formação de professores no Brasil: características e problemas. *Educação & Sociedade*, Campinas, SP, v. 31, n. 113, p. 1355-1379, out./dez. 2010.
- HODGES, Charles; MOORE, Stephanie; LOCKEE, Barbara B., TRUST, Torrey; BOND, Aaron. The Difference Between Emergency Remote Teaching and Online Learning. **Educause Review**, 27 de março de 2020. Disponível em: <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning>. Acesso em: 28 out. 2023.
- JUCÁ, Leina. Estágio supervisionado de Língua Inglesa: construindo caminhos alternativos para a formação de professores. *In: JORDÃO, Clarissa Menezes; MARTINEZ, Juliana Zeggio; MONTE MÓR, Walkyria (org.). Letramentos em prática na formação inicial de professores de Inglês*. Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores, 2018. p. 107-134.
- LAKATOS, Eva Maria; MARCONI, Marina de Andrade. *Fundamentos da metodologia científica*. 5. ed. São Paulo: Atlas, 2003.

LUCKESI, Cipriano. *Avaliação da aprendizagem*: componente do ato pedagógico. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011.

LUCKESI, Cipriano. Heteroavaliação, auto-avaliação e avaliação por opinião: cuidados metodológicos necessários. *In*: LUCKESI, Cipriano. *Luckesi - avaliação em educação, blog*. Salvador, 13 jul. 2016. Disponível em: <http://luckesi.blogspot.com/2016/07/110-heteroavaliacao-auto-avaliacao-e.html>. Acesso em: 11 set. 2022.

MENEZES DE SOUZA, Lynn Mário. Para uma redefinição de letramento crítico: conflito e produção de significação. *in*: MACIEL, Ruberval Franco; ARAUJO, Vanessa de (org.). *Formação de professores de línguas*: ampliando perspectivas. Jundiaí: Paco Editorial, 2011. p. 128-140.

MOITA LOPES, Luiz Paulo. Pesquisa interpretativista em Linguística Aplicada: a linguagem como condição e solução. *DELTA*: documentação de estudos em Linguística Teórica e Aplicada, São Paulo, SP, v. 10, n. 2, p. 329-338, 1994. Disponível em: <https://revistas.pucsp.br/delta/article/view/45412>. Acesso em: 5 nov. 2023.

ROSA, Acassia dos Anjos Santos; BARRETO, Juliana Pereira Souto. Multiletramentos no Programa Residência Pedagógica de línguas estrangeiras. *Revista Fórum Identidades*, Itabaiana, SE, v. 37, n. 1, p. 153–167, 2023. DOI: 10.47250/forident.v37n1.p153-167. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.ufs.br/forumidentidades/article/view/v37p153>. Acesso em: 18 nov. 2023.

SILVA JÚNIOR, Antônio Carlos Da Silva; MATOS, Doris C. V. da Silva. Linguística Aplicada e o SUEar: práticas decoloniais na educação linguística em espanhol. *Revista Interdisciplinar SUEar*, Ibirité, MG, ano 2, n. 2, p. 101-116, 2019. Edição Especial Dossiê SUEar.

TELES, Gildete C. N. S.; BARRETO, Juliana P. Souto; GUIMARAES, Mariana de Oliveira; COSTA, Milena Santana. Inglês com música - além do *fill in the blanks*: experiências remotas. *In*: MAYNARD, Dilton C. S.; COSTA, Patrícia R. S. M.; AZEVEDO, Ana Maria L. (org.). *Formação docente no Programa Residência Pedagógica*: relatos de experiências colaborativas da UFS com educação básica: livro de resumos. São Cristóvão: Editora UFS, 2022b. p. 22-26.

TELES, Gildete C. N. Santos; SANTANA, Luíza S.; SANTOS, Lucas N. Alves dos; CARDOSO, Lucas S. P.; BARRETO, Juliana P. Souto. Aprender a ser no ensino de inglês: experiências remotas. *In*: MAYNARD, Dilton C. S.; COSTA, Patrícia R. S. M.; AZEVEDO, Ana Maria L. (org.). *Formação docente no Programa Residência Pedagógica*: relatos de experiências colaborativas da UFS com educação básica. São Cristóvão: Editora UFS, 2022a. v. 1, p. 145-156.

TELLES, João A. “É pesquisa, é? Ah, não quero não, bem!” sobre pesquisa acadêmica e sua relação com a prática do professor de línguas. *Revista Linguagem & Ensino*, Pelotas, RS, v. 5, n. 2, p. 91-116, 2002.

ZACCHI, Vanderlei J. Esperando o inesperado: formação de professores numa era de incertezas. *In*: ZACCHI, Vanderlei J. (org.). *Língua e literatura na época da tecnologia*. Florianópolis: EDUFSC, 2015. p. 259-276.