Changes in the curriculum of a septuagenarian school: a study on the frameworks of higher education courses in Physical Education of the ESEF/UFRGS

Alex Branco Fraga[*]
Felipe Wachs[**]
Rute Viégas Nunes[***]
Cibele Biehl Bossle[****]
Ana Paula Pagliosa Bastos[*****]
Felipe Freddo Breunig[******]

Abstract: This article is based on a study about the Physical Education Curricula for Higher Education at the ESEF/UFRGS in its 70 years of existence. The general goal was to show elements that rendered important curricular changes through this time. Therefore, we made a mapping of the curriculum from 1941 to 2010 based on the following documents: records of degrees, course catalogues, and the UFRGS website, among others. Based on the documental analysis, we highlight six points of tension that were constituted from, and at the same time rendered, important curricular changes: (1) the ESEF's curricula and the educational regulatory mark; (2) linking of subjects to different departments; (3) separation of the curricular paths of men and women; (4) proportion between required and elective subjects; (5) emergence and expansion of required teaching practice; (6) the strengthening of research at basic training. In this article, we focused on the first point as it covers the entire period studies and deeply relates to the others. We concluded that the tension pressed by the educational regulatory mark in courses of the ESEF/UFRGS was stronger in 3 major moments: The school's federalization in 1970, the curricular changes of 1987, and the division of the teaching course/baccalaureate in 2005.

Key Words: Physical Education, Curriculum, Professional Formation.

1 INTRODUCTION

[*]Professor of the School of Physical Education and the Graduate Studies Program in Human Movement Science at the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil. E-mail: brancofraga@gmail.com
[**]Physical Education Teacher, Specialist in Body and Health Pedagogy and Mental Health, Master in Human Movement Sciences, PhD in Human Movement Science. E-mail: felipewachs@hotmail.com
[***]ESEF/UFRGS e-mail: rutebit@yahoo.com.br
[****]PhD Student in the Graduate Program in Human Movement of the ESEF/UFRGS, Master in Human Movement Science, Specialist in Sports and Exercise Psychology, Physical Education Graduate and Scholarship Member of the CAPES S. E-mail: cibele.bossle@terra.com.br
[*****]Physical Education Teacher, Specialist in Body and Health Pedagogies and Master's Degree Student in the Graduate Program in Human Movement Sciences of the UFRGS. E-mail: pagliosabastos@yahoo.com.br
[******]Undergraduate Student in Physical Education, Member of the PET, ESEF/UFRGS. E-mail: felipefreddo@hotmail.com

The year 2010 marked the 70th anniversary of the beginning of activities in the School of Physical Education of the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (ESEF/UFRGS). The UFRGS Core of the CEDES[1] Network, composed of several research groups, and under funding by the Ministry of Sports, has developed the project *Escola de Educação Física da Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (1940-2010): mapeando cenários da formação profissional e da produção do conhecimento em políticas públicas de esporte e lazer* (School of Physical Education of the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (1940-2010): mapping scenarios for training and production of knowledge in public policy for sports and leisure)[2], whose main goal was to examine the role of the ESEF/UFRGS in the development of Physical Education, Sport and Leisure at the local, regional and national levels. The Education Policies in Health and Physical Education (POLIFES) study and research group had to investigate significant moments in the curricular history of Physical Education (PE) courses offered by the ESEF[3] over this period.

Besides being the year of the 70th anniversary, 2010 was also the year in which the ESEF community defined the outlines of a new curriculum for higher education courses in PE. The Unit Council of the School of Physical Education (CONSUN) approved the general principles contained in the letter sent by the curricular restructuring committee designated by the School Board, in which it indicated the need to build a unified curriculum that would allow the dual mode of education (Licentiate Degree/Bachelor's Degree) in a single PE course. Thus, the performance possibilities of undergraduates would be extended, still accommodating the demands of the contemporary professional field and the guidelines for higher education in the area. The process underway, with completion scheduled for 2011 and deployment for freshmen in 2012, was triggered by the effects generated in the field of professional training in our state since the implementation of the Bachelor's Degree course in Physical Education Bachelor's Degree in the ESEF, in 2005, in line with the National Curriculum Guidelines for undergraduate courses in PE (FILIPPINI; DIEHL, Frizzera, 2010). Since then, discussions about the training division in the area in two separate licenses (Licentiate Degree/Bachelor's Degree) and protests against this model – most of them by the

[1] Development Centers of Recreational Sports and Leisure (CEDES) are part of a program activity of the Ministry of Sport, managed by the Secretariat of National Sports Development and Leisure. They gather higher education institutions that make up the core of the network. Available at: <http://www.esporte.gov.br/sndel/esporteLazer/cedes/apresentacao.jsp> Retrieved: Oct. 21st. 2010.

[2] Projeto ESEF 70 anos. Porto Alegre: UFRGS, 2010. Available at: <http://www.esef.ufrgs.br/ceme/projetos/esef70anos/equipe.php> Retrieved: Feb. 19th, 2010.

[3] Since we are referring exclusively to the School of Physical Education of the UFRGS this article, we will refer to it simply as the ESEF.

student movement – were intensified. A “cultural melting pot” that led this septuagenarian school community to invest heavily in developing a more profound change in the curriculum of their university courses in PE.

For those who live intensely in the daily life of this process within the ESEF, the impression is that we are facing one of the best moments in its history. Given the intensity of events, it is very likely that future research on the period will, no doubt, confirm such predictions. But, for this, it is necessary to point out other unique moments in the curricular history of this long-living institution – many no longer so visible to the ESEF contemporary community due to the “lack of studies that reconstitute its memory” (MAZO, 2005, p. 144).

In *Memórias da Escola Superior de Educação Física da Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (ESEF/UFRGS): um estudo do período de sua fundação até a federalização (1940-1969* (Memoirs of the School of Physical Education of the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (ESEF/UFRGS): a study of the period from its foundation to its federalization (1940-1969)), Janice Mazo (2005) tries to fill part of this deficiency. Although it is not her primary goal, the author offers a substantial contribution about the early history of this institution, which was the first one for training physical education teachers in Rio Grande do Sul and one of the first ones in the country. This fact indicates not only the relevance of the ESEF in the local, regional and national scenario at the time, but also that the curricular changes introduced in it strongly affected the PE structure in the state. And for being the only training institution in the area for thirty years (MAZO, 2005), one can assume that any change affected the area in, perhaps, a more intense than today.

The intent here is not to assess the degree of importance of this or that moment in the 70 years of curricular history of the ESEF. Such an undertaking is unattractive from the point of view of studies on the curriculum and unproductive for the reconstitution of the institutional memory, and would require wider limits than those set for the articles comprising this special issue of Revista Movimento. To take account of the investigative task that fit into the “ESEF 70 years” project, we found more prudent to deal with elements that highlight the striking curriculum changes in the higher education curricula in PE. To this end, we decided to work with documentary analysis from the reconstitution of the curriculum frameworks of the period, going from 1941, the year a higher education course in PE in the ESEF was offered for the first time, to 2010.

The assembly of the curriculum frameworks from 1941 to 2010 was done in two steps. First, we collected almost all the frameworks of the last forty years. This period is almost complete in the "Undergraduate Course Catalogue" available at the Central Library of the UFRGS and in the webpages of the university. To remount the frameworks of the previous periods, however, it was necessary to use other strategies. We invested in the research about the material available in the collection of the Memorial Center of Sport (CEME), basically, the records of degrees, and through them, we mapped the courses taken by students in first, second and third grades of each school year.

In this mapping process, we were faced with an unusual number of factors: concepts that sounded strange to contemporary ears, the appearance and disappearance of subjects in a given period, and the complete absence of information about some times. The latter, despite our efforts and the collaboration of the technical staff from the record sectors of the University, resulted in a lapse of information for years 1958, 1959 and between 1963 and 1972.

It is important to point out that the reconstitution of frameworks worked as a survey of the disciplines offered in the period, which allowed us to systematize the research on curricula within the "ESEF 70 years" Project in six "stress points" that were formed from, and mobilized at the same time, important curricular changes: 1) curricula of the ESEF and the educational regulatory framework; 2) linking of disciplines to different departments; 3) separation of curricular paths of men and women, 4) proportionality between required and elective subjects; 5) appearance and expansion of required internships; 6) strengthening of research in basic training.

We decided to call our findings "stress points" because they did not appear as isolated data awaiting collection or linear events ready to be listed, but as a web full of confluences in which only some of its wires allow us to go by. For covering the whole period and interacting with others thicker stress points, we committed ourselves, in this paper, to examine only the first one: the relationship between education regulatory framework and most significant structural changes in the courses of the ESEF.

2 AN OVERVIEW OF CURRICULUM STUDIES

Curriculum is a common word in the contemporary educational environment, but it is a very new concept in educational theory. The Interactive Dictionary of Brazilian Education presents a very concise entry on the term: "a set of subjects on a particular course or instruction program or the trajectory of an individual for their professional development" (MENEZES, SANTOS, 2002). Zotti (2006), author of another entry for the website *Navegando pela História da Educação Brasileira*, explains the etymology: "The word curriculum comes from the Latin word *scurrere* ("to run") and refers to a course, a career or a journey that must be taken." According to Silva (2001), in turn, curriculum is a word that comes from the Latin *curriculum*, and means "racetrack". Seeking the etymology of the word is a good approximation strategy, but to have an idea of the circulating meanings, one must know a little about field production.

Despite controversies in the literature about the origin of the term and the "birth" of the field (TERIGI, 1996), most authors point *The curriculum*, a book by John Franklin Bobbitt, published in 1918 in the United States, as the forerunner of the studies exclusively dedicated to the topic (SACRISTÁN, 1998, SILVA, 2001, MOREIRA, 2002).

In a book originally published in 1991, Spaniard José Gimeno Sacristán (1998) gives an overview of the term in the American literature, based on Rule's PhD Thesis[4] (produced in the early 70s) and in Schubert's work [5] (published in the mid-80s). The first author cited by Sacristán indicates two groups of meaning in the analyzed works: 1) "curriculum as a guide of the experience that students have at school [...] 2) as the definition of content for education, such as *plans* or programs, specification of objectives" (SACRISTÁN, 1998, p. 14). The second author quoted by Sacristán presents "images" about curriculum that fulfill the specialized thought, including: "a set of knowledge or subjects to be overcome by the student [...] program of planned activities, properly sequenced, methodologically sorted [...] as tasks and skills to be mastered – such as vocational training" (1998, p. 14).

Within the Brazilian context, an important review was made in the e-book *Sentidos de currículo: entre linhas teóricas, metodológicas e experiências investigativas* (Curriculum meanings: among theoretical, methodological lines and investigative experiences) (OLIVEIRA; AMORIM, 2006), a gathering of texts commissioned by the coordination of Working Group (WG) Curriculum of the National Association for Graduate

[4] RULE, I. *A philosophical inquiry into the meaning(s) of 'curriculum'*. New York University, 1973.
[5] SCHUBERT, W. *Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm and possibility*. Nueva York. Macmillan Pub. Comp., 1986.

Studies and Research in Education (ANPED) for its 28th annual meeting in 2005. There, the plurality of theoretical references, methodological strategies and analytical developments highlighted the multiple meanings of the word curriculum in the contemporary "state of the art", something which was also found in a review article by Antonio Flavio Moreira (2002), on the papers presented in the same WG between years 1996 and 2000.

To Flávia Terigi (1996), the extension of the concept of curriculum found in specific literature leads us to believe that all that is done in education is the curriculum. Later she says that "the analysts coincide in describing the field in a situation of 'boom' in the sense that it has reached a state in which everything that happens in school institutions and the education system is, in an undifferentiated way, the *curriculum*" (TERIGI, 1996, p. 161). This dispersion is closely related to theoretical concepts underlying curriculum production. According to Tomaz Tadeu da Silva, there are four dominant views in the theorization of curriculum:

> 1) the traditional, humanistic, based on a conservative conception of (fixed, stable, inherited) culture and knowledge (as fact, as information) ;[...] 2) the technical, in many respects similar to the traditional, but emphasizing the instrumental, utilitarian and economic dimensions of education; 3) the critique, with a neo-Marxist orientation, based on an analysis of school and education as institutions for the reproduction of class structures of capitalist societies; [...] 4) the post-structuralist, which incorporates and reworks some of the analysis of the neo-Marxist critical tradition, emphasizing the curriculum as cultural practice and a signification practice (SILVA, 1999, p. 12-13).

At the same time the "boom" of curriculum production in recent years broadened the scope of specialized theorization about the subject, it also contributed to the emergence of study niches such as, for example, dealing with professional training curricula in a specific area. In the case of PE, such niche emerges in the late 80s, partly due to the effects generated by normative acts that changed the educational landscape of the vocational training area in 1987 and gained strength in the early 2000s, when the new curriculum guidelines for undergraduate courses in physical education and for training of Basic Education[6] teachers heated of the discussions about the professional qualification and the possibilities of performance in the job market.

[6] Available at: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=12991>. Retrieved: Dec. 18th, 2010.

3 STUDIES ON THE PHYSICAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM

The PE professional training courses in Brazil date back to the "first decades of the twentieth century in short courses geared primarily to the training of the military" (BENITES; SOUZA NETO, HUNGER, 2008, p. 346). We can assume that even then the area struggled with a basic curriculum question: "what' students should learn to become instructors/teachers. Although there has been, since then, a concern about the development of curricula, research on "how they are made" and "what they did (and do)" is very recent in the PE area.

To have an idea of the PE production on this topic, we did a search on electronic databases of national journals of the area[7]: Movimento, Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte (RBCE), Motriz, Pensar a Prática, Revista da Educação Física da UEM and Revista Brasileira de Educação Física e Esporte (RBEPE). Besides these, we also analyzed the database of the Scientific Electronic Library Online [8] (SciELO).

This survey revealed several approaches to studies on the subject curriculum and the use of different methodological approaches: document analysis, content analysis, literature review, oral testimony, maps, structured interviews, and semi-structured narrative, among others. Some deal with analyzing the curricula of primary schools, but most are limited to examining higher education in PE, curriculum guidelines for undergraduate courses, curriculum modifications for certain courses, assessment of academic background, and the profile of PE professionals.

Within this revisional clipping, we found 25 articles[9] that deal with curriculum topics relating to higher education in PE. Of these, few examine the educational normative acts they produced (and which, at the same time, reflected) important changes in the way of conceiving and making the curriculum for higher education in PE. On the UEM's Revista de Educação

[7] The search was carried out in these journals, using the descriptor "*currículo*" ("curriculum") in the "subject" field or "index terms" or "general search", according to the characteristics of each database. The selection criteria of journals were the following: ranking on the Quali-Capes list of Physical Education; scope covering the teaching area; and tradition in PE.

[8] In the SciELO database, we used the descriptor "currículo" ("curriculum") and refined the search with the descriptor "*educação física*" ("physical education"). We chose this database because it brings together a large number of journals well indexed on the Qualis-Capes list in the Education area.

[9] We found no article in the database by Revista Brasileira de Educação Física e Esporte through the use of the descriptor "*currículo*".

Física, we highlight two [10]: *Análise crítica do currículo das disciplinas práticas do curso de educação física da Universidade Estadual de Maringá* (A critical review of the curriculum in practices of the physical education course from the State University of Maringá), in which Amauri Bassoli de Oliveira (1989) analyzes the concepts of education, sport and class resulting from the experience gained by students in practical training of the PE curriculum of the UEM: and *Análise dos currículos de Ed. Física no Brasil: contribuições ao debate* (Analysis of Physical Education curricula in Brazil: contributions to the debate), in which Celi Taffarel (1992) makes a panoramic analysis of the discussions on the PE curriculum in the three levels of education provided at that time (1st, 2nd, and 3rd grades) and examines the possibilities of intervention of the student movement in matters of curriculum scope.

On the RBCE, two articles are closely connected with this topic: *Memória do currículo de formação profissional em educação física no Brasil* (Memory of the professional training curriculum in physical education in Brazil) (AZEVEDO; MALINA, 2004), which deals with the continuities and discontinuities in the curricular changes that occurred in 1969 and 1987 in the undergraduate course in PE, from the creation of the National School of Physical Education and Sports in Rio de Janeiro; and *A formação do profissional de educação física no Brasil: uma história sob a perspectiva da legislação federal no século XX* (Training of physical education professionals in Brazil: a story from the perspective of the federal legislation in the twentieth century) (SOUZA NETO et al., 2004), in which the authors sought to identify aspects that contributed to the constitution of the PE field in Brazil in the twentieth century, as well as changes in the educational regulatory framework between the years 1939 and 1987.

On Revista Motriz, two articles stand out. One is *Educação Física na UNESP de Rio Claro: Bacharelado e Licenciatura* (Physical Education at the UNESP, Rio Claro: Bachelor's Degree and Licentiate Degree), by José Maria de Camargo Barros (1995). It discusses the impact of Resolution 03/1987 of the Federal Council of Education (CFE), referring to the restructuring of undergraduate courses in physical education and advocates the division Bachelor's Degree/Licentiate Degree, as they were implemented at the UNESP at the time, as the best way to cope with the gradual expansion of the professional field outside school. The other article is *Teoria da Formação e Avaliação no currículo de Educação Física* (Theory of

[10] The articles by Amauri Bássoli de Oliveira (1989) and Celi Taffarel (1992) are not available in full at the website of Revista de Educação Física of UEM; there are only a summary of each. These articles were consulted in their entirety in printed version.

Training and Evaluation in the Physical Education curriculum), by Fuzii, Souza Neto, Benites (2009), which also examines the PE curricula of the UNESP, but focuses on changes to the undergraduate course, due to the establishment of curriculum guidelines for undergraduate courses in PE and to train teachers in Basic Education between the years 2002 and 2004.

Revista Movimento, probably due to the higher number of articles published on this subject, shows a greater variety of approaches. Among the items found in this journal, we highlight: *Currículo, formação profissional na educação física & esporte e campos de trabalho em expansão: antagonismos e contradições da prática social* (Curriculum, professional training in physical education & sport and work fields in expansion: antagonisms and contradictions of social practice), by Celi Taffarel (1997), as it shows the links among curriculum projects in PE in Brazil and the historical project of capitalism, and presents strategies for curriculum reform of professional training in the dialectical materialist perspective; *A evolução dos esportes de combate no currículo do Curso de Educação Física da UFRGS* (The evolution of combat sports in the curriculum of the Physical Education Course of the UFRGS), by Rodrigo Trusz and Alexandre Nunes (2007), which retrieves information about inclusion and evolution of fighting subjects in the undergraduate PE course of the ESEF.

In the SciELO database, we found the article *Caracterização dos currículos de formação profissional em Educação Física: um enfoque sobre saúde* (Characterization of professional training curricula in physical education: a focus on health) (BRUGNEROTTO; SIMÕES, 2009), in which the authors analyze the concept of health of political and pedagogical projects of the 12 PE courses (six Bachelor's Degree and six Licentiate Degree degrees) in six public universities in the state of Paraná and relate theoretical concepts found in national guidelines for undergraduate courses in health.

Despite the diversity of topics, it is remarkable that the papers published in this collection of scientific PE journals do not dialogue with the literature on curriculum produced by area[11], often not even within the journal on which they are published, which denotes the low valuation of a systematic review by the authors. Furthermore, the use of the word curriculum is quite "free", largely because of the diversity of theoretical and methodological

[11] This lack of connection to the specialized field of curriculum studies has been identified by Claudio Lúcio Mendes in a review article (MENDES, 2005).

strategies, but also due to poor analytical connection with works of the specialized field of curriculum studies.

Since we are interested in a very timely way in the curriculum history of the ESEF, we seek, on the previously mentioned journals, and in the SciELO database, articles that dealt more specifically with the ESEF [12] and we found 12. Of this set, three articles published on Revista Movimento (GOELLNER et al. 2005, MAZO, 2005, NUNES; MOLINA NETO, 2005), they indirectly address issues related to the curriculum of higher education PE courses, and only one, published in 2006 on Revista Pensar a Prática, is directly linked to the curriculum of the ESEF: *"Alinhamento astral": o estágio docente na formação do licenciado em educação física na ESEF/UFRGS* ("Astral alignment": the teaching stage in the training of licentiates in physical education at the ESEF/UFRGS), by Rute Nunes and Alex Fraga.

It is important to point out that a review of the literature in databases allows us to address the discussion, find theoretical and methodological frameworks, and see how the authors take a position on the subject from sources deemed reliable, regardless of how extensive, does not cover all that has already been produced. There is a range of materials available in journals that are not indexed in databases, in addition to those that only appear in print, which are not visible to the electronic literature review. In this light, we turn to other search engines to try to find texts that could be important to the study we did. Among other articles found, we highlight two of the review that helped us to map the relations in the production field of the curriculum: *O campo do currículo e a produção curricular na educação física nos anos 90* (The field of the curriculum and physical education curriculum production in the 90s), by Claudio Lúcio Mendes (2005), published on Revista Arquivos em Movimento; and *A Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte e a formação profissional em Educação Física* (Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte and the professional training in Physical Education), by Francisco Souza, co-authored with Samuel de Souza Neto (2005), published on Revista Digital EF Deportes .

Both the literature review on the discussion of professional training curriculum in Brazilian PE and the more timely review of the articles that deal either directly or indirectly with the curricula of the ESEF allowed us to situate the research object in the context of discussions on curriculum studies and then move the analysis of moments in which the

[12] For this new search, we used the term "*Educação Física*" ("Physical Education") and then "ESEF/UFRGS".

regulatory framework of education demanded structural changes in the most significant the courses of the ESEF.

4 CURRICULUM OF THE ESEF AND THE EDUCATIONAL REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Amid the process of rebuilding the frameworks, and based on literature review, we were able to pinpoint the specific strength of normative acts in major curricular changes that occurred in the ESEF in the past 70 years. Due to this initial evidence, we try to examine discontinuities and/or disruptions perceived in the set of curriculum frameworks in correlation to the educational regulatory framework of periods considered remarkable.[13]

The ESEF started its activities in 1940. It was created by the State Department of Physical Education (DEEF), a technical agency under the Ministry of Education of the State of Rio Grande do Sul, which managed the school in its first 30 years (MAZO, 2005, GOELLNER et al., 2005). It was federalized by Decree-Law 62.997/1968 and effectively incorporated into the UFRGS in 1970. Its creation was closely linked to the requirement of PE under the Constitution of 1937[14] and Decree-Law 1.212/1939, which determined, as of the January 1, 1941, the requirement of the degree in PE to perform the task of the teacher of this subject in official establishments. It also provided, for primary education, the requirement of a normal school graduate degree in PE in cities with more than 50,000 inhabitants. This Decree-Law guided and standardized the creation of the ESEF and courses offered by it.

The first course was offered at the ESEF[15] was the Normal Course in Physical Education in 1940[16]. The following year, another four were added to the former: Degree in

[13] Souza Neto et al. (2004) discuss the implications of Decrees-Law 1212/1939 and 8270/1945 and Resolutions 69/1969 and 3/1987 in physical education in his article *"A formação do profissional de educação física no Brasil: uma história sob a perspectiva da legislação federal no século XX"* (Physical education professional training in Brazil: an overview from the perspective of the federal legislation in the 20th Century). This article was quite useful for us to analyze this period. However, in addition to these resolutions, we also analyzed Resolution 7/2004 of the CNE, relating to the curricular guidelines for undergraduate courses in PE and Resolutions 1 and 2/2002 of the CNE, instituting curricular guidelines for Basic Education teacher training.

[14] Article 131 of the Constitution of 1937 determined that "physical education, civic education and manual labor education shall be required in all primary, secondary and normal schools and no school in these classes shall be authorized or acknowledged without meeting this requirement" (BRASIL, 1937).

[15] Official authorization for the School's operation was granted by Decree 7.219/1941 of May 27, 1941 and, on May 16, 1944, Decree 15.582/1944 granted recognition to the School (MAZO, 2005).

Physical Education; Sports Technique Course; Training and Massage Course; and Physical Education and Sports Medicine Course. The five courses were provided for in Decree-Law 1212/1939, which stipulated entry requirements and qualifications conferred according to the table below:

COURSE	REQUIREMENT	DEGREE
PE college	Certificate of secondary school graduation	Licentiate Degree in PE
Normal course in PE	Normal school degree	Normal school graduate specializing in PE
Sports technique course	Certificate of secondary school graduation;[17]	Sports coach
Training and massage course	Certificate of secondary school graduation;	Coach and sports massage therapist
PE and sports medicine course	Medical degree	Physician specializing in PE and sports

Table 1 – Entry and Qualifications Requirements

Over the years, several courses were offered in the ESEF: Instructor of Military Physical Education, Recreation, Weapon Master, Rhythmic Gymnastics, and Dance, among others (GUTIERREZ, 1971). Currently, the school also houses the Bachelor's Degree course in Physical Therapy and Licentiate Degree course in Dance; extension courses, *lato sensu specialization* and the Masters/PhD courses in the Graduate Studies Program in Human Movement Sciences (PPGCMH), in addition to the undergraduate courses in PE, on which we focused the analysis in this section.

The first higher education training course in PE of the ESEF was structured on the basis of theoretical and medical-military organizational logic assumptions, as other PE courses created in the early twentieth century in Brazil. The faculty chosen to the subjects of the first higher education course of the ESEF, in 1941, was composed mainly of physicians, military physicians, and military instructors (BRAUNER, 1999, MAZO, 2005). The course had a total duration of two years, divided into two grades, predominantly with instrumentation practice

[16] Act 1.153/1950 of July 4, 1950 applies to students of the Normal Course in Physical Education graduated up to 1942 – benefits granted to Licentiates in PE. In the period preceding 1940, the content related to PE was taught by teacher trainers, as seen in details of the article of this journal (MAZO, 2005).

[17] For the two first years, there was no requirement regarding a secondary school course for the sports and technique and training – and massage – course for those who with evidence that they were already performing the activity, in a logic similar to that applied by the Federal Council of Physical Education for those working the area prior to regulation of the profession in 1998.

subjects. It is interesting to note that some of these subjects, even with slight changes in nomenclature and reorganization of content, still make up the curricula of PE courses of the ESEF.

Decree-Law 1212/1939 and Decree-Law 8270/1945, contrary to the resolutions that followed, had the particularity to determine the subjects that should be offered in the PE curriculum. Despite specifying the duration of the term and requiring a minimum frequency of students in them, the total number of credit hours that a course should have was not stipulated. The main difference between Decree-Law 1212/1939 and Decree-Law 8270/1945[18], in relation to the higher education course in PE is the addition of one school year. Although the third year was determined by Decree-Law 8270/1945, we found that it only became effective in the ESEF in the 60s. The inclusion of another year/grade, however, produced no significant changes in the contents of the subjects that made up the curriculum.

Moreover, we highlight two aspects of Decree-Law 1212/1939 related to the composition of the frameworks. The first is the determination of different curricular paths for men and women[19]; the second is the classification of subjects into three educational models: theoretical, exercises, and practice. It is in Article 25 of the decree that such planning is evident: "organization of physical education and sports and history of physical education and sports shall be given in lectures, rhythmic gymnastics, physical education and general sports, exercises, and other disciplines, in lectures and practical classes" (BRASIL, 1939). This writing indicates that the theory/practice binarity dates back to the beginnings of higher education in PE and indicates a difference in meaning between the terms "practice" and "exercise", something somewhat indistinguishable in the daily lessons of contemporary PE.

Two events in years 1969 and 1970 spurred major changes in the structure of the ESEF, significantly impacting on the frameworks of PE courses: 1) defining the minimum curriculum due to the 1968 University Reform[20]; and 2) the federalization of the School.

[18] By Decree-Law 8270/1945, the normal school course shall be called 'children physical education' (Article 4) and the sports technique course shall require a degree in physical education (Article 21) (BRASIL, 1945).
[19] This was one of the six stress points prospected in our empirical research documents, but will not be discussed in this article.
[20] According to Rothen (2008), "Act 5.540/1968 [University Reform] is, on the one hand, the fruit of discussions that were held on the university model to be adopted in Brazil – discussions that guided the action of the CFE in the judicial phase, as in the drafting of Decree-Law 53/1966 and 252/1967, on the other hand, inspired by the ambition of the military, through a centralized legislation, to *impose* a consensus on civil society regarding the university model and decrease internal resistance of universities to the military regime" (p. 471).

In the wake of the 1968 University Reform, the CFE issued Resolution 69/1969[21] that, based on Opinion 894/1969, stipulated a minimum curriculum for PE, grouping the subjects into three groups: biological basis subjects, teaching subjects, and gymnastic and sports subjects. Although the Law of Directives and Bases of Education of 1961 (Act 4024/1961) highlighted the importance of investing in a more pedagogically sustained training of teachers, Opinion 894/1969 referred to the low number of sports coaches to meet the demands of a growing field beyond school walls (BENITES; SOUZA NETO, HUNGER, 2008). The opinion indicated the incorporation of the qualification of "sports coaches" to the "Bachelor's Degree in PE" as a way of encouraging training of the former. The recommendation for incorporation was seen in Resolution 69/1969, and required courses to implement the two-subject choice mechanism for students, from the list of sports offered by the institution, leaving to them the option of each sport to be listed.

Resolution 69/1969, and Decree-Laws 1212/1939 and 8270/1945, determined a minimum list of subjects, but it opened up room for Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to complement the framework according to local peculiarities. The minimum curriculum for a higher education PE course prescribed in this resolution provided the following disciplinary groupings: 1) "basic subjects": Biology, Anatomy, Physiology, Kinesiology, Biometrics, and Hygiene, 2) "professional subjects": Urgent Aid, Gymnastics, Rhythmic, Swimming, Athletics, Recreation, and pedagogical subjects. The credit hours were set in 1800 for the degree in PE, with a minimum duration of three years and a maximum of five (BRASIL, 1969a).

The pedagogical subjects were specified in CFE Opinion 672/1969, while Resolution 9/1969 pointed to the indispensability of subjects such as Educational Psychology; Teaching; and Structure and Operation of Secondary School Teaching for the practice of teaching in secondary schools (BRASIL, 1969d). In observing this legal framework, these disciplines were added to the curriculum framework of the ESEF, making the school knowledge visible in the curriculum framework of that period.

In general, we can say that the incorporation of the training of sports coaches with a degree has widened the training of both. But instead of actually adding pedagogical knowledge to the training of sport coaches, and thus give more balance to the training of

[21] Although the literature and Resolution 3/1987 of the CFE make reference to Resolution 69/1969, we find the same normalization under the title "Resolution 12 of the CFE, of February 5th, 1970" (GUTIERREZ, 1971).

teachers, this movement ended up driving the annexation process which was known as "sportification" of the training of school PE teachers[22]. A process that would be further strengthened the enactment of Act 5692/1971 (LDB), and Decree 69.450/1971, where PE was treated as a school activity aimed at developing physical fitness. Appeals in favor of sports and a healthier physical condition[23] led to the training in PE, even as a Licentiate degree, more and more outside the school walls. Interestingly, the annexation of the coach and Licentiate training in PE at the moment ended up working for the gradual estrangement between those who worked inside and those who worked outside the school, which probably ended up strengthening the arguments in favor of a new division among the qualifications.

In addition to the normative acts that came on the heels of the 1968 University Reform, the process of federalization of the ESEF was also strongly reflected in the composition of the PE course curriculum framework of that period. With the incorporation of the School to the structure of the UFRGS, some subjects began to be taught by other units, new subjects were included in the curriculum, the course was organized into semesters, and with the requirement of PE for all undergraduate courses (defined by Decree-Law 705/1969), the ESEF started to offer courses throughout the University. PE became a cross curricular component in higher education, even if loosely articulated with pedagogical projects in other areas.

In the first half of 1987 the PE higher education course of the ESEF underwent another major curricular reform. That same year, on June 16th, the CFE approved Resolution 3/1987. Among many points, this resolution provided for the expansion of the credit hours from 1800 to 2800, granted greater autonomy to HEIs in the formulation of curriculum projects and – its most iconic issue – established the division of the PE course in a Bachelor's Degree[24] (AZEVEDO; MALINA, 2004, SOUZA NETO et. al., 2004, BENITES; SOUZA NETO; HUNGER, 2008).

The reformulation of the PE course of the ESEF that year was based on discussions by the ESEF community accumulated since at least the early 80s[25]. Such a big involvement enabled the ESEF to incorporate the discussion of the time about training courses inside and

[22] To learn more about the process of sportification in Brazilian PE, see Bracht (1997).

[23] To get an idea of the assumptions regarding physical fitness and health and relationship with lifestyle, see FRAGA, Alex B. *Exercício da informação: governo dos corpos no mercado da vida ativa*. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2006.

[24] About this division of Bachelor's Degree and Licentiate Degree degrees in PE, see the article of the Commission of Experts of SESu/MEC published on Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte, v. 18, n. 3, May, 1997, p 247-256.

[25] This movement by the ESEF community would somehow reflect the movement of the area in Brazil between late 70s and early 80s, which eventually ended up in Resolution 03/1987 (AZEVEDO; MALINA, 2004)

outside the school. From Resolution 3/1987, one of the requirements met was the increased number of credit hours, which made the course go from three to four years, divided into eight semesters, and made quite an impact in the framework structure and school infrastructure in the early years after implantation. But the most important decision for future curricular movements of the ESEF was another one: maintaining the supply of a single undergraduate course, despite the possibility of opening up the Bachelor's Degree

The prediction of such a possibility under Resolution 03/1987 led some HEIs from the center of the country, especially the state of São Paulo[26], to create Bachelor's Degree courses with the explicit intention of adapting the curriculum for technical and scientific training demanded by the labor market outside the school and the implicit intention of "decontaminating" the curricula of main pedagogical discussions for school PE[27].

The ESEF, in turn, decided to provide a degree of more general character, embracing in a single qualification what Resolution 03/1987 expected in two. It is quite possible that the division of training into two qualifications was suggested during the process of reformulation, because the first argument for the division of the course had already been "upgraded" since the approval of Resolution 69/1969, as discussed earlier, but it was not a dominant position in the School. Although the ESEF community's decision at that moment was the realization of the so-called "extended Licentiate Degree"[28], the relation of strengths between knowledge relating to school education in this wider setting, as had already occurred upon incorporation of sport coach training to the Licentiate degree under Resolution 69/1969, was gradually shifting to the outside of the school.

Besides the macro-structural issues triggered by the extended degree option, the 1987 curricular reform led to a change in "enrollment culture" in the disciplines of the PE course of the ESEF, since it gave students a list of elective subjects, leaving at the discretion of each

[26] The arguments that led some institutions from São Paulo to create the Bachelor's Degree can be found in the article *Educação Física na UNESP de Rio Claro: Bacharelado e Licenciatura*, by José Maria de Camargo Barros, published in Revista Motriz, in 1995.

[27] The following excerpt, taken from the article by Barros (1995), illustrates such intentions: "Until 1987, all undergraduate courses in Physical Education, we could say, were wearing a straitjacket imposed by the CFE, which restricted their ability to offer the Licentiate Degree course and, in addition, the Sports Coach training course" (p. 71).

[28] "Extended Licentiate Degree" was the term used by the PE field to refer to the Licentiate Degree curricula that gathered, in one only course, what Resolution 03/1987 provided in two: a Bachelor's Degree with a Licentiate Degree (SOUZA NETO et. al., 2004). Not to be confused with "full Licentiate Degree", which refers to teacher training for basic education at the university level in all areas, which was used in Act 5692/1971 to differentiate from the "short Licentiate Degree", with shorter duration and certification for specific performance in elementary school. Therefore, the term "extended Licentiate Degree" only makes sense in the specific context of PE. For the other areas, it sounds redundant.

one a definition of the paths they wanted to follow. Before the implementation of the extended Licentiate Degree, almost all ESEF students followed the same academic path during their undergraduate course.[29] After 1987, the scenario changed dramatically. The number of elective disciplines "hypertrophied" and the table was reversed[30]: for students to graduate, they were required to accomplish 74 required and 117 elective credits. This setting generated an unusual situation: all received the same degree, but few had followed the same curricular path. From 1987 onward, the relationship between required and elective subjects varied; it became more balanced at some times, less at others, but the elective curricular culture remained in the following overhaul.

In 2004, the ESEF community promoted a new wide curriculum reform. And this time, unlike what happened in 1987, the PE course was divided into two qualifications: Bachelor's Degree and Licentiate Degree, which became fully operational in 2005. After much time supporting PE training under one name, the ESEF ended up leaning more heavily in favor of the division when Resolution 7/2004, by the Board of Higher Education of the National Education Council (CNE), of March 31st. 2004, was approved, which established the curricular guidelines for undergraduate PE courses[31].

The reasons cited for division of the course were very similar to those that had been rejected by the 1987 reform, only this time they gained more strength in accordance with changes in the field under the rules of the PE profession, which occurred on September 1st, 1998 through the enactment of Act 9696/1998[32], establishing the image of a PE professional. In addition to the effects produced by regulation in the field, the approval of Resolutions 1/2002 and 2/2002 of the CNE, which established the National Curriculum Guide for Training of Basic Education Teachers, also contributed for the pro-Bachelor's degree movement within the ESEF to gain even more strength. These resolutions established, in a

[29] Differences in path in the period before 1987 were restricted to two elective disciplines included as a result of Resolution 69/1969 and the mechanisms of differentiation of paths for both men and women.

[30] This was another stress point prospected in empirical research, but that cannot be treated in this article in accordance with the limits for each article in this special issue.

[31] It is importantly to point out that the term "bachelor" does not appear in this resolution, but rather "Bachelor's Degree" and "Licentiate Degree" More details about the construction process of these guidelines can be found in Frizzo (2010).

[32] Promulgation of the law has generated many political clashes in the professional academic field of PE, and lately it has heated tempers among Licentiate Degree graduates and Bachelor's Degree graduates trained in the later period after 2004. For a better insight into major clashes in favor and against regulations, check website of the Federal Council of Physical Education (CONFEF) (Available at: <http://www.confef.org.br>. Retrieved: Nov. 24th, 2010) and the website of the National Movement Against the Regulation of Physical Education Professional (MNCR) (Available at: <http://mncref.sites.uol.com.br>. Retrieved: Nov. 25th, 2010).

forceful way, the contours of teacher training effectively targeted at Basic Education since the beginning of the course, giving no room for the existence of degree courses in which the profession was only an afterthought in the last semester, as an internship, as happened with the extended Licentiate Degree in the ESEF.

To be able to systematize so many changes, the UFRGS established the Coordination of Undergraduate Studies (COORLICEN), with the aim of proposing a unified reformulation for all Licentiate Degree courses at the University, with a planned joint deployment set for 2005. Between 2002 and 2003, with the "new Licentiate Degree"[33] in PE at sight, this time more focused on training teachers as from the first semester, the Undergraduate Studies Commission of the ESEF (COMGRAD)[34] began studies for creation of the Bachelor's Degree. The idea was to design a curriculum capable of supporting not only the PE professional training and the job market, but also to prepare the new researcher in the human movement sciences.[35] The approval of Resolution 7/2004 of the CNE/CES ended up rushing the whole process, leading COMGRAD to submit, and CONSUN to approve, both proposals later in 2004, expected to start in 2005.

The differences are notorious between the process of implementing the extended Licentiate Degree in 1987 and the implementation of Bachelor's Degree/Licentiate Degree degrees in 2005. Whereas in the former case the ESEF community spent nearly ten years discussing the curriculum structure that would be more suited to the profile of the established egress, the second case did not actually complete two years of discussion, which led to the formulation of curricula without broad domestic support, very stuck to the texts of guidelines and a structure almost identical to the extended Licentiate Degree in force until then. This "similarity" was used as one of the convincing arguments for accepting the proposal, but contrary to what one would expect, there could be more similarities between the curriculum of the "old Licentiate Degree" (endangered) and the structure provided by Resolution 7/2004 of the CNE/CES for the training of Bachelors (graduates) in PE than for the training of Licentiates in PE. It is interesting to note that, under the banner of the extended Licentiate Degree, the knowledge related to teacher training, as occurred with the incorporation of sports coach training in the Licentiate Degree in PE under Resolution 69/1969, was gradually

[33] Term used by the ESEF community to refer to the Licentiate Degree course that replaces a degree that is endangered.
[34] According to Minutes 08 of the Undergraduate Commission of the ESEF/UFRGS.
[35] It is important to remember that this concern was most evident with the implementation of the Master's Degree in 1989 and the PhD Degree in 2000.

relegated to the background; it was summed up in the middle of sports or biomedical disciplines.

In our analysis of curriculum frameworks, we identified that the endangered Licentiate Degree curriculum worked as a "mounting platform" of "new Licentiate Degree" and Bachelor's Degree curricula of the ESEF. The internal structure of most of the subjects offered for the new courses was not modified, only redistributed into the two curricula. In some cases the same subject changed in category only when it appeared in a framework or another: required for one course, elective for the other. There are other differences in the "body" of the curriculum such as, for example, the vast majority of required courses offered to the Licentiate Degree in PE by departments linked to the Education College (FACED) do not appear for Bachelor's Degree courses. But the biggest change was in the required internships at the end of the course. For the "new Licentiate Degree", 450 hours are distributed in three educational levels: kindergarten, primary school and secondary school[36]. For the Bachelor's Degree, 450 hours are also required, but they are divided according to the field of professional intervention: sports activities, physical activities, and health and recreational activities and leisure. The equivalence between the hours of internships in political and pedagogical projects of the two courses was a decision of the ESEF, since the respective guidelines required 400 hours for the Licentiate Degree and 300 hours for the Bachelor's Degree in PE.

There is no doubt that the curricular platform of the extended Licentiate Degree of 1987 was built over a solid and long process of discussion about the training courses in the ESEF during that period. Such consistency allowed the curriculum to cross over a decade without much questioning, with only occasional adjustments along the way. But when the curricular guidelines came in 2004, that "old" platform did not stand even the curriculum which had been built on itself, so it was not hard to imagine it would not bear the weight of two curricula for long. It did not take long for wearing signs to appear; and by 2007 the ESEF community began to put at stake the current curriculum planning. Since then, discussions have become increasingly fierce, many of them perpetrated by the student movement, providing considerable discussion ballast for the curriculum reform that is now unfolding.

[36] For more information about the changes in required internships check: *Os estágios de docência e a formação de professores em educação física: um estudo de caso no curso de licenciatura da EsEF/UFRGS* (NUNES, 2010).

5 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

To analyze in a scientific paper the 70-year curricular history of the ESEF is a risk. The period is too long, the empirical material is immense, the literature is voluminous, the views are endless, and the conclusions are invariably partial. To handle this enterprise with certain safety margin, we had to strategize, demarcate the path, review routes, and, mainly, establish cutouts that allowed us to somehow finish an investigation that initially seemed to never end.

We began by mapping the higher education courses offered by the school through the curriculum framework of the entire period. The vast majority was not available in full, which forced us to seek, in the CEME archive, sources such as degree records to somehow view the curriculum driven by students of that time. Nevertheless, we were unable to remount the frameworks of years 1958, 1959 and between years 1963 and 1972.

From what was possible to recover, we began to map the periods in which changes in frameworks were more outstanding. Next, we sought to establish the correlation among those temporally closer and then among those more distant. We conveniently grouped these changes into six major topics which we called “stress points” as we felt that they not only were formed from major changes in the curriculum, but they also mobilized them.

The stress points were made based on the internal coordination level and degree of intensity that affected the curricular structure of the ESEF over the years: some more, some less. And as it was not possible to examine one by one, we opted for one that pervaded the whole period and was linked more densely with the others: the relationship among different PE higher education courses offered by the ESEF and corresponding educational normative acts.

As we examined this point, we noted that the pressure exerted by the educational regulatory framework on training courses of the ESEF was more intense in three major phases: the federalization of the School in 1970, the curricular changes in 1987, and the Licentiate Degree/Bachelor’s Degree division in 2005. Each with its own characteristics of its time, but tinged with some common disputes concerning the validation of knowledge within the area.

In general, the federalization process of the ESEF occurred in the wake of the process of deployment of the University Reform – an events that caused very deep structural changes throughout the School. Specifically, the approval of Resolution 69/1969 also caused changes

in the provision of the curricular framework of the ESEF. Among many measures, it determined the incorporation of sports coach training to the Licentiate Degree – an annexation movement that extended training in higher education and pointed out didactic and pedagogic knowledge toward the school environment.

In 1987, Resolution 3/1987 of the CFE allowed for the possibility of separation of Bachelor's Degree and Licentiate Degree courses in PE in order to meet the demands of a labor field expanding outside the school. The ESEF community, unlike what happened in universities at the center of the country, decided to keep a more general training with the proposition of the "extended Licentiate Degree degree". Although the decision was made in favor of a more didactic and pedagogical training, the relation of strengths within the knowledge related to school education in this extended setting, contrary to what one might suppose, was gradually shifting to the outside of the school .

In 2004, under the influence of new curriculum guidelines for undergraduate courses in PE (Resolution 7/2004 of the CNE/CES) and the training of Basic Education teachers (Resolutions 1/2002 and 2/2002 of the CNE), the ESEF decided to create a Bachelor's Degree and reshape the Licentiate Degree. The arguments rejected in 1987 by the ESEF community came back with all their strength at that time, affected by the enactment of Act 9696/1998 which established the rules of the profession. After nearly 20 years, the extended Licentiate Degree initiated to become extinct in the ESEF, but the curricular platform that supported it went on supporting the two new courses. Very shortly thereafter, the first "gaps" in the frameworks of the "new Licentiate Degree" and Bachelor's Degree started to appear.

In 2010, after a series of debates by the student movement (FILIPPINI; DIEHL, FRIZZERA, 2010), the CONSUN of the ESEF approved the general principles contained in the letter drafted by the curriculum restructuring committee, triggering a curriculum rebuilding process, providing dual training mode (Licentiate Degree/Bachelor's Degree) in a single PE course.

This is a relatively new movement within the context of PE education, but mobilized by a common element for the previous processes of reformulation: disputes in the field of professional practice among the "tribes"[37] of school PE and "tribes" from outside school for the validation of knowledge that they are responsible for: Licentiates versus Bachelors, or

[37] Expression coined by Hugo Lovisolo (2000) to refer to the various groups inhabiting the PE area.

teachers versus professionals – a fratricidal conflict that feeds off the division of the course, but is not necessarily appeased by a simple course unification.

Unlike what happened with the previous processes of reformulation, here the ESEF is not being pressured to change because of a specific educational legislation. The mobilization emanates mainly from the shortcoming of much of the ESEF community with the current curriculum structure and discrimination in the exercise of professional qualifications imposed by Act 9696/1998, which regulates the PE profession.

It will certainly not be easy, as it never was in the history of the ESEF, to produce a curriculum that addresses the peculiarities of our time, prepares future generations to face the changing work world, and preserves the tradition of the School. But the ballast of discussions produced, regardless of positions for or against the Bachelor's Degree/Licentiate Degree division, leaves no doubt about the need to abandon the "old" curricular platform that has sustained ESEF curricula for the last 20 years. And that alone makes us think that the process experienced by the School in the first decade of this century, though turbulent, may not have been as bad as we supposed.

Alterações curriculares de uma escola septuagenária: um estudo sobre as grades dos cursos de formação superior em Educação Física da ESEF/UFRGS

Resumo: O artigo é oriundo de um estudo sobre os currículos de formação superior em Educação Física da ESEF/UFRGS em 70 anos de existência. O objetivo geral foi evidenciar elementos que mobilizaram alterações curriculares marcantes ao longo deste período. Para tanto, realizamos um mapeamento das grades curriculares de 1941 a 2010 por meio dos seguintes documentos: registros de graus, catálogos de cursos, página da UFRGS na internet entre outros. Através de análise documental destacamos seis "pontos de tensão" que se constituíram a partir de, e ao mesmo tempo mobilizaram, importantes alterações curriculares: 1) currículos da ESEF e o marco regulatório educacional 2) vinculação das disciplinas aos diferentes departamentos; 3) separação dos percursos curriculares de homens e mulheres; 4) proporcionalidade entre disciplinas obrigatórias e eletivas; 5) surgimento e expansão dos estágios obrigatórios; 6) fortalecimento da pesquisa na formação inicial. Por recobrir todo o período analisado, e se articular mais densamente com os demais, aqui nos concentramos exclusivamente no primeiro ponto. Concluímos que a pressão exercida pelo marco regulatório

educacional sobre os cursos de formação da ESEF/UFRGS foi mais intensa em três grandes momentos: federalização da escola em 1970, mudanças curriculares de 1987 e divisão licenciatura/bacharelado em 2005.

Palavras-Chave: Educação Física, Currículo, Formação Profissional.

References

AZEVEDO; MALINA, Memória do currículo de formação profissional em educação física no Brasil. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Campinas, v. 25, n. 2, p. 129-142, January 2004.

BARROS, José Maria de Camargo. Educação Física na UNESP de Rio Claro: Bacharelado e Licenciatura. **Motriz**, Rio Claro, v. 1, n. 1, p. 71-80, June 1995.

BENITES, Larissa Cerignoni; SOUZA NETO, Samuel de; HUNGER, Dagmar Aparecida Cynthia França. O processo de constituição histórica das diretrizes curriculares na formação de professores de Educação Física. **Educação e Pesquisa** (USP), São Paulo, v. 34, p. 343-360, May/August 2008.

BRACHT, Valter. **Sociologia crítica do esporte:** uma introdução. Vitória: UFES, 1997.

BRASIL. [Constituição, 1937]. **Constituição dos Estados Unidos do Brasil, de 10 de novembro de 1937**. Available at: <http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/constituicao/constitui%C3%A7ao37.htm>. Retrieved: November 15, 2010.

BRASIL. **Lei n. 1.153/1950**, de 04 de julho de 1950 - Estende a alunos do Curso Normal de Educação Física regalias conferidas aos licenciados em Educação Física, de que trata o Decreto-Lei nº 1.212, de 17 de abril de 1939. 1950. Available at: <http://www2.camara.gov.br/legin/fed/lei/1950-1959/lei-1153-4-julho-1950-363453-publicacao-1-pl.html>. Retrieved: December 12, 2010.

_____. **Lei n. 4.024/1961**, de 20 de dezembro de 1961. Fixa as Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional. 1961. Available at: <http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/Leis/L4024.htm>. Retrieved: December 18, 2010.

_____. **Lei n. 5.540/1968,** de 28 de novembro de 1968. Fixa normas de organização e funcionamento do ensino superior e sua articulação com a escola média, e dá outras providências. 1968b. Available at: <http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/Leis/L5540.htm>. Retrieved: November 25, 2010.

_____. **Lei n. 5.692/1971**, de 11 de agosto de 1971. Fixa diretrizes e bases para o ensino de 1º e 2º graus, e dá outras providências. 1971a. Available at: <http://www.pedagogiaemfoco.pro.br/l5692_71.htm>. Retrieved: November 12, 2010.

_____. **Lei n. 9.696/1998**, de 01 de setembro de 1998. Dispõe sobre a regulamentação da profissão de Educação Física e cria os respectivos conselho federal e conselhos regionais de educação física. Brasília, 1998. Available at: <http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/Leis/L9696.htm>. Retrieved: November 24, 2010.

BRASIL. Conselho Federal de Educação. **Decreto-Lei n. 1.212/1939**, de 17 de abril de 1939. Cria, na Universidade do Brasil, a Escola Nacional de Educação Física e Desportos. 1939. Available at: <http://www2.camara.gov.br/legin/fed/declei/1930-1939/decreto-lei-1212-17-abril-1939-349332-retificacao-72183-pe.html>. Retrieved: September 16, 2010.

_____. **Decreto n. 7.219/1941,** de 27 de maio de 1941. Concede autorização para o funcionamento da Escola Superior de Educação Física do Estado do Rio Grande do Sul. 1941. Available at: <http://cev.org.br/biblioteca/compilacao-legislacao-educacao-fisica-desportos>. Retrieved: December 12, 2010.

_____. **Decreto n. 15.582/1944,** de 16 de maio de 1944. Concede reconhecimento a diversos cursos da Escola Superior de Educação Física de Porto Alegre. 1944. Available at: <http://cev.org.br/biblioteca/compilacao-legislacao-educacao-fisica-desportos>. Retrieved: December 12, 2010.

_____. **Decreto-Lei n. 8.270/1945**, de 03 de dezembro de 1945. Altera disposições do Decreto-Lei número 1.212, de 17 de abril de 1939. 1945. Available at: <http://www.fiscolex.com.br/doc_107076_DECRETO_LEI_N_8_270_3_DEZEMBRO_1945.aspx >. Retrieved: September 16, 2010.

_____. **Decreto-Lei n. 53/1966** , de 18 de novembro de 1966 . Fixa princípios e normas de organização para as universidades federais e dá outras providências. 1966. Available at: <http://www.jusbrasil.com.br/legislacao/126183/decreto-lei-53-66>. Retrieved: December 18, 2010.

_____. **Decreto-Lei n. 252/1967**, de 28 de fevereiro de 1967. Estabelece normas complementares ao decreto-lei nº 53, de 18 de novembro de 1966, e dá outras providências. 1967. Available at: <http://www6.senado.gov.br/legislacao/ListaPublicacoes.action?id=117229>. Retrieved: November 24, 2010.

_____. **Decreto-Lei n. 62.997/1968**, de 16 de julho de 1968. Aprova o Plano de Reestruturação da Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul. 1968a. Available at: <http://www2.camara.gov.br/legin/fed/decret/1960-1969/decreto-62997-16-julho-1968-404329-publicacaooriginal-1-pe.html>. Retrieved: December 20, 2010.

_____. **Decreto-Lei n. 705/1969**, de 25 de julho de 1969. Altera a redação do artigo 22 da Lei n. 4.024, de 20-12-61, estendendo a obrigatoriedade da prática da Educação Física a todos os níveis e ramos de ensino. 1969e. Available at: <http://cev.org.br/biblioteca/compilacao-legislacao-educacao-fisica-desportos>. Retrieved: December 12, 2010.

_____. **Resolução n. 9/1969**, de 10 de outubro de 1969. Fixa os mínimos de conteúdo e duração a serem destinados à formação pedagógica nos cursos de licenciatura. 1969d. Available at: <http://cev.org.br/biblioteca/compilacao-legislacao-educacao-fisica-desportos>. Retrieved: December 12, 2010.

_____. **Resolução n. 69/1969**, de 06 de novembro de 1969. Fixa os mínimos de conteúdo e duração a serem observados na organização dos Cursos de Educação Física. 1969a. Available at: <http://www.efdeportes.com/efd141/formacao-profissional-em-educacao-fisica.htm>. Retrieved: November 24, 2010.
_____. **Parecer n. 894/1969,** de 14 de novembro de 1969. Fixa o currículo mínimo, a duração e a estrutura dos cursos superiores de graduação em Educação Física. 1969b. Available at: < http://www.scielo.br/pdf/ep/v34n2/09.pdf>. Retrieved: November 26, 2010.

_____. **Decreto n· 69.450/1971**, de 01 de novembro de 1971. Regulamenta o artigo 22 da Lei número 4.024, de 20 de dezembro de 1961, e alínea c do artigo 40 da Lei 5.540, de 28 de novembro de 1968 e dá outras providências. 1971b. Available at: <http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/decreto/D69450.htm>. Retrieved: November 25, 2010.

_____. **Resolução n. 03/1987**, de 16 de junho de 1987. Fixa os mínimos de conteúdo e duração a serem observados nos cursos de graduação em Educação Física (Bacharelado e/ou Licenciatura Plena). 1987. Available at: <http://www.ufpb.br/sods/consepe/resolu/1990/Res0387-cfe.htm>. Retrieved: September 16, 2010.

BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Câmara de Educação Superior. **Resolução n. 7/2004**, de 31 de março de 2004, que instituiu as Diretrizes Curriculares para os cursos de graduação em EF. 2004. Available at: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=12991>. Retrieved: December 18, 2010.

BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Educação. Conselho Pleno. **Resolução CNE/CP n. 1/2002**, de 18 de fevereiro de 2002. Institui Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a Formação de Professores da Educação Básica, em nível superior, curso de licenciatura, de graduação plena. 2002a. Available at: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/CP012002.pdf>. Retrieved: November 24, 2010.

_____. **Resolução CNE/CP n. 2/2002**, de 19 de fevereiro de 2002. Institui a duração e a carga horária dos cursos de licenciatura, de graduação plena, de formação de professores da Educação Básica em nível superior. 2002b. Available at: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/CP022002.pdf>. Retrieved: November 24, 2010.

BRASIL. Ministério do Esporte. Centros de Desenvolvimento de Esporte Recreativo e de Lazer (CEDES). Available at: <http://www.esporte.gov.br/sndel/esporteLazer/cedes/apresentacao.jsp>. Retrieved: December 21, 2010.

BRAUNER, Vera Lúcia Pereira. **La formación del profesorado de Educación Física em la UFRGS,** Porto Alegre (Brasil). Tendências teóricas. 1999. Tese (Doutorado) – Educació Social Contemporánea, Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, 1999. Available at: <http://www.bibliotecadigital.ufrgs.br/da.php?nrb=000280491&loc=2010&l=802ceee14f59dcc6>. Retrieved: August 19, 2010.

BRUGNEROTTO, Fábio; SIMÕES, Regina. Caracterização dos currículos de formação profissional em Educação Física: um enfoque sobre saúde. **Physis:** Revista de Saúde Coletiva, Rio de Janeiro, v. 19, n. 1, p. 149-172, 2009.

COMISSÃO DE ESEFCIALISTAS DE ENSINO DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA DA SESu/MEC. Descrição de área Formação Profissional em Educação Física. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte,** v. 18, n. 3, p 247-256, May 1997.

FILIPPINI, Isabella; DIEHL, Vera Regina Oliveira; FRIZZO, Giovani Felipe. Formação de professores de Educação Física da ESEF/UFRGS: balanço após cinco anos da divisão do curso. **Revista Digital EF Deportes**, Buenos Aires, v. 15, n. 144, Mai 2010. Available at: <http://www.efdeportes.com/efd144/formacao-de-professores-de-educacao-fisica.htm> Retrieved: November 1, 2010.

FRAGA, Alex B. **Exercício da informação:** governo dos corpos no mercado da vida ativa. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2006.

FRIZZO, Giovanni. Divisão da formação em educação física: "crônica de uma morte anunciada". **Germinal:** Marxismo e Educação em Debate, Londrina, v. 2, n. 2, p. 163-173; ago. 2010.

FUZII, Fábio Tomio; SOUZA NETO, Samuel de; BENITES, Larissa Cerignoni. Teoria da formação e avaliação no currículo de Educação Física. **Motriz**, Rio Claro, v. 15, n. 1, January/March 2009

GOELLNER, Silvana Villodre *et. al*. ESEF 65 anos: entre memórias e histórias. **Revista Movimento,** Porto Alegre, v. 11, n. 3, p. 201-218, set./dez. 2005.

GUTIERREZ, Washington. **ESEF:** história. Porto Alegre: ESEF/UFRGS, 1971. Available at: <http://www.esef.ufrgs.br/historia.htm> Retrieved: November 10, 2010.

LOVISOLO, Hugo R. **Atividade física, educação e saúde.** Rio de Janeiro: Sprint, 2000.

MAZO, Janice Zarpellon. Memórias da Escola Superior de Educação Física da Universidade Federal de Educação Física (ESEF/UFRGS): um estudo do período de sua fundação até a federalização (1940-1969). **Revista Movimento**, Porto Alegre, v. 11, n. 1, p.143-167, January/April 2005.

MENDES, Cláudio Lúcio. O campo do currículo e a produção curricular na educação física nos anos 90. **Arquivos em Movimento**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 1, n. 2, p. 39-48, July/December 2005.

MENEZES, Ebenezer Takuno de; SANTOS, Thais Helena dos. Currículo (verbete). In: DICIONÁRIO Interativo da Educação Brasileira. São Paulo: Midiamix, 2002, Available at: <http://www.educabrasil.com.br/eb/dic/dicionario.asp?id=349>. Retrieved: November 19, 2010.

MOREIRA, Antonio Flavio Barbosa. O campo do currículo no Brasil: construção no contexto da ANPED. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**, São Paulo, n. 117, p. 81-101, November 2002.

NUNES, Cássio Felipe T.; MOLINA NETO, Vicente. O processo de federalização da ESEF/UFRGS sob a perspectiva dos professores o estudo de um caso. **Revista Movimento**, Porto Alegre, v. 11, n. 2, p.167-190, May/August 2005.

NUNES, Rute Viégas. **Os estágios de docência e a formação de professores em educação física:** um estudo de caso no curso de licenciatura da EsEF/UFRGS. 2010. Dissertação (Mestrado em Ciências do Movimento Humano) - Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2010.

NUNES, Rute Viégas; FRAGA, Alex Branco. "Alinhamento Astral": o estágio docente na formação do licenciado em Educação Física na ESEF/ UFRGS. **Revista Pensar à Prática**, Goiânia, v. 9, n. 2, p. 297-311, July/December 2006.

OLIVEIRA, Amauri Bássoli de. Análise critica do currículo das disciplinas práticas do curso de educação física da Universidade Estadual de Maringá. **Revista da Educação Física da Universidade Estadual de Maringá**, Maringá, v. 1, n. 0, p.17-25, 1989.

OLIVEIRA, Inês. B., AMORIM, Antônio Carlos R. (Org.) **Sentidos de currículo:** entre linhas teóricas, metodológicas e experiências investigativas. Campinas, SP: FE/UNICAMP; ANPEd, 2006. Available at: <http://www.fe.unicamp.br/gtcurriculoanped/documentos/LivroDigital_Amorim2006.pdf >. Retrieved: November 17, 2010.

PROJETO ESEF 70 anos. Porto Alegre: UFRGS, 2010. Available at: <http://www.esef.ufrgs.br/ceme/projetos/esef70anos/equipe.php> Retrieved: December 19, 2010.

RIO GRANDE DO SUL. ESCOLA SUPERIOR DE EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA. **Registro de Atas de 1940.**

_____. **Registro de Graus – 1941, 1942.**

_____. **Registro de Graus – 1943.**

_____. **Registro de Graus – 1944, 1945.**

_____. **Registro de Graus – 1949, 1950, 1951.**

_____. **Registro de Graus – 1951, 1952, 1953.**

_____. **Registro de Graus – 1953**.

_____. **Registro de Graus – 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962.**

_____. **Registro de Graus – 1962**.

ROTHEN, José Carlos. Os bastidores da reforma universitária de 1968. **Educação & Sociedade**, Campinas, v. 29, n. 103, p. 453-475, May/August 2008.

SACRISTÁN, Gimeno. **O Currículo:** uma reflexão sobre a prática. 3. ed. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 1998.

SILVA, Tomaz Tadeu da. **Documentos de identidade:** uma introdução às teorias do Currículo. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2001.

_____. **O currículo como fetiche:** a poética e a política do texto curricular. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 1999.

SOUZA, Francisco J.; SOUZA NETO, Samuel de. A Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte e a formação profissional em Educação Física. **Revista Digital EF Deportes**, Buenos Aires, v. 11, n. 103, 2006. Available at: <http://www.efdeportes.com/efd103/ciencias-do-esporte.htm>. Retrieved: November 17, 2010.

SOUZA NETO, Samuel de; ALEGRE, Atílio de Nardi; HUNGER, Dagmar Aparecida Cynthia França; PEREIRA, Juliana Martins. A formação do profissional de educação física no Brasil: uma história sob a perspectiva da legislação federal no século XX. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Campinas, v. 25, n. 2, p. 113-128, 2004.

TAFFAREL, Celi Nelza Zulke. Análise dos currículos de educação física no Brasil: contribuição ao debate. **Revista da Educação Física da Universidade Estadual de Maringá**, Maringá, v. 3, n. 1, p. 48-56, 1992.

_____. Currículo, formação profissional na educação física & esporte e campos de trabalho em expansão: antagonismos e contradições da prática social. **Movimento**, Porto Alegre, v. 4, n. 7, 1997.

TERIGI, Flávia. Notas para uma genealogia do currículo escolar. **Educação e Realidade, Porto Alegre,** v. 1, n. 1, fev 1976. Porto Alegre: Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Faculdade de Educação, 1996. p. 159- 186.

TRUSZ, Rodrigo Augusto; NUNES, Alexandre Velly. A evolução dos esportes de combate no currículo do Curso de Educação Física da UFRGS. **Revista Movimento**, Porto Alegre, v. 13, n. 1, p. 179-204, January/April 2007.

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL. Escola de Educação Física. Comissão de Graduação. **Ata n.08/2004**, p. 1-6, 2004 b.

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL. Escola de Educação Física. Comissão de Reestruturação Curricular (CRC). **Carta ao Conselho da Unidade (CONSUNI) da Escola de Educação Física/UFRGS**. Porto Alegre, 9 de julho de 2010.

ZOTTI, S. A. Currículo (verbete). In: LOMBARDI, J. C.; SAVIANI, D.; NASCIMENTO, M. I. M. **Navegando pela História da Educação Brasileira.** Campinas/SP: Faculdade de Educação UNICAMP, 2006. Available at: <http://www.histedbr.fae.unicamp.br/navegando/glossario/verb_c_curriculo.htm#_ftn1> Retrieved: November 19, 2010.