

POLÍTICAS PÚBLICAS EDUCACIONAIS CONTRADITÓRIAS: A ALFABETIZAÇÃO EM FOCO

POLÍTICAS PÚBLICAS EDUCATIVAS CONTRADICTORIAS: LA ALFABETIZACIÓN EN FOCO

CONTRADITORY EDUCATIONAL PUBLIC POLICIES: THE LITERACY IN FOCUS

Sergio Brasil FERNANDES¹
Ronaldo Bernardino COLVERO²

RESUMO: Neste artigo, abordam-se contradições entre as políticas públicas que abrangem a alfabetização, particularmente entre o Plano Nacional de Educação – PNE e a Base Nacional Comum Curricular – BNCC. Ressalta-se a importância da alfabetização como suporte para que o cidadão possa desenvolver-se plenamente, exerça a cidadania e qualifique-se para o trabalho. Evidencia-se que o PNE estabelece que a alfabetização das crianças deve ocorrer até o final do 3º (terceiro) ano do Ensino Fundamental – EF, enquanto a BNCC determina que os alunos devem estar alfabetizados até o 2º (segundo) ano do EF. Essa desconexão demonstra um conflito entre normas jurídicas que são hierarquicamente diferentes, porque o PNE trata-se de uma Lei, enquanto a BNCC é uma Resolução. Por fim, enfatiza-se que a alfabetização se mantém como um dos graves problemas da educação brasileira e que sua resolução passa, em grande parte, pelo trabalho efetivo da comunidade escolar (equipes diretivas, professores, alunos, pais e mães, etc.) nos educandários.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Alfabetização. Educação. Políticas públicas.

RESUMEN: *En este artículo, se abordan contradicciones entre las políticas públicas que abarcan la alfabetización, particularmente entre el Plan Nacional de Educación - PNE y la Base Nacional Común Curricular - BNCC. Se resalta la importancia de la alfabetización como soporte para que el ciudadano pueda desarrollarse plenamente, ejercer la ciudadanía y calificarse para el trabajo. Se evidencia que el PNE establece que la alfabetización de los niños debe ocurrir hasta el final del 3º (tercer) grado de la Educación Primaria Básica - EF, mientras que la BNCC determina que los alumnos deben estar alfabetizados hasta el 2º (segundo) grado de la Primaria. Esta desconexión demuestra un conflicto entre normas jurídicas que son jerárquicamente diferentes, porque el PNE se trata de una Ley, mientras que la BNCC es una Resolución. Por último, se enfatiza que la alfabetización se mantiene como uno de los graves problemas de la educación brasileña y que su resolución pasa, en gran parte, por el trabajo efectivo de la comunidad escolar (equipos directivos, profesores, alumnos, padres y madres, etc.) en las escuelas.*

¹ Pampa Federal University (UNIPAMPA), São Borja – RS – Brazil. Public Policies Post-Graduation Program Student – PPGPP. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2614-6414>. E-mail: sergiohaiti33@hotmail.com

² Pampa Federal University (UNIPAMPA), São Borja – RS – Brazil. Professor of Public Policies Post-Graduation Program – PPGPP. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2958-8656>. E-mail: ronaldocolvero@unipampa.edu.br

PALABRAS CLAVE: Alfabetización. Educación. Políticas públicas.

ABSTRACT: *In this article, contradictions between public policies that cover literacy, particularly between the National Education Plan – PNE and the National Curricular Common Base – BNCC are address. It is emphasizing the importance of the literacy as a support so that the citizen can fully develop, exercise citizenship and qualify for work. It is evident that the PNE establishes that the children's literacy must occur by the end of the 3rd year of Elementary School – EF, while the BNCC determines that students must be literate by the 2nd year of the EF. This disconnection demonstrates a conflict between legal norms that are hierarchically different, because the PNE is a Law, while the BNCC is a Resolution. Finally, it is emphasized that literacy continues as one of the serious problems of Brazilian education and that its resolution passes, in large part, by the effective work of the school community (management teams, teachers, students, fathers and mothers, etc.) in the schools.*

KEYWORDS: Literacy. Education. Public policy.

Introduction

In Brazil, literacy - inserted in the great scope of one of the most expensive social goods in a modern society that is education - has been a recurring theme in government plans and constantly present in the public policy agenda, since for several decades not all children could be literate, even though universal access to elementary education (EF), particularly in the initial grades.

Studies such as those by Frangella (2016) and Perovano and Costa (2017) show that despite the implementation of several public education policies aimed at literacy and the apparent state effort to achieve them successfully, the results show unsatisfactory evolution, in great part because of inadequate and/or contradictory articulations of these policies.

Specifically, with regard to children's literacy, considering the relevance of this process, the state³ inserted in the National Plan of Education (PNE⁴) a literacy target, namely: "Goal 5: to teach all children by the end of the 3rd (third) year of elementary school, at maximum." (BRASIL, 2014, p. 3).

As a strategy to contribute to this goal, the National Pact for Literacy in the Right Age – PNAIC (Portuguese initials) was established, which according to the Ministry of Education - MEC, "[...] is a formal commitment assumed by the federal governments , the Federal District,

³ A form of social organization that uses coercive elements to regulate life in society in a given territory (WEBER, 2004).

⁴ State public policy, focused on education in Brazil, which sets goals to be achieved during the decade 2014-2024.

the states and municipalities to ensure that all children are literate until the age of eight, at the end of the 3rd year of elementary school." (BRASIL, 2017c).

It is observed that there is coherence between what establishes the PNE and the PNAIC, as far as literacy is concerned. This is what, of course, is expected of a policy that emerges as a strategy - the PNAIC - to reach a goal established by another major policy - PNE.

However, by imposition of PNE, the National Curricular Joint Base – BNCC (Portuguese initials) approved by the National Education Council – CNE (Portuguese initials) was implemented by MEC, bringing some changes that were considered polemical, among others: literacy up to the second year of elementary school - EF.

In this context of changes in the direction of education, it should be pointed out that the BNCC defined that literacy must take place up to the second year of the EF, and is therefore in disagreement with what is predicted by the PNE. In addition, disregards what experts in the fields of linguistics, neuropsychiatry, pedagogy and psychopedagogy claim in relation to the ideal or suitable age to insert the children in a literacy context, that is, from the age of six. This suggests that it may be a very short time between inserting the child into a literacy context (from the age of six) and becoming literate (at the age of seven), as each child develops their learning in an individualized way.

This polemic and controversial reality, although "thorny", is the one that is intended to be addressed in this article. Therefore, from this introduction, it is understood that there is a need to emphasize the importance of literacy, as well as the public policies that involve it, particularly those that are contradictory, and, finally, to present the final considerations of this article.

The relevance of literacy

Living in a society requires a number of factors to be taken care of and a large part of them are governed by state action. There is an immense list of aspects necessary for this social interaction to take place in an organized and healthy way. Among these needs are the social assets of which education is emphasized, which is a social right provided for in Article 6 of Federal Constitution (CF - Portuguese initials)/1988 (BRASIL, 2016). In addition, it should be emphasized that Article 205 of CF/1988 provides that: "Education, the right of all and the duty of the state and the family, shall be promoted and encouraged with the collaboration of society,

aiming at the full development of the person, for the exercise of citizenship and its qualification for work" (Idem, 123).

It is understood that in order to implement what is established in Art. 205 of CF/1988, literacy must be prioritized. It is also necessary to assert that, in order for citizens to obtain basic rights guaranteed by the Constitution - including education - and from it, full development, preparation to exercise citizenship and qualification for work, literacy is an essential and preponderant factor. Therefore, for the country literacy must be treated as one of the most important goals to be achieved.

Given this importance, it is necessary to determine a conceptual parameter for literacy. Therefore, it is worth emphasizing that the concept of literacy is built dynamically over the years, considering different didactics and its different teaching methods and techniques, also heterogeneous, as well as theoretical approaches that are most varied.

According to the National Curricular Parameters - PCNs: Portuguese language,

[...] literacy is not a process based on perceiving and memorizing, and in order to learn to read and write, students must construct a knowledge of a conceptual nature: they must understand not only what writing represents, but also how it graphically represents language (BRASIL, 1997, p.20).⁵

In this conceptual idea of literacy adopted in Brazil, via PCNs, one can verify the constructivist perspective. Conceptual advances or setbacks may vary according to the theoretical tendency, which can influence, positively or negatively, the literacy process.

Thus, twenty years later, the BNCC presents the following concept: "[...] literacy is to work with the student's appropriation of written Brazilian Portuguese spelling, understanding how is made this (long) process of constructing a set of knowledge about the phonological functioning of the language by the student "(BRASIL, 2017a, 88). This conceptualization makes explicit the bias of the defenders of the phonic method, denying constructivism.

For this reason, and because of going beyond the strict spelling and phonological knowledge proposed by BNCC, it is worth mentioning the conceptualization presented by Costa and Putkul (2018, p. 235):

[...] literacy is the process that enables children, youth and adults to relate to the world also through written texts that convey relationships of interlocution,

⁵ [...] a alfabetização não é um processo baseado em perceber e memorizar, e, para aprender a ler e a escrever, o aluno precisa construir um conhecimento de natureza conceitual: ele precisa compreender não só o que a escrita representa, mas também de que forma ela representa graficamente a linguagem. (BRASIL, 1997, p. 20).

that is, they present positions, disagreements, concordances and objections about the more varied themes that populate human relations.⁶

In view of these conceptual ideas, it is proposed that literacy - regardless of the theoretical-methodological perspective - be a transformative process, in the sense of making the human being a reader and a writer, that is, that everyone can read and write, establishing effective communication.

This proposal is anchored in Snow's (2017) experience, which states that there is evidence that global methods - somewhat like Brazilian constructivism - show good results in preschool, while the specific teaching of the relationships between sounds and letters brings best results in the first year. Therefore, the author advocates the union of specialists and that the teaching networks take a conciliatory stance, because the use of language is important throughout schooling, but emphasizes that learning the relationships between sounds and letters may be of primary importance for students in the 1st year of the EF.

So how should literacy take place? It is understood that there can/should be several forms of literacy, emphasizing that all of them must respect the individual time of the child. Snow (2017), in turn, advocates reconciliation among scholars, similar to that promoted in the United States, through the American National Academy of Science, in order to promote a rich language throughout schooling, but to devote a period of teaching, especially in the first year on the relations between sounds and letters. According to the author, this would not do any harm to students, and may be essential for some of them. In short, it would be a mix of constructivism and phonic method, particularly at the beginning of literacy.

From this proposition, we highlight the argument of Soares (2004, p.14):

Dissociating literacy and "letramento" is a misunderstanding because, in the context of current psychological, linguistic and psycholinguistic conceptions of reading and writing, the entry of the child (and also of the illiterate adult) in the world of writing occurs simultaneously through these two processes: conventional writing - literacy - and the development of skills to use this system in reading and writing activities, social practices involving the written language - "letramento". They are not independent, but interdependent and inseparable processes: literacy develops in the context of and through social practices of reading and writing, that is, through "letramento" activities, and this, in turn, can only be develop in the context of and through the learning of

⁶ [...] a alfabetização é o processo que possibilita as crianças, jovens e adultos a relacionar-se com o mundo também por meio dos textos escritos que veiculam relações de interlocução, ou seja, apresentam posicionamentos, discordâncias, concordâncias e objeções sobre os mais variados temas que povoam as relações humanas.

phoneme-grapheme relations, that is, in dependence on literacy (Author highlights).⁷

And when should literacy take place? Literacy can occur at various stages of life, including adulthood or old age, for example. As for the reality that is intended as ideal, according to the PNE, the age of 8 years. However, you need to consider that learning can vary from child to child. According to Muniz and Muniz (2016), it is necessary to re-think literacy at the right age, because it is more important to adapt legal provisions and to make the children's literacy process enriching and enjoyable, both for the students as well as the teachers.

From the answers to these questions, it can be seen that "how and especially when they are literate" are neuralgic points of public policies that deal with literacy, because there are contradictions in words and ideas, or "antitheses and paradoxes" as Frangella prefers (2016), which interfere in the pedagogy to be used in the classes of the initial grades, particularly in the first three years of EF. It is these contradictions that need to be addressed and, through appropriate political actions, duly corrected so that there are defined and persistent directions, without constant changes in the paths leading to a certain goal - in this case, PNE goal 5.

Public policies that involve literacy in Brazil

Literacy remains on the agenda of educational public policies, as a demand of society, because it is a problem that has persisted for decades and, therefore, the policies that involve it should not be discontinued. In spite of this, it can be seen that sometimes the lack of culture to develop policies of state causes governments to ignite the discontinuity of some policies or the substitution by others with the intention of promoting governments, in order to propagate the idea of idealizers of a particular program/plan.

It can be observed that the implementation of educational policies (Table 1), whose target is, directly or indirectly, literacy has been recurrent, particularly in the last three decades.

⁷ Dissociar alfabetização e letramento é um equívoco porque, no quadro das atuais concepções psicológicas, linguísticas e psicolinguísticas de leitura e escrita, a entrada da criança (e também do adulto analfabeto) no mundo da escrita ocorre simultaneamente por esses dois processos: pela aquisição do sistema convencional de escrita – a *alfabetização* – e pelo desenvolvimento de habilidades de uso desse sistema em atividades de leitura e escrita, nas práticas sociais que envolvem a língua escrita – o *letramento*. Não são processos independentes, mas interdependentes, e indissociáveis: a alfabetização desenvolve-se *no contexto de e por meio de* práticas sociais de leitura e de escrita, isto é, através de atividades de letramento, e este, por sua vez, só se pode desenvolver *no contexto da e por meio da* aprendizagem das relações fonema–grafema, isto é, em dependência da alfabetização. (grifos da autora).

However, the effectiveness of these public policies can be questioned, since they have not presented the desired results.

Table 1 - Correlation between legal norms and goals inherent to literacy

Legal Norms / Public Policies	Objectives inherent to literacy
Constitution of the Federative Republic of Brazil (1988)	- to eradicate illiteracy (Art. 214).
Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education – LDB (1996)	-
National Curricular Parameters: Portuguese language (1997-2017)	- Literacy, considered in its narrow sense of acquiring alphabetic writing, occurs within a broader process of learning the Portuguese Language. (BRASIL, 1997, p.28).
Parameters in Action: Literacy (1999)	- continuing education of literacy teachers
Document Literacy with texts (1999)	- continuing education of literacy teachers.
National Education Plan I (2001-2010) Law nº 10.172, de January 9, 2001.	- literate 10 million young people and adults in five years [by 2006] and, by the end of the decade [2011], to eradicate illiteracy.
Literacy Teacher Training Program – PROFA (2001-2003)	- continuing education of literacy teachers.
“Pró-letramento” (2006-2012)	- continuing education of literacy teachers.
Goals Plan Commitment All for Education Decree nº 6.094, of April 24, 2007	- children up to and including eight years of age. (Section II, of Article 2).
Education Development Program – PDE (2007)	- literate children up to and including eight years of age.
More Education Program (2007-2016) Ordinance nº 17 of April 24, 2007	-
National Pact for Literacy in the Right Age - PNAIC (2012-2017) Ordinance nº 867, of July 4, 2012. (revoked)	- literate children up to the age of eight at the end of the 3rd year of primary education.
National Education Plan II - PNE (2014-2024) Law nº 13,005, June 25, 2014	- literate all children by the end of the 3 rd year of primary education. - eradicate illiteracy by the end of 2024.
New More Education Program (2016-current) Ordinance nº 1,144, of October 10, 2016	- contribute to the literacy of children through specific pedagogical accompaniment.
National Pact for Literacy in the Right Age - PNAIC (2017-current) Ordinance nº 826, of July 7, 2017	- ensure that all students of public education systems are literate in Portuguese and Mathematics until the end of the 3rd year of primary education (Art. 5).
National Curricular Common Base - BNCC Resolution CNE/CP nº 2 of December 22, 2017	- literacy should be the focus of pedagogical action in the first two years of primary education.
More Literacy Program Ordinance nº 142, of February 22, 2018	- contribute to literacy (reading, writing and mathematics) of students who are regularly enrolled in the first year and in the second year of elementary school [...].

Fonte: authors

In this broad context of legislation, in order to maintain the main focus of this article, namely children's literacy, there is a discrepancy between what is prescribed in PNE goal 5 and

what is established by BNCC specifically on the stage at which this process should be built and consolidated. Therefore, it emphasizes the analysis of these two public policies, as well as the PNAIC contributory strategy to achieve the goal 5 PNE and More Program Literacy resulting from BNCC.

Literacy: PNE *versus* BNCC

First of all, it is worth noting that the PNE establishes, in its Art. 2, as the first directive, the eradication of illiteracy and this inevitably goes through literacy. Thus, from this guideline, among other goals, the goal 5 of the PNE was designed, with the aim at children's literacy up to the end of the 3rd year of the EF.

In addition, the PNE points out, through strategy 7.1, the need to:

[...] establish and implement, through interpersonal agreement, pedagogical guidelines for basic education and the common national basis of curricula, with the rights and objectives of learning and development of the students for each elementary and high school year, respecting regional, state and local diversity; (BRASIL, 2014, p. 4).⁸

In order to implement this strategy, MEC formulated a proposal of a new BNCC that was approved by CNE, whose definition establishes that:

The National Curricular National Base (BNCC) is a normative document that defines the organic and progressive set of essential learning that all students must develop throughout the stages and modalities of Basic Education, so they have their learning and development rights assured, in accordance with what the National Education Plan (PNE) prescribes. (BRASIL, 2017a, p. 7).⁹

In this transcribed definition, a contradiction is made explicit, which is: "... according to what the National Education Plan (PNE) prescribes", because this is not the case with regard to literacy. While the PNE states that children's literacy must occur by the end of the third (3rd) year of elementary education, BNCC determines that:

⁸ [...] estabelecer e implantar, mediante pactuação interfederativa, diretrizes pedagógicas para a educação básica e a base nacional comum dos currículos, com direitos e objetivos de aprendizagem e desenvolvimento dos (as) alunos (as) para cada ano do ensino fundamental e médio, respeitada a diversidade regional, estadual e local; (BRASIL, 2014, p. 4).

⁹ A Base Nacional Comum Curricular (BNCC) é um documento de caráter normativo que define o conjunto orgânico e progressivo de **aprendizagens essenciais** que todos os alunos devem desenvolver ao longo das etapas e modalidades da Educação Básica, de modo a que tenham assegurados seus direitos de aprendizagem e desenvolvimento, em conformidade com o que preceitua o Plano Nacional de Educação (PNE). (BRASIL, 2017a, p. 7, grifo no original).

In the first two years of Elementary Education, pedagogical action should focus on literacy in order to ensure ample opportunities for students to appropriate the alphabetic writing system in an articulated manner to the development of other reading and writing skills and their involvement in diversified literacy practices (BRASIL, 2017, p. 57, authors highlights).

[...]

In Elementary School - Early Years, the curricular components theme various practices, especially considering those related to traditional and contemporary children's cultures. **In this set of practices, in the first two years of this segment, the literacy process should be the focus of pedagogical action** (BRASIL, 2017, p. 61, authors highlights).

[...]

Although, since birth and in early childhood education, the child is surrounded and participates in different literate practices, **it is in the initial years (1st and 2nd years) of Elementary School** that it is expected that it will be literate. This means that **literacy should be the focus of pedagogical action**. (BRASIL, 2017a, p. 87, authors highlights).¹⁰

There is an express order reiterated in the text of the BNCC, emphasizing that children with six years (1st year of EF) and 7 years old (2nd year of EF) will be targets of pedagogical actions focused, primarily, on literacy. This means that, in addition to contradicting what is established by the PNE, the BNCC disregard expert opinions. A group of scientists from the fields of linguistics, neurosciences, psycholinguistics and psychology sent a note analyzing the BNCC, strongly criticizing the literacy proposal (INSTITUTO ALFAEBETO, 2017). It is worth mentioning that "[...] the group is made up of people with publications in international scientific journals of high prestige, some of them also having enormous practical experience in the field" (OLIVEIRA, 2017) which guarantee their credibility to expose the deficiencies of BNCC.

The point is that setting a minimum age for children's literacy without providing the basic conditions for learning to take place is "more of the same." To dictate that literacy be given until the 1st, 2nd or 3rd year does not solve the problem, it only puts pressure on those

¹⁰ **Nos dois primeiros anos do Ensino Fundamental, a ação pedagógica deve ter como foco a alfabetização**, a fim de garantir amplas oportunidades para que os alunos se apropriem do sistema de escrita alfabética de modo articulado ao desenvolvimento de outras habilidades de leitura e de escrita e ao seu envolvimento em práticas diversificadas de letramentos. (BRASIL, 2017, p. 57, grifo nosso).

[...]

No Ensino Fundamental – Anos Iniciais, os componentes curriculares tematizam diversas práticas, considerando especialmente aquelas relativas às culturas infantis tradicionais e contemporâneas. Nesse conjunto de **práticas, nos dois primeiros anos desse segmento, o processo de alfabetização deve ser o foco da ação pedagógica**. (BRASIL, 2017, p. 61, grifo nosso).

[...]

Embora, desde que nasce e na Educação Infantil, a criança esteja cercada e participe de diferentes práticas letradas, **é nos anos iniciais (1º e 2º anos) do Ensino Fundamental** que se espera que ela se alfabetize. Isso significa que **a alfabetização deve ser o foco da ação pedagógica**. (BRASIL, 2017a, p. 87, grifo nosso).

involved in this process, particularly children, to reach the goals set and holds teachers accountable when those goals are not met.

Based on a study by Muniz and Muniz (2016), it can be affirmed that educational policies tend to require children's efforts in the pursuit of literacy, but especially to obtain good performance in the external evaluations to which they are submitted (ANA, Provinha Brasil, etc.), in addition to the daily tests of the school itself. In the same way, the teachers who are "concerned with the content to be taught often follow the suppression of the playfulness, only" introducing "the subjects to reach the curriculum" (Idem, p. 29).

But why does BNCC contradict PNE and disregard expert opinion? In the search for an adequate answer to this question, it is worth emphasizing the argument of Oliveira (2017) on the obstacles that the country itself creates, hindering the advance in the area of education:

What prevents Brazil from advancing education? BNCC's referral process clarifies the reasons for this: Brazil wants to be different. In any democratic country with reasonable educational systems, the design of teaching programs follows a ritual. In the country of Jaboticabas, we created a ritual of its own, doomed to failure. [...] Public hearings and online consultations do not replace debate and confrontation of ideas - essential in a process of this nature. We could not even do a decent teaching program to say what needs to be taught in schools¹¹ (In: <https://veja.abril.com.br/blog/educacao-em-evidencia/alfabetizacao-na-bncc-mais-um-retrocesso-na-educacao/>).

Thus, the differences between the BNCC and the PNE in relation to literacy can also be considered as some more obstacles erected by Brazil itself, contributing to the stagnation of the country in educational terms.

Following this path of pointing out the difficulties faced by Brazilian education, the implementation of the public policy "More Literacy Program" can help to elucidate some aspects that respond to the proposed questioning, since, like BNCC in relation to PNE, More Literacy also establishes contradictory/disconnected ideas in relation to the PNAIC.

More disconnections between literacy public policies

¹¹ What prevents Brazil from advancing education? BNCC's referral process clarifies the reasons for this: Brazil wants to be different. In any democratic country with reasonable educational systems, the design of teaching programs follows a ritual. In the country of Jaboticabas, we created a ritual of its own, doomed to failure. [...] Public hearings and online consultations do not replace debate and confrontation of ideas - essential in a process of this nature. We could not even do a decent teaching program to say what needs to be taught in schools. (In: <https://veja.abril.com.br/blog/educacao-em-evidencia/alfabetizacao-na-bncc-mais-um-retrocesso-na-educacao/>).

The claims for disconnections caused by the approval of BNCC in relation to the PNE are not clear in the text of the Base. However, these motivations became more explicit, beginning in early 2018, with the adoption of another public policy of government, helping to understand some of the reasons for these disconnections.

In pursuit of the affirmation of what was instituted by the BNCC in relation to literacy, here comes the More Literacy Program, a public policy created by the Ministry of Education, through Ordinance nº 142, dated February 22, 2018, whose purpose is set in its Art. First, it is "[...] to strengthen and support the school units in the literacy process, for reading, writing and mathematics, for students in the first and second year of elementary school" (BRASIL, 2018b, p. 54).

The text of the Ordinance reinforces, in several sections, the contradiction between what is predicted by the PNE and the proposal of the BNCC, regarding literacy. The following is highlighted:

CONSIDERING: [...] That, according to the National Curricular Common Base - BNCC (Resolution CNE/CP nº 2, of December 22, 2017), **in the first two years of elementary education, pedagogical action should focus on literacy**, in order to ensure ample opportunities for students to appropriate the alphabetic writing system in an articulated manner to the development of other reading and writing skills and their involvement in diverse literacy practices [...] (BRASIL, 2018b, p. 54, authors highlights).¹²

If the BNCC is due to enter into force in the year 2020, why does the government create a program (More Literacy) two years before its implementation? The answer to this question may be tied to the elections (2018 is year of election), after all the program "creates" 200,000 jobs which could contribute to the improvement of the image of a government with low popularity rate in an election year.

In addition, this strategy¹³ adopted by the MEC presupposes the lack of preparation of the Ministry in relation to its own convictions or confirms the lack of them, since it establishes execution actions that are doomed to failure: "Art. 4º [...] § 1º Technical support will be given through training processes, from the assistance of the literacy assistant to the activities established and planned by the literacy teacher [...]" (BRASIL, 2018b, p. 54). After all, there

¹² CONSIDERANDO: [...] Que, conforme a Base Nacional Comum Curricular – BNCC (Resolução CNE/CP nº 2, de 22 de dezembro de 2017), **nos dois primeiros anos do ensino fundamental, a ação pedagógica deve ter como foco a alfabetização**, a fim de garantir amplas oportunidades, para que os alunos se apropriem do sistema de escrita alfabética, de modo articulado ao desenvolvimento de outras habilidades de leitura e de escrita e ao seu envolvimento em práticas diversificadas de letramentos [...] (BRASIL, 2018b, p. 54, grifo nosso).

¹³ Strategy is the term used by the MEC to designate the More Literacy Program.

was no adequate time for teachers to revise their pedagogical actions for possible adaptation to the new BNCC, which in itself makes it impossible for a concrete pedagogical action on the part of the assistants, which should be guided by the literacy teachers.

Exposed these aspects of the More Literacy Program, it is important to consider that the PNAIC - remodeled by MEC, through Ordinance nº 826, of July 7, 2017 - presents as one of its objectives the guarantee that all students are literate until the 3rd year of elementary school, that is, another contradiction, which again demonstrates the lack of a logical criterion of the MEC to follow the course defined in the PNE.

This lack of criteria in the elaboration of public policies aimed at literacy is such that the PNAIC and the More Literacy, despite the contradictions evidenced, will be part, both, of the National Literacy Policy: "Art. 9 The More Literacy Program, as well as the National Pact for Literacy in the Right Age - PNAIC, regulation within the scope of Ordinance MEC nº 826, of July 7, 2017, will be part of the National Literacy Policy "(BRASIL, 2018b, p. 55).

Therefore, it would not be too much to infer that the More Literacy is a purely political action, in year of election, aiming to bring spotlight to one of the practices of government. This inference can be validated by reading the excerpt transcribed from the Term of Commitment (among governments) of Administrative Rule MEC 142/2018 (More Literacy Program), with an explicitly marketable bias.

This [state, district or municipal] Government undertakes to establish literacy as a priority for management and **to publicize the resources of the Program as a source of the Federal Government in all its communications, also committing itself to disseminate the Ministry of Education and the Federal Government mark** (BRASIL, 2018b, p. 55, authors highlight).¹⁴

It is verified that this public policy does not take into account what PNE provides (that students must be literate at the end of the 3rd year of the EF), even though it claims that the program arises from the use of the results obtained in the ANA.

The More Literacy Program emerged as a strategy of the Ministry of Education in light of the results of the National Literacy Assessment - ANA, of the Education Evaluation System - SAEB, created to evaluate the level of literacy of students at the end of the 3rd year of elementary education, pointed

¹⁴ Este Governo [estadual, distrital ou municipal] se compromete a estabelecer a alfabetização como prioridade para a gestão e a **dar publicidade aos recursos do Programa como procedência do Governo Federal em todas as suas comunicações, comprometendo-se também a divulgar a marca do Ministério da Educação e do Governo Federal.** (BRASIL, 2018b, p. 55, grifo nosso).

out a significant amount of children in the insufficient levels of literacy (reading, writing and mathematics). (BRASIL, 2018c, p. 3-4).¹⁵

The significant amount of children in the insufficient levels of literacy (considering reading and writing) verified in the ANA, proves the lack of effectiveness of the policies, which is due, for the most part, to failures in implementation and/or execution.

Regarding reading (Table 2), the indexes obtained are alarming, because more than half of the children at the end of the 3rd year of elementary school have not yet learned to read.

Table 2 - Pedagogical interpretation of ANA reading scale

Level	Description	ANA students %
Level 1 < 425 points	At this level, students are likely to: - Read words with canonical syllabic structure, not canonical, although they alternate canonical and noncanonical syllables.	22%
Level 2 > or = 425 and < 525 points	In addition to the skills described in the previous level, students are likely to: - Find explicit information in short texts, such as joke, speech, poem, comic, fragments of narratives and scientific curiosity, and in larger texts, when the information is located in the first line of the text. - Recognize the purpose of text as invitation, advertising campaign, infographic, recipe, ticket, advertisement, with or without image support. - Identify subject in texts such as advertising campaign, scientific or historical curiosity, fragment of reportage and poem whose subject is in the title or the first line. - Infer relationship of cause and consequence in comic strip.	33%
level 3 > or = 525 and < 625 points	In addition to the skills described in previous levels, students are likely to: - Find explicit information in texts of greater extension as a fragment of children's literature, scientific curiosity, synopsis, legend, folk song and poem, when the information is located in the middle or at the end of the text. - Identify the referent of a personal pronoun of the straight case in texts such as comic strip and narrative poem. - Infer relationship of cause and consequence in verbal texts such as joke, fable, fragments of texts of children's literature and text of scientific curiosity, based on textual progression; information in texts such as comic strip, joke, poem and "cordel"; subject in texts of scientific divulgation and fragment of children's literature; and sense of expression of everyday use in texts such as narrative poem, fragments of children's literature, scientific curiosity and comic strip.	32%
Level 4 > or = 625 points	In addition to the skills described in previous levels, students are likely to: - Identify the referent of: possessive pronoun in poem and folk song; adverb of place in reportage; demonstrative pronoun in fragment of text of scientific divulgation for the infantile public; indefinite pronoun in fragment of infantile narrative; and oblique personal pronoun in fragment of infantile narrative. - Identify time relationship between actions in fable and the interlocutors of a dialogue in a fictional interview. - Inferring unusual sense of expression in child narrative text fragment.	13%
Total		100%

Source: BRASIL (2018a)

¹⁵ O Programa Mais Alfabetização surgiu como estratégia do Ministério da Educação diante dos resultados da Avaliação Nacional da Alfabetização - ANA, do Sistema de Avaliação da Educação - SAEB, criada com o intuito de avaliar o nível de alfabetização dos estudantes ao final do 3º ano do ensino fundamental, apontou uma quantidade significativa de crianças nos níveis insuficientes de alfabetização (leitura, escrita e matemática). (BRASIL, 2018c, p. 3-4).

The data show that 55% of students in the 3rd year of EF are at levels 1 (22%) and 2 (33%), and are considered unfit for reading. These students are unable to identify the purpose of a text and cannot locate explicit information that is not in the first line of the text. That is, more than half of the students who did ANA do not read fluently.

Regarding writing, the results of ANA (Table 3) also show worrying indices revealing the lack of teaching-learning effectiveness available to Brazilian children regarding literacy.

Table 3 - Pedagogical Interpretation of ANA Writing Scale

Level	Description	ANA students %
Level 1 < 350 points	Regarding word writing, students at this level probably do not write the words or establish some correspondence between the written letters and the sound pattern, but they still do not write words in alphabetical order. In relation to the production of texts, students probably do not write the text or produce illegible texts.	14%
Level 2 > or = 350 and < 450 points	Regarding word writing, students at this level are likely to alphabetize words with letter changes or omissions, letter order changes, and other misspellings. In relation to the production of texts, students probably do not write or produce illegible texts.	17%
Level 3 > or = 450 and < 500 points	Regarding the writing of words, students who are at this level probably write words orthographically with consonant-vowel syllable structure, with some spelling deviations in words with more complex syllabic structures. Regarding the production of texts, they probably write incipiently or inappropriately to what has been proposed , without the parts of the story being told, or produce fragments without connectives and/or lexical substitution and/or punctuation resources to establish articulations between parts of the text. They also present a large amount of spelling mistakes and segmentation throughout the text.	2%
Level 4 > or = 500 and < 600 points	In relation to word writing, students at this level probably orthographically write words with different syllabic structures. In relation to the production of texts, they probably attend to the proposal of continuing a narrative, although they may not contemplate all the elements of the narrative and/or parts of the story to be told. They articulate parts of the text with the use of connectives, lexical substitution resources, and other articulators, but still commit deviations that partially compromise the meaning of the narrative, including not using the punctuation or using the signals inappropriately. In addition, the text may have few segmentation deviations and some spelling deviations that do not compromise understanding.	58%
Level 5 > or = 600 points	In relation to word writing, students at this level probably orthographically write words with different syllabic structures. In relation to the production of texts, they probably attend to the proposal of continuing a narrative, evidencing an initial situation, central and final, with narrator, space, time and characters. They articulate parts of the text with connectives, lexical substitution resources, and other textual articulators. They target and write words correctly, although the text may have few spelling and punctuation deviations that do not compromise understanding.	8%
Total		100%

Source: BRASIL (2018a, authors highlights).

The data show that 33% of students in the 3rd year of EF are in levels 1 (14%), 2 (17%) and 3 (2%), and are considered unfit in writing. These students, therefore, do not know how to write with correction, nor are they capable of producing readable texts.

These catastrophic indexes serve as "fertilizer to fertilize 'politicagem'", in so far as it allows for ideas that appear as saviors of Brazilian education. In this context, the Brazilian government, via MEC, created the National Literacy Policy (BRASIL, 2017b), intending to make available an assistant professor for each of the 200,000 classes of the 1st and 2nd year of the EF. Faced with this proposal, the question is: How to hire 200,000 literacy assistants with competence to perform the function? And more: How will this hiring take place, if More Literacy leaves to the states, federal district and municipalities the choice to participate in the program, through the counterpart marketer? These issues expose the fragility of the proposal, reiterating ineffective, dream-like, doomed to failure.

But, faced with this alarming picture, what can be done to improve these rates? Or rather, what can be done to, in fact, literate Brazilian children? Literacy effectively entails moving towards the goal by a path established by well-designed public policies, implemented and implemented in the short, medium and long term independently of the political group who is in power, exercising educational management at the national, state, district or municipal level. This includes defining when and how children should be literate.

Legal order: legal security for school administrators and teachers

Faced with this disconnection provoked by the BNCC in relation to what is established by the PNE, educational managers (in the municipalities), and especially school administrators (managers), and teachers may feel themselves faced with a dilemma: What now? Blindly follow what prescribes the BNCC or work to reach PNE goal 5 within the specified time frame (3rd year of the EF)?

There is a conflict between two legal norms that are hierarchically different, since the PNE is a Law, while the BNCC is a Resolution. The Kelsen¹⁶ Pyramid (Table 4) can help solve this dilemma by presenting a staggering of legal norms.

¹⁶ The Kelsen Pyramid is an abstraction that presents the idea of legal order, through the hierarchy of structured legal norms. The most important norm occupies the top of the Pyramid and subordinates the other legal norms of inferior hierarchy.

Table 4 - Hierarchy of legal rules

Hierarchy of legal norms related to literacy in Brazil	Hierarchy of legal norms, taking as a parameter the Kelsen Pyramid (2011)
Constitution of the Federative Republic of Brazil Promulgated on October 5, 1988	Constitution
-	Constitutional Laws and Amendments
-	Delegated laws
National Education Plan (2014-2024) Law nº 13,005, dated 06/25/2014.	Ordinary Laws
-	Decree-Law
-	Regulations
-	Treaties, Agreements, Acts, International Conventions
-	Analogies
-	General Principles of Law
-	Customs
-	Doctrines
-	Case laws
National Curricular Common Base Resolution CNE/CP nº 2, of 12/22/2017	Decrees, Provisional Measures, Resolutions
National Pact for Literacy in the Right Age Ordinance 826/2017-MEC. More Literacy Program Ordinance 142/2018-MEC.	Ordinances , Normative Acts
-	Contracts in general

Source: Kelsen (2011) – adapted by the authors

The analysis of the legislation, considering the Kelsen Pyramid (2011), makes possible the understanding on which of the norms should be followed, in order to give legal certainty to the directive teams of the schools and the teachers, in the sense of not reproving students that, by chance, did not reach the minimum levels of literacy required by the BNCC at the end of the 2nd EF, adopting what is predicted by the PNE, that is, literacy students at the end of EF's 3rd year.

Thus, it can be said that the BNCC, as far as literacy is concerned, is not valid within the legal system which is covered by the PNE. In this context, it can be inferred that there is an attempt to impose a public policy of government (the BNCC, regarding literacy) on a State public policy (PNE, in relation to goal 5).

Final considerations

From the above, the importance of literacy for the advancement of societies is reaffirmed, even validated by the United Nations - UN, by including the index of illiteracy with one of the aspects to be taken into consideration in order to obtain the Human Development Index.

Despite this highlighted relevance, in Brazil, literacy remains one of the problems to be solved. However, there is a lack of coordination, or rather, the confrontation of objectives between public policies aimed at this national demand.

This is revealed by comparing what PNE intends to do (alphabetize up to the 3rd year of EF) and proposes it to the BNCC (to be literate until the second year of EF). In July 2017, through the PNAIC, the intention is to teach students up to the 3rd year of EF, but in December 2017, the MEC simply changes its mind and, through the BNCC, intends it up to the 2nd year of EF.

This "pace acceleration" in search of the literacy of even younger children (at seven years and no more than eight, as predicted by the PNE) requires marked changes in the organization of the pedagogical process hitherto developed. Teachers can feel at a crossroads: What is the way forward: to continue to develop play activities that aim to stimulate children to recognize themselves in the world and learn about it, or to propose content learning, aiming at earlier literacy, or try a mix of the two which can result in not achieving either one goal or another?

Therefore, it is inferred that the anticipation intended by the BNCC can have devastating results in the sense of high non-literacy rates at the end of the 2nd year of the EF. On the other hand, anticipation of content education can contribute to achieving PNE's goal 5, after all, it may be two years of pedagogical actions aimed at literacy another year that can be used to attend at least half of the students who, to continue in this rhythm of learning, will not yet be literate. Perhaps this is the implicit intention of the MEC. This response will only be answered with the ANA indexes, starting in 2020, if this evaluation continues to be performed in the 3rd year.

This study also explains that there is a wide range of legislation on literacy, after all there are plans, guidelines and bases, pacts and programs, but despite this, there is little effectiveness. Data from the ANA in 2016 corroborate this finding, after which more than half of the children evaluated cannot read and more than a third of them can not write words alphabetically, producing illegible texts.

This can be a reflect, precisely, of this disconnection between the policies implemented, as well as the constant changes in public policies, particularly those of government. This volatility in relation to political determinations, inadmissible contradictions in a democratic state of law continue to occur without there being a reaction from society in order to avoid time spent with misunderstandings that should not occur, failing to take a definite course with the broad participation of representative bodies in the Brazilian educational context and,

consequently, inhibiting and/or hindering the realization of effective works that could contribute to real advances in education.

On this aspect, it is necessary to consider that internalizing the changes, constantly proposed through different policies, in the form of public education offered implies time of adaptation of the population (students and teachers - less, parents - more). The changes from eight to nine years of elementary school¹⁷, as well as the nomenclature of grades 1 to 8 to grades 1 to 9, for example, have not yet been fully assimilated even after more than a decade.

In this context, it is understood that children's literacy goes much more by the action of teachers, aided by parents, than by the institution of plans, programs and pacts. These policies have proved to be ineffective in that they privilege to place immediate actions on paper. The actions of effective work in schools are the best that can happen with regard to education and, particularly, literacy, that is, the actions of the school community (management teams, teachers, students, parents and mothers, etc.) that can change the current panorama of literacy in Brazil.

Finally, it is inferred from what is exposed in this text that it seems more sensible, reasonable and coherent, to design, to elaborate, to institute plans/programs, in short, public policies that meet the strategies outlined in PNE, without "pushing too hard" to do what should have already been done in terms of education, for example: improving the physical structure of schools and improving teachers' working conditions (career plans, better pay, working hours in one school setting, etc.), among others, than to venture in the creation of new programs, without even carrying out a pilot test to verify its effectiveness, as is the case of More Literacy.

REFERENCES

BRASIL. Constituição 1988. **Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil**: texto constitucional promulgado em 5 de outubro de 1988, com as alterações determinadas pelas Emendas Constitucionais de Revisão nos 1 a 6/94, pelas Emendas Constitucionais nos 1/92 a 91/2016 e pelo Decreto Legislativo no 186/2008. Brasília: Senado Federal, Coordenação de Edições Técnicas, 2016. 496 p.

BRASIL. Lei n. 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. **Diário Oficial [da] República Federativa do Brasil**, Brasília, v. 134, n. 248, p. 1-9, 23 dez. 1996. Seção 1.

BRASIL. Secretaria de Educação Fundamental. **Parâmetros curriculares nacionais**: língua portuguesa. Brasília: MEC, 1997.

¹⁷ Law nº 11.274, of February 6, 2006, provides for the duration of 9 (nine) years for elementary education, with compulsory enrollment from the age of 6 (six).

BRASIL. Secretaria de Ensino Fundamental. **Programa de desenvolvimento profissional continuado**: alfabetização. Módulo alfabetizar com textos. Brasília: A Secretaria, 1999.

BRASIL. Lei n. 10.172, de 9 de janeiro de 2001. Aprova o Plano Nacional de Educação e dá outras providências. **Diário Oficial [da] República Federativa do Brasil**, Brasília, DF, v. 139, n. 7, p. 1-20, 10 jan. 2001. Seção 1.

BRASIL. Lei n. 11.274, de 6 de fevereiro de 2006. Altera a redação dos arts. 29, 30, 32 e 87 da Lei n. 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996, que estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional, dispondo sobre a duração de 9 (nove) anos para o ensino fundamental, com matrícula obrigatória a partir dos 6 (seis) anos de idade. **Diário Oficial [da] República Federativa do Brasil**, Brasília, v. 143, n. 27, p. 1-2, 7 fev. 2006. Seção 1.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Portaria n. 867, de 4 de julho de 2012. Institui o Pacto pela Educação na Idade Certa e as ações do Pacto e define suas diretrizes gerais. **Diário Oficial [da] República Federativa do Brasil**, Brasília, DF, v. 149, n. 129, p. 22-23, 5 jul. 2012. Seção 1. Brasília, DF, 2012.

BRASIL. Lei n. 13.005, de 25 de junho de 2014. Aprova o Plano Nacional de Educação – PNE e dá outras providências. **Diário Oficial [da] República Federativa do Brasil**, Brasília, DF, v. 151, n. 120-A, edição extra, p. 1-7, 26 jun. 2014. Seção 1.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **Base Nacional Comum Curricular**. Brasília, DF: MEC, 2017a. Disponível em: <http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/>. Acesso em: 25 jul. 2018.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **Política Nacional de Alfabetização**. Brasília, DF: MEC, 2017b. Disponível em: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/docman/outubro-2017-pdf/75191-mais-alfabetizacao-apresentacao-251017-pdf/file>. Acesso em: 23 ago. 2018.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Portaria n. 826, de 7 de julho de 2017. Dispõe sobre o Pacto Nacional pela Alfabetização na Idade Certa – PNAIC, suas ações, diretrizes gerais e a ação de formação no âmbito do Programa Novo Mais Educação – PNME. **Diário Oficial [da] República Federativa do Brasil**, Brasília, DF, v. 154, n. 130, p. 20-23, 10 jul. 2017c. Seção 1.

BRASIL. Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira. **Relatório do 2º Ciclo de Monitoramento das Metas do Plano Nacional de Educação – 2018**. Brasília, DF: Inep, 2018a.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Portaria n. 142, de 22 de fevereiro de 2018. Institui o Programa Mais Alfabetização. **Diário Oficial [da] República Federativa do Brasil**, Brasília, DF, v. 155, n. 37, p. 54-55, 23 fev. 2018b. Seção 1.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **Programa mais alfabetização**: manual operacional do sistema de orientação pedagógica e monitoramento. Brasília: MEC, 2018c.

COSTA, Dania Monteiro Vieira; POTKUL, Renata Strzepa. Produção de textos no Pacto Nacional pela Alfabetização na Idade Certa. **Revista Brasileira de Alfabetização**, Vitória-ES, v. 1, n. 7, p. 234-253, jan./jun. 2018. Disponível em:

<http://abalf.org.br/revistaeletronica/index.php/rabalf/article/view/258/197>. Acesso em: 18 jul. 2018.

FRANGELLA, Rita de Cássia Prazeres. Entre antíteses e paradoxos: o ciclo de alfabetização nas políticas educacionais. **Teoria e Prática da Educação**, Maringá-PR, v. 19, n. 3, p. 33-45, set./dez. 2016. Disponível em: <http://periodicos.uem.br/ojs/index.php/TeorPratEduc/article/view/36619/pdf>. Acesso em: 4 jun. 2018.

IBGE – Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. **Pesquisa Nacional por Amostra de Domicílios Contínua – PNAD Contínua**. Educação 2017. IBGE: Rio de Janeiro, 2018. Disponível em: https://biblioteca.ibge.gov.br/visualizacao/livros/liv101576_informativo.pdf. Acesso em: 2 jun. 2018.

INSTITUTO ALFAEBETO. **Nota sobre a nova proposta de alfabetização apresentada pelo MEC ao CNE**. Versão: 18 de dezembro de 2017. Disponível em: <http://arquivos.alfaebeto.org.br/nota-sobre-nova-proposta.pdf>. Acesso em 13 ago. 2018.

KELSEN, Hans. Teoria pura do Direito. 7. ed. São Paulo: **Revista dos Tribunais**, 2011.

MUNIZ, Rita de Fátima; MUNIZ, Sheila Maria. (Re)Pensando a alfabetização na idade certa. **Revista Educação & Linguagem**, v. 3, n. 1, p. 24-31, jun. 2016. Disponível em: http://www.fvj.br/revista/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/3_EDUC_20161_v2.pdf. Acesso em 19 jul. 2018.

OLIVEIRA, João Batista. Alfabetização na BNCC: mais um retrocesso na educação. **Revista Veja**. Publicado em: 14 dez. 2017. Disponível em: <https://veja.abril.com.br/blog/educacao-em-evidencia/alfabetizacao-na-bncc-mais-um-retrocesso-na-educacao/>. Acesso em: 15 ago. 2018.

PEROVANO, Nayara Santos; COSTA, Monique Linciano de Azevedo. Políticas monológicas de formação continuada de professores alfabetizadores. **Revista Brasileira de Alfabetização**, Vitória-ES, v. 1, n. 6, p. 161-175, jul./dez. 2017. Disponível em: <http://abalf.org.br/revistaeletronica/index.php/rabalf/article/view/230/179>. Acesso em: 15 jul. 2018.

SNOW, Catherine. Quando os especialistas pararem de gritar uns com os outros, o problema da alfabetização estará resolvido. **Nova Escola**. 23 mar. 2017. Disponível em: <https://novaescola.org.br/conteudo/4850/alfabetizacao-polemicas-metodo-fonico-idade-certa>. Acesso em: 17 jun. 2018.

SOARES, Magda Becker. Letramento e alfabetização: as muitas facetas. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, São Paulo, n. 25, p. 5-17, jan./abr. 2004. Disponível em: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/rbedu/n25/n25a01.pdf>. Acesso em: 18 ago. 2018.

WEBER, Max. **Economia e sociedade**: fundamentos da sociologia compreensiva. Volume 2. Tradução de Regis Barbosa e Karen Elsabe Barbosa; Revisão técnica de Gabriel Cohn. Brasília, DF: Editora Universidade de Brasília: São Paulo: Imprensa Oficial do Estado de São Paulo, 2004.

How to quote this article

FERNANDES, Sergio Brasil; COLVERO, Ronaldo Bernardino. Políticas públicas educacionais contraditórias: a alfabetização em foco. **Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional**, Araraquara, v. 23, n. 2, p. 286-305, maio/ago., 2019. E-ISSN:1519-9029. DOI: 10.22633/rpge.v23i2.11963

Submitted: 05/12/2018

Required revisions: 26/12/2018

Approved: 22/01/2019

Published: 06/03/2019