

Interview with professor Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: The evaluation of Graduate Education In Education in the 2025– 2028 four-year period – what challenges lie ahead?¹

Ângelo Ricardo de Souza ^I  

Luiz Gustavo Tiroli ^{II}  

Adriana Regina de Jesus Santos ^{III}  

Abstract

In the interview granted to *Revista Educação em Análise*, Professor Ângelo Ricardo de Souza, Coordinator of the Education Area at the Brazilian Federal Agency for Support and Evaluation of Graduate Education (CAPES) since 2022, discusses the main challenges facing graduate education in Education in Brazil, situating them within the context of the transformations of the National Graduate Education System and CAPES' new evaluation cycle for the 2025–2028 four-year period. The interview addresses key issues related to funding, regional inequalities, teacher education, researcher training, and the identity of the field of Education, highlighting its specificities in relation to other areas of knowledge. The interviewee analyzes the changes introduced in the new evaluation framework, emphasizing the recognition of program identity, self-assessment, social engagement, impact cases, and internationalization understood as a cross-cutting dimension, linking these elements to the strengthening of educational quality and scientific production. The discussion also examines the challenges arising from the declining demand for graduate education, changes in academic work, the advancement of artificial intelligence in research, and the need for the continuous improvement of evaluation processes. Throughout the interview, the importance of theoretical and methodological diversity, commitment to research in Education, and the development of policies aimed at strengthening science, teacher and researcher education, and the social contribution of Brazilian graduate education is reaffirmed. In this context of profound transformations and the redefinition of the parameters guiding the evaluation and development of graduate education, the interview seeks to answer the following question: **What challenges lie ahead for the field of Education in the new four-year evaluation period?**

Keywords: Interview; graduate education evaluation; 2025–2028 four-year evaluation period; CAPES.

- I. PhD in Education from the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC-SP). Full Professor at the Federal University of Paraná (UFPR). Coordinator of the Education Area at the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES) since 2022. Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil. E-mail: angelo@ufpr.br.
- II. Lawyer. PhD Candidate in Education at the State University of Londrina (UEL). Bachelor of Laws (LL.B.) from the State University of Londrina (UEL). Londrina, Paraná, Brazil. E-mail: tiroli@uel.br.
- III. PhD in Education from the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC-SP). Associate Professor at the State University of Londrina (UEL). Londrina, Paraná, Brazil. Email: adrianar@uel.br.

Entrevista com o professor Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: A avaliação da Pós-Graduação em Educação no quadriênio 2025–2028 – Que desafios nos aguardam?

Resumo

Na entrevista concedida à *Revista Educação em Análise*, o professor Ângelo Ricardo de Souza, Coordenador da Área de Educação da Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES) desde 2022, discute os principais desafios da pós-graduação em Educação no Brasil, situando-os no contexto das transformações do Sistema Nacional de Pós-Graduação e do novo ciclo avaliativo da CAPES para o quadriênio 2025–2028. A conversa aborda questões estruturantes relacionadas ao financiamento, às assimetrias regionais, à formação de professores, à formação de pesquisadores e à identidade da área de Educação, destacando suas especificidades em relação a outros campos do conhecimento. O entrevistado analisa as mudanças introduzidas na nova ficha de avaliação, com ênfase na valorização da identidade dos programas, da autoavaliação, da inserção social, dos casos de impacto e da internacionalização compreendida de forma transversal, articulando esses elementos ao fortalecimento da qualidade da formação e da produção científica. Além disso, são discutidos os desafios decorrentes da redução da demanda pela pós-graduação, das transformações no mundo do trabalho acadêmico, do avanço da inteligência artificial na pesquisa e da necessidade de aperfeiçoamento permanente dos processos avaliativos, reafirmando a importância da diversidade teórico-metodológica, do compromisso com a pesquisa em Educação e da construção de políticas capazes de fortalecer a ciência, a formação de professores e pesquisadores e a contribuição social da pós-graduação brasileira. Nesse contexto de profundas transformações e de redefinição dos parâmetros que orientam a avaliação e o desenvolvimento da pós-graduação, a entrevista busca responder à seguinte questão: **quais desafios aguardam a área da Educação no novo quadriênio?**

Palavras-chave: Entrevista; avaliação da pós-graduação; quadriênio 2025-2025; CAPES.



Entrevista con el profesor Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: la evaluación del posgrado en educación en el cuatrienio 2025–2028: ¿Qué desafíos nos esperan?

Resumen

En la entrevista concedida a la *Revista Educação em Análise*, el profesor Ângelo Ricardo de Souza, Coordinador del Área de Educación de la Coordinación de Perfeccionamiento del Personal de Nivel Superior (CAPES) desde 2022, analiza los principales desafíos del posgrado en Educación en Brasil, situándolos en el contexto de las transformaciones del Sistema Nacional de Posgrado y del nuevo ciclo de evaluación de la CAPES para el cuatrienio 2025–2028. La conversación aborda cuestiones estructurales relacionadas con la financiación, las asimetrías regionales, la formación de docentes, la formación de investigadores y la identidad del área de Educación, destacando sus especificidades en relación con otros campos del conocimiento. El entrevistado examina los cambios introducidos en la nueva ficha de evaluación, con énfasis en la valorización de la identidad de los programas, la autoevaluación, la vinculación con la sociedad, los casos de impacto y la internacionalización entendida de manera transversal, articulando estos elementos con el fortalecimiento de la calidad de la formación y de la producción científica. Asimismo, se analizan los desafíos derivados de la disminución de la demanda de estudios de posgrado, de las transformaciones en el trabajo académico, del avance de la inteligencia artificial en la investigación y de la necesidad de perfeccionar continuamente los procesos de evaluación. A lo largo de la entrevista, se reafirma la importancia de la diversidad teórico-metodológica, del compromiso con la investigación en Educación y de la construcción de políticas orientadas al fortalecimiento de la ciencia, de la formación de docentes e investigadores y de la contribución social del posgrado brasileño. En este contexto de profundas transformaciones y de redefinición de los parámetros que orientan la evaluación y el desarrollo del posgrado, la entrevista busca responder a la siguiente pregunta: **¿Qué desafíos esperan al área de Educación en el nuevo cuatrienio?**

Palabras clave: entrevista; evaluación del posgrado; cuatrienio 2025–2028; CAPES.



Introduction

Brazilian graduate education is undergoing a period of profound transformations. In a context marked by system expansion, growing demands for internationalization, social impact, high-quality scientific production, and the mitigation of regional inequalities, the evaluation processes conducted by the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES) play a central role in defining the direction of research and training at the master's and doctoral levels. In the field of Education, these challenges deepen and acquire distinct characteristics, as it is an area historically committed to teacher training, the production of knowledge aimed at understanding educational phenomena, the development of strategic public policies, and the formulation of responses to issues that affect educational institutions and Brazilian society.

To reflect on these issues, we interviewed Professor Ângelo Ricardo de Souza, PhD, a researcher with a recognized trajectory in studies on educational policies, educational management, and institutional evaluation. A Full Professor at the Federal University of Paraná (UFPR), he works at the Educational Policies Research Center (NuPE), in the Graduate Program in Education (PPGE/UFPR), and in the Professional Graduate Program in Policy, Planning, and Management of Education (PROPLAGE).

Graduado em Educação Física pela Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Paraná (PUC-PR), mestre e doutor em Educação pela Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo (PUC-SP), realizou estágio pós-doutoral na *University of Bristol*, no Reino Unido, e estágio sênior de pesquisa na *Università degli Studi di Trento*, na Itália. Sua trajetória acadêmica reúne extensa produção científica e participação em diferentes espaços de gestão, pesquisa e avaliação da educação brasileira.

Currently, he holds a Bachelor's degree in Physical Education from the Pontifical Catholic University of Paraná (PUC-PR), and a Master's and PhD in



Education from the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC-SP). He completed a postdoctoral fellowship at the University of Bristol, in the United Kingdom, and a senior research fellowship at the Università degli Studi di Trento, in Italy. His academic trajectory combines extensive scientific production and participation in various management, research, and evaluation spaces within Brazilian education.

In this interview, we discuss the main challenges facing graduate programs in Education in the 2025–2028 quadrennium, with an emphasis on funding, regional asymmetries, and social impact, as well as their specificities compared to other fields. We also address CAPES's evaluation systems, the preservation of theoretical-methodological diversity, and the changes introduced in the new evaluation rubric (2025–2028), alongside topics such as internationalization, researcher training, the impacts of artificial intelligence, the specificities of the Human Sciences, and the strategic challenges of the Education Area for the upcoming quadrennium. Drawing on the experience accumulated by Professor Ângelo Ricardo de Souza, PhD, in research, university administration, and the coordination of the Education Area at CAPES, this work seeks to understand the perspectives and challenges ahead for the future of graduate education in Brazil.

Questions

Topic: Structural challenges of Brazilian graduate education and its specificities in the field of Education

Question: Professor Ângelo, Brazilian graduate education faces challenges related to funding, regional asymmetries, internationalization, scientific production, and the growing demand for social impact. In the specific case of the field of Education, which challenges do you consider most strategic for the next quadrennium? To what extent do they differ from those faced by other knowledge areas?



Answer: There is a set of issues that have a cross-cutting impact on the future of CAPES's Areas, such as those you mentioned (funding, asymmetries, etc.), as well as proposed changes in the organization of the National Graduate Education System (SNPG), materialized especially through CNE/CES Opinion 331/2024, and the need for more operational planning for the system, given that the current National Graduate Education Plan (PNPG) is excessively simple.

For the field of Education, beyond these elements, we also have other aspects directly linked to our graduate programs, their identity, scope, and reach within society. A first point concerns the training of teachers for basic education and higher education. Our programs enroll, especially in master's courses, mostly students who are, for the vast majority, basic education teachers. This occurs in both professional and academic degree programs. In Brazil, we have more than 2.5 million basic education teachers, fewer than 5% of whom hold a master's or doctoral degree, and these individuals are distributed across all of the more than 5,500 Brazilian municipalities. We need to bring graduate education, especially master's degrees, closer to basic education teachers, expanding the number of programs and/or transforming single-campus/individual courses into *multi-campus* programs (within intra-institutional associations) or into partnerships between distinct institutions.

Another aspect is linked to the previous one and relates to the course modalities. In the Education Area, master's programs are primarily dedicated to training individuals for whom this degree represents the completion of their education, given that the return rate of master's graduates to doctoral programs is low in our field. This implies that the master's degree often serves as the terminal qualification and, with few exceptions, aims primarily to qualify individuals professionally for fields outside academia. In practice, master's programs—whether academic or professional—are predominantly providing professional training. On the other hand, doctoral programs—whether academic or professional—offer advanced preparation for entry into the academic world, and graduates from both modalities tend to seek opportunities in career paths



associated with academia. In other words, again in practice, while master's programs have become more professional, doctoral programs have become more academic. All of this highlights the need for a broader discussion with the academic community and the agency (CAPES) regarding the nature and specific characteristics of the training provided by our programs, so that we can define pathways and strategic actions for the coming years.

Topic: Evaluation, diversity, and identity of the Education field

Question: Some argue that evaluation systems tend to induce specific forms of research, publication, and knowledge production. In your view, how is it possible to ensure that the field of Education preserves its theoretical and methodological diversity without compromising the establishment of shared quality parameters?

Answer: Graduate training has a very important characteristic of its own: it is training through research and for research. That is, a student in a master's or doctoral program in the field of Education learns how to conduct educational research and develops knowledge on how to utilize research in both academic and professional settings.

Those who train these students—those who advise these master's and doctoral candidates—are professor-researchers, because we do not believe it is possible for someone who has not mastered the investigative process to successfully train a researcher. In our field, precisely for this reason, all faculty members must hold a doctoral degree; that is, they must possess a deep understanding of the research process.

Those who conduct research—whether graduate students or faculty members—aim to gain a broader and deeper understanding, describe and analyze (educational) phenomena, answer research questions, and propose solutions to these problems. However, these researchers do not do so solely for themselves; that is, they do not research merely for their own personal



knowledge. They do so to develop knowledge both for themselves and for the world. The key issue is that this knowledge must circulate to reach others (researchers, citizens, society, organizations, etc.). For this reason, we expect them to publish their research findings.

There are various ways to contribute to this process of knowledge circulation, and we should make use of all of them, as a committed researcher aims to ensure that their research results reach the target audience for whom the material was written—and this audience may not always have daily or immediate access to a given type of publication. That is to say, all forms of publishing research findings are valid: bibliographic production (articles, books, book chapters, entries in academic dictionaries, papers presented at scientific events), technical and technological production (TTP: general outreach materials, educational materials, lectures, presentations, etc.), and artistic and cultural production (ACP: films, audio recordings, music, exhibitions, curatorial projects, etc.). It is important for the graduate program (PPG) to seek to diversify this production in order to reach the greatest number of people across the widest possible diversity.

However, this broad and diversified production does not excuse a researcher from publishing scientific articles in academic journals. Given the commitment researchers hold, it is fundamental that they publish their research results in articles that will circulate among fellow researchers within the academic community. This is crucial to ensure that the knowledge generated by that research, among many other possible objectives, circulates and contributes to the development of the scientific field itself.

Finally, there is not, nor should there be, any type of academic, theoretical, or methodological restriction on the intellectual productions that our students, alumni, and faculty publish, nor should ideological or any other forms of bias regarding researchers' choices be permitted.



Topic: Impacts of evaluation processes on the quality of Brazilian graduate education and the New Evaluation Rubric (2025–2028)

Question: The new evaluation rubric for the 2025–2028 quadrennium is the result of a review process of CAPES's evaluation model. What are the main changes introduced in this instrument, and what problems or limitations of the previous model did this reformulation seek to address?

Answer: The new evaluation rubric applied to this cycle (2025–2028), for the so-called 2029 Evaluation, brings important innovations aimed at technically improving the evaluation process, reducing the volume of information required from graduate programs (PPGs), and explicitly focusing on the impact and quality of the training provided. On the other hand, the rubric retains elements considered important by our community in evaluating programs in Education. It is important to note that this rubric was developed through an extensive debate with our PPGs throughout 2024.

There are several changes, but I would like to highlight a few. A first major alteration is the emphasis on the program's identity. The PPG must have this well-elaborated and clearly articulated in its report, as the elements of this identity (mission, values, objectives, etc.) will serve as parameters for evaluating the quality of training provided by the program.

The creation of a self-evaluation indicator is also a novel feature. Our new rubric introduces an indicator (2.2.2) requiring programs to assign a grade to their own performance (Very Good, Good, Regular, Weak, Insufficient) regarding the placement and career outcomes of their graduates, and to justify that grade. It represents a first step toward bringing evaluated entities (the programs) to share responsibility for assigning their own rating. Although it remains a modest measure with a small weight, it can yield encouraging results for the evolution of the evaluation system.

Another aspect modified in the new rubric is the creation of an indicator dedicated to having the program describe its extension activities, provided



they are linked to the research projects conducted. The idea is to incentivize the dissemination of produced knowledge and the social integration of the graduate program.

Finally, there is a new indicator demanding the identification of “impact cases,” in which programs must compose a description of activities—preferably collective—expressed through projects, processes, products, and individuals, that have generated academic, social, economic, or educational impact. The activity may have originated long before the current evaluation cycle (it is retroactive up to 12 years), but the evidence of its impact must have materialized during the 2025–2028 cycle.

Topic: Evaluation of social impact and articulation with public education networks

Question: Considering the strong link between graduate programs in Education and public school systems—through actions such as continuing teacher education, pedagogical consulting, the production of teaching materials, and collaborative projects—to what extent does the new evaluation manage to recognize these initiatives as knowledge production rather than merely complementary activities? Are there concrete advances in how the social impact of programs is evaluated?

Answer: As I mentioned in the previous questions, these products constitute important elements that evidence the PPG’s integration into and impact on society. Technical and technological productions (TTP), such as those cited in your question, are part of this. The key to evaluation returns to something already highlighted: the identity of the program. That is, the evaluation will analyze the extent to which these TTPs are articulated with the program’s objectives and the research being conducted. Thus, it is not just any form of social integration that matters, but rather that which aligns effectively with what the program proposes to achieve.



Topic: Internationalization in Graduate Education and the new CAPES evaluation parameters (2025–2028)

Question: Historically, internationalization has been associated with academic mobility, co-authored publications, and partnerships with institutions in global north countries. Does the new evaluation rubric propose a broader understanding of this process? How has the field of Education envisioned forms of internationalization that value South-South cooperation networks, Portuguese-language production, and the specificities of Latin American and Lusophone educational contexts?

Answer: The new rubric introduces another novel element centered on this topic: internationalization. Unlike the previous two cycles, where the rubric included a standalone item to address internationalization, in the 2029 rubric this issue is embedded cross-cuttingly, spanning 9 out of the 10 rubric items (only Self-Evaluation lacks an internationalization dimension). Thus, graduate programs (PPGs) can highlight aspects of internationalization in their reports that correspond to the specific themes of each item: PPG identity and curricular structure; mobility of individuals (incoming and outgoing); planning for internationalization actions; placement and career paths of international graduates; co-tutelle and double degree programs; participation of foreign scholars on examination boards and in other PPG activities; research with international partners; publications abroad and/or with international co-authors; international nucleation; international visibility of the program; solidarity with foreign higher education institutions; international integration and impacts of the program; and so on.

The rule remains that a program might not have an international orientation, and therefore its integration and impacts may not reach elements within this dimension. The program will not be penalized for this; on the contrary, in the 2029 Evaluation, for the first time, Internationalization will not be a requirement for awarding a Grade 6 to programs in our field.



Topic: Training of new researchers and the sustainability of graduate education

Question: In recent years, we have observed challenges related to attracting and retaining students in graduate programs, particularly due to fluctuations in funding policies, changes in the world of work, and the expectations of new generations regarding academic and scientific careers. How do you evaluate this scenario, and what are the main challenges for training researchers in the field of Education in this quadrennium?

Answer: We have observed a general decline in demand for graduate studies across Brazil. In the field of Education, given the massive unmet demand, the aforementioned continuing education of basic education teachers presents us with a Herculean task—one that requires extensive prior discussion with the community. Nevertheless, our programs suffer less from this problem; even with lower demand than in the past, especially in urban centers with greater program offerings, we do not face a shortage of candidates for master's and doctoral degrees in Education overall.

There are at least two dimensions that must be considered regarding this issue: 1) The aforementioned need to promote the training of basic education professionals occurs in a context of weak support from state and municipal government structures, which are the main employers of these professionals. In other words, unless these governments establish policies to support and incentivize teacher training, few teachers will enroll in master's programs, and even fewer in doctoral programs; 2) There is an evident decrease in job openings in the academic world, driven both by the lack of expansion in higher education offerings and by higher education faculty staying in their careers longer due to social security and pension reforms. As a result, our graduates—particularly from academic doctoral programs—struggle to find academic positions. For context, our graduate programs in Education produced 17,000 master's graduates and 6,000 doctoral graduates between 2021 and 2024. The job market simply lacks



academic positions for the majority of these Ph.D. holders; consequently, many of the master's graduates we train see little future in academia and choose not to return for a doctorate.

This situation calls for deeper study and reflection to help us reorient how we structure and offer graduate training today.

Topic: Artificial Intelligence and challenges for research and evaluation

Question: The advancement of artificial intelligence technologies has produced profound impacts on academic research, scientific writing, and researcher training processes. How do you evaluate the challenges and opportunities that these transformations have presented for graduate education in Education and for the evaluation processes of scientific quality?

Answer: Indeed, this is a major issue. The entire academic community, both in Brazil and worldwide, is grappling with the challenges generated by the growth of artificial intelligence tools in research and training. As a professor, I see that we must rethink our training strategies; that is, it no longer makes sense (if it ever did...) to ask a student to write an “academic assignment” at home on a given topic and assign full recognition of the student’s learning to that text.

Similarly, one cannot simply analyze a research proposal for an admission process without engaging in a dialogue or interview with the candidate. It is and will continue to be necessary to establish oral examination mechanisms to verify the authorship of these materials.

Regarding research production itself, I believe that advising by faculty, alongside other program strategies (project evaluation, qualification exams, etc.), can be sufficient to identify inappropriate uses of artificial intelligence, whether in data generation and analysis or in the production of the final report (master’s thesis or doctoral dissertation).



Ideally, graduate programs—and our entire community—should open a debate on this issue, so that, within the scope of each institution or program, regulations are established regarding the responsible and ethical use of these tools.

Topic: Specificities of the Humanities and critique of quantitative evaluation rationality

Question: Throughout historical periods, the field of Education has problematized evaluation models based on homogeneous criteria, advocating for the need for approaches that consider the specificities of the Human and Social Sciences. In this regard, it is pertinent to inquire to what extent the new evaluation proposal represents an effective shift toward recognizing these particularities?

Answer: The evaluation conducted by the field of Education has long sought to improve the technical quality of the process, expand the presence of qualitative indicators, encourage and establish self-evaluation mechanisms, and recognize the social integration and impacts of our training and production on society, taking into account the specificities of research and graduate education in Education.

The 2029 Evaluation consolidates this effort by articulating the elements I mentioned earlier. However, a central question remains: what our programs do is train high-quality master's and doctoral graduates for solid academic and professional integration, whose research is, as we have seen, both a formative strategy and an objective, while always keeping in mind that this is research in Education. Our field is multidisciplinary by nature. This ultimately brings people and research from diverse fields into our programs, which is positive; however, such diversity must not obscure the nature of the research developed here, which must focus on Education, or more broadly speaking, on human formation processes—that is to say, studies on: learning subjects, teaching personnel, the processes and practices of teaching and learning, within and



outside basic and higher education, both formal and non-formal, foundations (historical, sociological, anthropological, psychological, philosophical, etc.), organization and policy, outcomes, levels, stages and their modalities, national and international comparisons, among many other objects...

For this reason, the evaluation is centered on the identity of the program, making it possible to verify the quality of the training provided in alignment with the different “approaches” taken by the PPG in the field of Education.

Topic: The Education Area at CAPES and strategic challenges for the National Graduate System

Question: Professor Ângelo, in your position as Coordinator of the Education Area at CAPES, you closely follow the challenges and potential of graduate programs across the country. In this context, what place does the Education Area intend to occupy in the national debate on science, teacher training, and social development in the coming years? What are the area’s strategic priorities today for strengthening research, researcher training, and the contribution of graduate education to Brazilian education?

Answer: We belong to a large Area encompassing a total of 202 graduate programs distributed across all states of the federation and the Federal District. Nevertheless, we still need to further interiorize program offerings and better articulate them with the profile of potential demand. This is a primary move on our horizon during this new term at the head of the Area Coordination: we are in constant contact with vice-rectors and other administrators of education and research institutions to expand, diversify, and interiorize the offering of our courses.

Another priority in graduate education policy is the debate surrounding program funding, especially for professional programs, which do not receive support from the National Graduate Education System (SNPG). CAPES does not fund programs of this modality, with few exceptions. Here we have a disparity between modalities that is unjustified. It is well known that the



national budgetary context is complicated, but a long-term strategy must be established to properly capture and direct resources to graduate studies. In this regard, we recently missed a major opportunity, as the new National Plan for Graduate Education (PNPG) failed to outline pathways in this direction. The new plan, which should come up for debate at the end of this cycle, must address this concern as a central issue.

Stemming from this issue, we have the aforementioned debate regarding the differences between course modalities and whether it makes sense to maintain them in their current format. That is, in practice, as mentioned, master's courses have proven to be more professional in nature, whereas doctoral programs are focusing heavily on academic training. Thus, do we need to maintain the modalities as they are currently structured? Would it not be possible to move beyond this model, allowing the same program to have a line of research or an Area of Concentration that is more professional alongside another that is more academic? This debate is urgent and lies at the core of our concerns for this cycle.

There is also another important aspect regarding the quality of the evaluation process. I believe that over the past 15 or 20 years we have devoted significant effort to technically improving the evaluation, and we have done so quite successfully. This does not mean we cannot refine it further; however, we must improve the training of PPG coordinators, program secretaries, and evaluators. Regarding the first two groups, it is necessary to improve the generation of information for the evaluation. We have a relatively high turnover rate among PPG coordinators, which often leads to discontinuities in program management and data recording. This directly impacts the program report and, consequently, complicates the evaluation process, generating negative outcomes. As for the latter group, the evaluators are experienced individuals—usually former program coordinators, many with vast evaluation experience in other agencies as well—but they are not always connected with the “spirit” of the quadrennial program evaluation. That is, they do not always understand the



purpose of a given indicator, the rationale for requiring specific information, or even the consequences of the evaluation results. Thus, while we have already been working on this, it is necessary to expand and enhance a process of continuing education for these individuals within the scope of Graduate Education Evaluation (in Education).

Topic: Perspectives for the upcoming quadrennium – the future of the area

Question: To conclude, what are your expectations for the field of Education in the 2025–2028 quadrennium? What aspects should programs prioritize right away to respond to the new evaluation parameters while simultaneously preserving their academic identity, intellectual autonomy, and commitment to social transformation? In your assessment, what characteristics will define the programs that stand out in the future of graduate education in Education?

Answer: I am confident, as our community has been responding very well to the demands presented by the evaluation process. Our efforts will move in the direction of reinforcing that a program's focus cannot be its grade, but rather the quality of the training provided. The grade must be understood as a consequence of this process. Naturally, given the centrality of graduate evaluation in the daily—and financial—life of programs, one cannot (and should not) ignore the evaluation process; however, the choices a program makes must be aligned with answering the following questions: How can we enhance the quality of the training we offer here? How can we contribute to training these individuals more effectively and in greater depth? How can we contribute more and better to the quality of science and education in Brazil and around the world?

The programs that perform best in the evaluation process will be those that build strategies to effectively answer these questions, as this is truly the



heart of what we do and ought to do: train people well, train researchers well, and contribute to the advancement of knowledge.

Final considerations

The interview with Professor Dr. Ângelo Ricardo de Souza constitutes a profound contribution to understanding the challenges and perspectives surrounding graduate education in Education in Brazil, particularly in light of the new CAPES evaluation cycle (2025–2028). Throughout this conversation, the professor offered a rigorous analysis of structural issues within the National Graduate Education System, highlighting the need to reconcile academic rigor, social commitment, the strengthening of research, and respect for the identity and epistemological diversity that characterize the field of Education.

The reflections presented transcend a strictly normative reading of evaluation by defending a concept of quality grounded in the training of researchers and teachers, the production of socially relevant knowledge, the expansion of research impact, the valuation of programs' social integration, and the construction of policies capable of addressing regional inequalities and strengthening Brazilian science. The interview also calls attention to emerging themes, such as ethics in the use of artificial intelligence, continuing education for basic education teachers within the scope of *stricto sensu* graduate programs, internationalization from a cooperative perspective, and the ongoing refinement of self-evaluation and graduate program evaluation processes.

In this regard, this dialogue assumes special relevance by recording the insights of the Coordinator of the Education Area at CAPES at a decisive moment for Brazilian graduate education. The interview offers reflections on the new evaluation parameters and invites programs, researchers, faculty, students, and coordinators to examine the purpose of graduate evaluation, understood as a process oriented toward promoting academic excellence in training committed to scientific production, national and social development, the democratization of knowledge, and the transformation of educational reality.



By publishing this interview, *Revista Educação em Análise* reaffirms its commitment to disseminating high-level debates and circulating ideas that contribute to the strengthening of research, teacher education, and public policies in Education. We consider this dialogue to be a reference document for the academic community, particularly for coordinators, faculty, and researchers affiliated with Graduate Programs in Education, as it gathers reflections that can inform planning processes, self-evaluations, and the development of institutional strategies for the 2025–2028 quadrennium.

We express our deepest gratitude to Professor Dr. Ângelo Ricardo de Souza for his availability, trust, and intellectual generosity in sharing his experience, analyses, and vision regarding the direction of graduate education in Education in Brazil. His contribution elevates this edition of *Revista Educação em Análise* and reaffirms the importance of a well-grounded, critical academic dialogue committed to the defense of public education, science, and human development. Please accept our sincere gratitude and appreciation for this valuable collaboration, which will undoubtedly remain an important reference for all those dedicated to strengthening graduate studies and research in Education in Brazil.

Note

- 1 Statement on the Use of Artificial Intelligence – Gemini, an artificial intelligence tool developed by Google, was used to assist in translating this article into English. The translated version was fully reviewed and adjusted by the editorial team to ensure fidelity to the original text, terminological accuracy, and compliance with the journal's editorial standards. The tool was not used to generate the article's arguments, analyses, or academic content.





How to cite

SOUZA, Ângelo Ricardo de; TIROLI, Luiz Gustavo; SANTOS, Adriana Regina de Jesus. Entrevista com o professor Ângelo Ricardo de Souza: A avaliação da Pós-Graduação em Educação no quadriênio 2025–2028 – que desafios nos aguardam? **Educação em Análise**, Londrina, v. 11, p. 1-21, 2026. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5433/1984-7939.2026.v11.54455>.

Submitted on: May 21, 2026

Accepted on: August 14, 2026

Published on: July 22, 2026



CRediT

Acknowledgments:	We thank Professor Ângelo Ricardo de Souza for granting the interview.
Funding:	Araucaria Foundation (FA) and Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES).
Conflict of Interests:	The authors certify that they have no commercial or associative interest that represents a conflict of interest in relation to the manuscript.
Ethical Approval:	Not applicable.
Author Contributions:	SOUZA, A. R. de: conceptualization, data curation, and formal analysis; TIROLI, L. G.: drafting of the questions, data transcription, information organization, and text revision; SANTOS, A. R. de J.: data curation, formal analysis, and text revision.

Editorial Team

Section Editor:	Quenizia Vieira Lopes
Production Team Member:	Junior Peres de Araujo
Editorial Assistant:	Giovanna Martins Capaci Rodrigues
Layout and Typesetting:	Carolina Motter Pizoni - Escritório de Apoio ao Editor Científico

