

SPECIAL ISSUE
Redesigning Assessment and Accountability

education policy analysis
archives

A peer-reviewed, independent,
open access, multilingual journal



Arizona State University

Volume 26 Number 9

January 29, 2018

ISSN 1068-2341

**Response to “Redesigning Systems of School
Accountability”: Addressing Underlying Inequities**

Elizabeth Gil

St. John’s University



Taeyeon Kim

Michigan State University

United States

Citation: Gil, E. & Kim, T. (2018). Response to “Redesigning Systems of School Accountability”: Addressing underlying inequities. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 26(9).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.3438> This article is part of the special issue, *Redesigning Assessment and Accountability for Meaningful Student Learning*, guest edited by Soung Bae, Jon Snyder, and Elizabeth Leisy Stosich.

Abstract: As Bae (2018) suggests, one way to fill gaps between a holistic view of student learning and accountability policy implementation is to use multiple measures that reflect diverse perspectives of learning. The purpose of this commentary is to provide a discussion of issues, which need to be considered in order to achieve the desired outcomes of greater equity and transparency through these broader accountability efforts. In this commentary, we address equity issues related to Bae’s argument and propose that taking action regarding existing inequities in terms of access to resources, and including traditionally excluded voices are crucial to ensuring that new accountability systems meet their intended goal of shared responsibility for deeper learning and continuous improvement.

Journal website: <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/>

Facebook: /EPAAA

Twitter: @epaa_aape

Manuscript received: d//2017

Revisions received: 30/10/2017

Accepted: 30/10/2017

Keywords: accountability policies; equity; parental voices; resource inequality; community-based initiatives

Comentario sobre la “Reestructuración de los sistemas de responsabilidad escolar”:

Abordando las inequidades subyacentes

Resumen: Como sugiere Bae (2018), una manera de acortar las distancias entre una visión holística del aprendizaje y la implementación de políticas de rendición de cuentas es usar medidas múltiples que reflejen las diversas perspectivas del aprendizaje. Estos asuntos deben ser considerados para lograr los resultados deseados de una mayor equidad y transparencia a través de esfuerzos más amplios de rendición de cuentas. En este comentario, abordamos cuestiones de equidad relacionadas con el argumento de Bae y proponemos que tomar medidas con respecto a las inequidades existentes relacionadas al acceso de recursos e incluir voces que tradicionalmente son excluidas, es vital para garantizar que los nuevos sistemas de rendición de cuentas cumplan su objetivo de responsabilidad para un aprendizaje más profundo y para el proceso de mejora continua.

Palabras clave: responsabilidad; equidad; voces de padres; desigualdad de recursos; iniciativas basadas en la comunidad

Comente sobre “Reestruturção dos sistemas de responsabilidade escolar”: Abordando as desigualdades subjacentes

Resumo: Como sugere Bae (2018), uma maneira de reduzir o fosso entre uma visão holística da aprendizagem e a implementação de políticas de responsabilização é usar múltiplas medidas que refletem as diversas perspectivas de aprendizagem. Essas questões devem ser consideradas para alcançar os resultados desejados de maior equidade e transparência através de esforços de responsabilização mais amplos. Neste comentário, abordamos questões de equidade relacionadas ao argumento de Bae e propomos que tomar medidas em relação a desigualdades existentes relacionadas ao acesso a recursos e incluindo vozes tradicionalmente excluídas é vital para garantir que os novos sistemas de responsabilidade cumprir seu objetivo de responsabilidade para uma aprendizagem mais profunda e para o processo de melhoria contínua.

Palavras-chave: responsabilidade; equidade; vozes dos pais; desigualdade de recursos; iniciativas comunitárias

Introduction

While scholars have expanded conceptions of learning (e.g., Dewey, 1902; Gardner, 2011) and undermined the binary of cognitive and non-cognitive skills (e.g., Immordino-Yang, 2016; Sawyer, 2005), test-based accountability policies, such as No Child Left Behind (NCLB), have narrowed the meaning of student achievement to test scores. As Bae (2018) suggests, one way to fill gaps between a holistic view of student learning and accountability policy implementation is to use multiple measures that reflect diverse perspectives of learning. The purpose of this commentary is to provide a discussion of issues, which need to be considered in order to achieve the desired outcomes of greater equity and transparency through these broader accountability efforts. In this commentary, we address equity issues related to Bae’s argument and propose that taking action regarding existing inequities in terms of access to resources, and including traditionally excluded voices are crucial to ensuring that new accountability systems meet their intended goal of shared responsibility for deeper learning and continuous improvement. While we agree with the importance of multiple measures that can “help stakeholders make valid inferences about school quality...and resource equity” (Bae, 2018, p. 5), we are concerned with the suggestion that everyone can equally make informed

decisions by employing stakeholder engagement and transparency. There appears to be an underlying assumption that there is equity of access to resources in terms of infrastructure, information, and skills required to fully implement accountability systems that require the use of technology (e.g., data dashboards) in order to participate in seeing what is being measured and how. However, research has shown that different levels of accessibility to resources result in issues of inequity.

Depending on school demographics, access to technology to implement accountability systems can differ. Lack of infrastructures and skills for using technology in under-resourced schools may result in difficulties of technology utilization. Literature has shown that the capacity for maintaining infrastructure is critical to support technology use in schools (Howley & Howley, 2008). For example, underfunded rural districts cannot provide human resources who deal with technical issues even though schools have required infrastructure, whereas more affluent districts can maintain technology equipment (Howley, Wood, & Hough, 2011). In addition to obtaining technology, skills for using technology is a key issue when accountability policies require new database systems. Park, Sinha, and Chong (2007) indicated that federal and state policies (programs) can promote access to technologies in rural schools, but training teachers and handling software remained the responsibility of individual schools. Therefore, effective training for staff who deal with data dashboards for accountability should be also considered with regard to resource equity to utilization of technology and information.

A digital divide also remains, in terms of access to technology and existing ability to use technology, even when it is available. Initiatives have emerged in order to address issues of access that may arise as a result of the digital divide. In discussing the importance of technology skills, Machado-Casas, Ek, and Sánchez (2014) note the lower rates of computer ownership and access of Latinos, stating that “computers are a central medium for knowledge distribution, thus further marginalizing many Latinas/os without computer access at home” (p. 28). La Clase Mágica, family technology workshops provided by a university-district partnership, helped parents support their children’s academic success and gain awareness of existing technologies. Similarly, Digital Home (pseudonym), a basic technology skills program, began in response to a recently-retired principal’s concern that the existing digital divide she witnessed for Latino families would grow as local schools turned more to data dashboards, digital report cards, and e-mail (Gil, 2017). Along with teaching computer skills, Digital Home offered information regarding school structures and terms that might be unfamiliar to the mostly-immigrant parent participants (Gil, 2017). As a result, parents developed technology skills, but also improved their ability to maneuver around systems that would otherwise remain less accessible, and less transparent. The initiatives described here made concerted efforts to lay the groundwork for families to access the information shared by their children’s school systems. Both of these examples indicate the importance of not assuming that systems of accountability, even the best-developed ones, are accessible and clear to all who are expected to be informed by them.

Whose Voices are Heard?

Additionally, we recognize that equity of voice and equally valuing all stakeholders is not a reality everywhere (Noguera, 2004; Orr & Rogers, 2010), thereby reducing the likelihood that the norms, values, and contexts of underrepresented communities are actually embedded in the development of what is counted in accountability.

According to Barry (2006), transparency in education reforms can be a tool for government entities. Research has shown that transparency in accountability measures controls knowledge by selecting which content and format are shared (Koyama & Kania, 2014, 2016). Arguing that policy

actors can utilize transparency to legitimize their political actions, Koyama and Kania (2014) revealed that use of numbers for transparency shield negative effects of NCLB for students from traditionally marginalized backgrounds. In addition, Koyama and Kania (2016) suggest that under the transparency in accountability policies, stakeholder power disparity can generate different benefits for different communities as “notions of transparency illuminate, and also conceal, information” (Koyama & Kania, 2016, p. 4). Thus, we are concerned that providing transparency itself may not represent educational accountability and is not enough to support informed decisions for student learning. As Koyama and Kania (2016) show, stakeholders can be less interested in the policy itself than in using transparency to gain support and find allies.

In cases where families and communities experience a lack of transparency or accountability to them, people have come together to combat these challenges. The Community Reviewer Program (CRP) (pseudonym) in Detroit trained parents and community members to “assess and evaluate the quality of schools in the city...through...citywide school visitations and evaluations” (Johnson, 2015, p. 7). The program emphasized parent and community access to transparent information on school performance trends. Through the training program, parents’ experiences as school quality reviewers, and the relationships that developed among and between urban parents, schools, and program organizers positively influenced parents’ interactions with their children’s schools, but did not cause schools to be held more accountable to improve (Johnson, 2015). Johnson’s (2015) study of the CRP also revealed that the accountability criteria identified by parents and community members did not always align with the measures of effectiveness recognized by the Detroit school system.

Padres & Jóvenes Unidos (PJU), a grassroots organization in Denver, seeks to increase equity in education for all students by addressing “the root cause of discrimination, racism and inequity” (Padres & Jóvenes Unidos, n.d.). The group’s Platform for Excellent Schools identifies its own accountability criteria, including college preparatory curriculum and culture, highly effective principals and teachers “with high expectations and [who] believe in the intellectual capacity of students of color,” and safe and caring schools (Padres & Jóvenes Unidos, 2016). Much like in the case of the CRP, the work of PJU centers the voices of parents (and youth) in its efforts to equalize voice and fight inequity. PJU has also developed and published its own Accountability Report Card “toward ending the school-to-jail track in Denver Public Schools” (Padres & Jóvenes Unidos, n.d.). Formed in 1992, PJU has had more success in playing an active role and having greater visibility in local reforms and accountability systems.

In light of instances where the accountability priorities of urban and traditionally marginalized communities may not be as closely aligned as those of the formal schools systems, the consensus building and transparency so crucial to redesigned school accountability systems that aim for “shared responsibility and continuous improvement” (Bae, 2018, p. 20) will not be actualized without acknowledging the concerns over whose voices are heard and taking action toward being inclusive of multiple perspectives and experiences.

Concluding Remarks

We acknowledge the importance of efforts to broaden measures in order to transform school accountability into a more meaningful vehicle for improving students’ learning. However, without considering the realities regarding resources in different contexts and the disparity in whose voices are heard, this goal will be unfulfilled. Actions, programs, and groups such as those described above offer examples of how to promote voice and value diverse communities that have traditionally not been included in discussions about accountability. While programs, often begun outside of the school system, have empowered those who have participated, increased accountability

in school systems, on a larger scale, has been less consistent. Therefore, we need constantly to ask ourselves: Who is at the table? Whose values and norms are represented? How are all members of communities engaging with the process and the reported outcomes of any new accountability measures?

References

- Bae, S. (2018). Redesigning systems of school accountability: A Multiple measures approach to accountability and support. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 26(7).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.2920>
- Barry, A. (2006). *Technological zones*. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 9(2), 239-253.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431006063343>
- Dewey, J. (1956). *The Child and the curriculum*. Joint edition with *The school and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Phoenix Books. (Original work published 1902)
- Gardner, H. (2011). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences* (3rd ed.). New York: Basic Books.
- Gil, E. (2017). *Engaging the community cultural wealth of Latino immigrant families in a community-based program* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 10622139).
- Howley, A., & Howley, C. (2008). Planning for technology integration: Is the agenda overrated or underappreciated. *Educational Planning*, 17(1), 1-17.
- Howley A., Wood L., & Hough B. (2011). Rural elementary school teachers' technology integration. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 26(9). Retrieved from <http://jrre.psu.edu/articles/26-9.pdf>
- Immordino-Yang, M. H. (2015). *Emotions, learning, and the brain: Exploring the educational implications of affective neuroscience*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Johnson, A. (2015). *The community reviewer program: An examination of a parent empowerment program in Detroit* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3740247).
- Koyama, J. P., & Kania, B. (2014). When transparency obscures: The political spectacle of accountability. *Journal of Critical Educational Policy Studies* 12(1), 143-169.
- Koyama, J., & Kania, B. (2016). Seeing through transparency in education reform: Illuminating the "local". *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24, 1-21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.24.2379>
- Machado-Casas, M. Ek, L., & Sánchez, P. (2014). The Digital literacy practices of Latina/o immigrant parents in an after-school technology partnership. *Multicultural Education*, 21(3), 28-34.
- Noguera, P. A. (2004). Transforming urban schools through investments in the social capital of parents. *In Motion Magazine*. http://www.inmotionmagazine.com/er/pn_parents.html
- Orr, M., & Rogers, J. (2010). Unequal schools, unequal voice: The Need for public engagement for public education. In M. Orr & J. Rogers (Eds.). *Public engagement for public education: Joining forces to revitalize democracy and equalize schools* (1-24). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Padres & Jóvenes Unidos. (2016, November). Platform for excellent schools. Retrieved from <http://padresunidos.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/pjuplatform.excellentschools.pdf>
- Padres & Jóvenes Unidos. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://padresunidos.org>
- Park, E., Sinha, H., & Chong, J. (2007). Beyond access: An analysis of the influence of the E-rate program in bridging the digital divide in American schools. *Journal of Information Technology Education*, 6, 387-406.
- Sawyer, R. K. (Ed.). (2005). *The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences*. Cambridge University Press.

About the Authors

Elizabeth Gil

St. John's University

gile@stjohns.edu

<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5308-6931>

Elizabeth Gil is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Administrative and Instructional Leadership at St. John's University. Her research interests include parental and community participation in education reform, coalitions in community engagement and public voice, and understanding the experiences of diverse families in schools. Prior to her current work, she was a teacher, professional developer, mentor, and data specialist in New York City Public Schools.

Taeyeon Kim

Michigan State University

kimtaeye@msu.edu

<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2020-9851>

Taeyeon Kim is a K-12 Educational Administration PhD Student in the Educational Administration Department at Michigan State University. Her research focuses on leadership development and school governance under education accountability policies. She is also interested in interactions between global changes and local education policies.

About the Guest Editors

Elizabeth Leisy Stosich

Fordham University

estosich@fordham.edu

Elizabeth Leisy Stosich is an Assistant Professor in Educational Leadership, Administration, and Policy at Fordham University. Previously, she was a Research and Policy Fellow at the Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education. Her research interests include education policy, assessment and accountability, school and district leadership, school improvement, and teachers' professional learning.

Soung Bae

Stanford University

soungb@stanford.edu

Soung Bae is a Senior Learning Specialist and UDL Innovation Studio Manager at the Schwab Learning Center at Stanford University. Formerly, she was a Senior Research and Policy Analyst at the Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education. Her research interests focus on school accountability, student engagement, and designing learning environments that appreciate and support learner variability.

Jon Snyder

Stanford University

jdsnyder@stanford.edu

Jon Snyder is the Executive Director of the Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education (SCOPE). His research interests include teacher learning, conditions that support teacher learning, and the relationships between teacher and student learning.

SPECIAL ISSUE
Redesigning Assessment and Accountability

education policy analysis archives

Volume 26 Number 9

January 29, 2018

ISSN 1068-2341



Readers are free to copy, display, and distribute this article, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and **Education Policy Analysis Archives**, it is distributed for non-commercial purposes only, and no alteration or transformation is made in the work. More details of this Creative Commons license are available at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>. All other uses must be approved by the author(s) or **EPAA**. **EPAA** is published by the Mary Lou Fulton Institute and Graduate School of Education at Arizona State University. Articles are indexed in CIRC (Clasificación Integrada de Revistas Científicas, Spain), DIALNET (Spain), [Directory of Open Access Journals](#), EBSCO Education Research Complete, ERIC, Education Full Text (H.W. Wilson), QUALIS A1 (Brazil), SCImago Journal Rank; SCOPUS, SOCOLAR (China).

Please send errata notes to Audrey Amrein-Beardsley at Audrey.beardsley@asu.edu

Join **EPAA's Facebook community** at <https://www.facebook.com/EPAAAPE> and **Twitter feed** @epaa_aape.

education policy analysis archives
editorial board

Lead Editor: **Audrey Amrein-Beardsley** (Arizona State University)

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Associate Editors: **David Carlson, Lauren Harris, Eugene Judson, Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Scott Marley, Iveta Silova, Maria Teresa Tatto** (Arizona State University)

Cristina Alfaro San Diego State University

Gary Anderson New York University

Michael W. Apple University of Wisconsin, Madison

Jeff Bale OISE, University of Toronto, Canada

Aaron Bevanot SUNY Albany

David C. Berliner Arizona State University

Henry Braun Boston College

Casey Cobb University of Connecticut

Arnold Danzig San Jose State University

Linda Darling-Hammond Stanford University

Elizabeth H. DeBray University of Georgia

Chad d'Entremont Rennie Center for Education Research & Policy

John Diamond University of Wisconsin, Madison

Matthew Di Carlo Albert Shanker Institute

Sherman Dorn Arizona State University

Michael J. Dumas University of California, Berkeley

Kathy Escamilla University of Colorado, Boulder

Melissa Lynn Freeman Adams State College

Rachael Gabriel University of Connecticut

Amy Garrett Dikkers University of North Carolina, Wilmington

Gene V Glass Arizona State University

Ronald Glass University of California, Santa Cruz

Jacob P. K. Gross University of Louisville

Eric M. Haas WestEd

Julian Vasquez Heilig California State University, Sacramento

Kimberly Kappler Hewitt University of North Carolina Greensboro

Aimee Howley Ohio University

Steve Klees University of Maryland

Jaekyung Lee SUNY Buffalo

Jessica Nina Lester Indiana University

Amanda E. Lewis University of Illinois, Chicago

Chad R. Lochmiller Indiana University

Christopher Lubienski Indiana University

Sarah Lubienski Indiana University

William J. Mathis University of Colorado, Boulder

Michele S. Moses University of Colorado, Boulder

Julianne Moss Deakin University, Australia

Sharon Nichols University of Texas, San Antonio

Eric Parsons University of Missouri-Columbia

Amanda U. Potterton University of Kentucky

Susan L. Robertson Bristol University, UK

Gloria M. Rodriguez University of California, Davis

R. Anthony Rolle University of Houston

A. G. Rud Washington State University

Patricia Sánchez University of University of Texas, San Antonio

Janelle Scott University of California, Berkeley

Jack Schneider College of the Holy Cross

Noah Sobe Loyola University

Nelly P. Stromquist University of Maryland

Benjamin Superfine University of Illinois, Chicago

Adai Tefera Virginia Commonwealth University

Tina Trujillo University of California, Berkeley

Federico R. Waitoller University of Illinois, Chicago

Larisa Warhol University of Connecticut

John Weathers University of Colorado, Colorado Springs

Kevin Welner University of Colorado, Boulder

Terrence G. Wiley Center for Applied Linguistics

John Willinsky Stanford University

Jennifer R. Wolgemuth University of South Florida

Kyo Yamashiro Claremont Graduate University

archivos analíticos de políticas educativas consejo editorial

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Editores Asociados: **Armando Alcántara Santuario** (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México), **Jason Beech** (Universidad de San Andrés), **Angelica Buendia** (Metropolitan Autonomous University), **Ezequiel Gomez Caride** (Pontificia Universidad Católica Argentina), **Antonio Luzon** (Universidad de Granada), **Angelica Buendia** (Metropolitan Autonomous University), **José Luis Ramírez** (Universidad de Sonora)

Claudio Almonacid

Universidad Metropolitana de
Ciencias de la Educación, Chile

Miguel Ángel Arias Ortega

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad
de México

Xavier Besalú Costa

Universitat de Girona, España

Xavier Bonal Sarro Universidad
Autónoma de Barcelona, España

Antonio Bolívar Boitia Universidad
de Granada, España

José Joaquín Brunner Universidad
Diego Portales, Chile

Damián Canales Sánchez Instituto
Nacional para la Evaluación de la
Educación, México

Gabriela de la Cruz Flores
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de
México

Marco Antonio Delgado Fuentes
Universidad Iberoamericana, México

Inés Dussel, DIE-CINVESTAV,
México

Juan Carlos González Faraco

Universidad de Huelva, España

María Clemente Linuesa

Universidad de Salamanca, España

Jaume Martínez Bonafé

Universitat de València, España

Alejandro Márquez Jiménez

Instituto de Investigaciones sobre
la Universidad y la Educación,
UNAM, México

María Guadalupe Olivier Tellez,
Universidad Pedagógica Nacional,
México

Miguel Pereyra Universidad de
Granada, España

Mónica Pini Universidad Nacional
de San Martín, Argentina

Omar Orlando Pulido Chaves
Instituto para la Investigación
Educativa y el Desarrollo
Pedagógico (IDEP)

Paula Razquin Universidad de
San Andrés, Argentina

Miriam Rodríguez Vargas

Universidad Autónoma de
Tamaulipas, México

José Gregorio Rodríguez

Universidad Nacional de Colombia,
Colombia

Mario Rueda Beltrán Instituto de
Investigaciones sobre la
Universidad y la Educación,
UNAM, México

José Luis San Fabián Maroto

Universidad de Oviedo,
España

Jurjo Torres Santomé,

Universidad de la Coruña, España

Yengny Marisol Silva Laya

Universidad Iberoamericana,
México

Ernesto Treviño Ronzón

Universidad Veracruzana, México

Ernesto Treviño Villarreal

Universidad Diego Portales
Santiago, Chile

Antoni Verger Planells

Universidad Autónoma de
Barcelona, España

arquivos analíticos de políticas educativas
conselho editorial

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Editores Associados: **Geovana Mendonça Lunardi Mendes** (Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina),
Marcia Pletsch, Sandra Regina Sales (Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro)

Almerindo Afonso

Universidade do Minho
Portugal

Alexandre Fernandez Vaz

Universidade Federal de Santa
Catarina, Brasil

José Augusto Pacheco

Universidade do Minho, Portugal

Rosanna Maria Barros Sá

Universidade do Algarve
Portugal

Regina Célia Linhares Hostins

Universidade do Vale do Itajaí,
Brasil

Jane Paiva

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Maria Helena Bonilla

Universidade Federal da Bahia
Brasil

Alfredo Macedo Gomes

Universidade Federal de Pernambuco
Brasil

Paulo Alberto Santos Vieira

Universidade do Estado de Mato
Grosso, Brasil

Rosa Maria Bueno Fischer

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Sul, Brasil

Jefferson Mainardes

Universidade Estadual de Ponta
Grossa, Brasil

Fabiany de Cássia Tavares Silva

Universidade Federal do Mato
Grosso do Sul, Brasil

Alice Casimiro Lopes

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Jader Janer Moreira Lopes

Universidade Federal Fluminense e
Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora,
Brasil

António Teodoro

Universidade Lusófona
Portugal

Suzana Feldens Schwertner

Centro Universitário Univates
Brasil

Debora Nunes

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Norte, Brasil

Lílian do Valle

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Flávia Miller Naethe Motta

Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Alda Junqueira Marin

Pontifícia Universidade Católica de
São Paulo, Brasil

Alfredo Veiga-Neto

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Sul, Brasil

Dalila Andrade Oliveira

Universidade Federal de Minas
Gerais, Brasil