



Democratic management conceptions in educational policies of the state Department of Education in Paraná (1990-2010)

Paraná: democratic management conceptions

Rayane Regina Scheidt Gasparelo^{1,2*} and Pedro Ganzeli³

¹Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, São Paulo, Brasil. ²Universidade Estadual do Centro Oeste, Irati, Paraná, Brasil. ³Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Cidade Universitária Zeferino Vaz, Barão Geraldo, 13083-970, Campinas, São Paulo, Brasil.

*Author for correspondence. E-mail: rayanegasparelo.0706@gmail.com

ABSTRACT. Investigating the democratic management of schools is a complex task, as it involves questioning the extent to which policies, systems and educational institutions were made, or are, democratic, considering different governments and the historical, social, economic and cultural movement of society. In this sense, we searched in the article to discuss a conception for Education management assumed between the years 1990 and 2010 in educational policies by the State Secretary of Education (SEED) in Paraná. Therefore, the study is based on the analysis of bibliographic and documental references relevant to the theme. Pointing the historic route of political constitution on democratic management frame in different moments of federal and state government, a field of disputes is noticed out, in which governing is synonymous with interests and momentary conveniences of specific groups that cover minority parcels of the population, not advancing in the formulation of a policy of democratic management for the State. It concludes that in political guidelines regarding the schools' participation and autonomy, the predominance is for managing and financial aspects. According to Lima (2011), for education, the perspective that is inscribed in economic rationality is based on the terms autonomy, decentralization and participation stripped of political meaning; that is, as technical-rational instruments. Participation means integration, collaboration and a strategy to reduce institutional conflicts, promoting cohesion and consent. Autonomy and decentralization are restricted to the functional and operational articulation between the central level and the local and institutional levels of school education. It intends to establish an organizational culture of strategic management, in which educational agents assume responsibility for the results, releasing the government from guaranteeing the necessary conditions for the realization of the right to education.

Keywords: Educational politics; education management; democracy; managerialism.

Concepções de gestão democrática nas políticas educacionais da Secretaria Estadual de Educação do Paraná (1990 a 2010)

RESUMO. Investigar a gestão democrática das escolas é uma tarefa complexa, pois remete problematizar até que ponto as políticas, os sistemas e as instituições de ensino se fizeram, ou fazem, democráticas, considerando diferentes governos e o movimento histórico, social, econômico e cultural da sociedade. Nesse sentido, buscamos no artigo discutir a concepção de gestão da Educação assumida, nos anos de 1990 a 2010, nas políticas educacionais da Secretaria Estadual de Educação (SEED) no Paraná. Portanto, o estudo fundamenta-se na análise de referencial bibliográfico e documental pertinente à temática. Apontando o percurso histórico de constituição política em torno do quadro da gestão democrática em diferentes momentos de governos federais e estaduais, percebe-se um campo de disputas, no qual governar é sinônimo de interesses e conveniências momentâneas de grupos específicos que abarcam parcelas minoritárias da população, não avançando na formulação de uma política de gestão democrática para o Estado. Conclui que, em orientações políticas referentes à participação e autonomia das unidades escolares, há predominância dos aspectos administrativo e financeiro. De acordo com Lima (2011), para a educação, a perspectiva que se inscreve na racionalidade econômica fundamenta os termos autonomia, descentralização e participação despojados de sentido político; ou seja, como instrumentos técnico-racionais. Participação significa integração, colaboração e estratégia para reduzir conflitos institucionais, promovendo coesão e consentimentos. Autonomia e descentralização restringem-se à articulação funcional e operacional entre o nível central e os níveis local e institucional da educação escolar. Intenciona estabelecer uma cultura organizacional de gestão estratégica, na qual os agentes educativos assumem a responsabilidade pelos resultados, desobrigando o poder público da garantia das condições necessárias para que se efetive o direito à educação.

Palavras-chave: política educacional; gestão da educação; democracia; gerencialismo.

Concepciones de gestión democrática en las políticas educacionales del Departamento de Educación del estado de Paraná (1990-2010) paran : concepciones de gesti n democr tica

RESUMEN. Investigar la gesti n democr tica de las escuelas es una tarea compleja, ya que implica cuestionar hasta qu  punto las pol ticas, los sistemas y las instituciones educativas fueron o son democr ticos, considerando los diferentes gobiernos y el movimiento hist rico, social, econ mico y cultural de la sociedad. En este sentido, buscamos en el art culo discutir la concepci n de gesti n de la Educaci n tomada en los a os de 1990 hasta 2010, en las pol ticas educativo de la Secretaria Estadual de Educaci n (SEED) en Paran . Por lo tanto, el estudio se basa en el an lisis de referencial bibliogr fico y documental pertinente la tem tica. Apuntando la ruta hist rica de constituci n pol tica acerca del cuadro de la gesti n democr tica en diferentes momentos de gobiernos federales y estaduais, se percibe un campo de disputas en que gobernar es sin nimo de intereses y conveniencias moment neas de grupos espec ficos que abarcan parcelas minoritarias de la poblaci n, no avanzando en la formulaci n de una pol tica de gesti n democr tica para el Estado. Concluye que, en orientaciones pol ticas referentes a participaci n y autonom a de las unidades escolares, hay predominancia de los aspectos administrativo y financiero. Seg n Lima (2011), para la educaci n, la perspectiva que se inscribe en la racionalidad econ mica se fundamenta en los t rminos autonom a, descentralizaci n y participaci n despojada de sentido pol tico; es decir, como instrumentos t cnico-racionales. Participaci n significa integraci n, colaboraci n y una estrategia para reducir los conflictos institucionales, promoviendo la cohesi n y el consentimiento. La autonom a y la descentralizaci n se restringen a la articulaci n funcional y operativa entre el nivel central y los niveles local e institucional de la educaci n escolar. Se busca establecer una cultura organizacional de gesti n estrat gica, en la que los agentes educativos asuman la responsabilidad de los resultados, liberando al gobierno de garantizar las condiciones necesarias para la realizaci n del derecho a la educaci n.

Palabras clave: pol tica educativa; gesti n de la educaci n; democracia; gerencialismo.

Received on July 19, 2019.
Accepted on October 21, 2019.

Introduction

The analysis of the construction of democratic management in Brazilian Education requires understanding about the historical process that preceded the constitutional guarantee of the right to Education, especially the organization of National Education.

Mendon a (2000) highlights that in Brazil, discussions about the notion of the State as an education provider for all, arose in the 1930s with the Manifesto of the Pioneers of New Education, prepared by Fernando de Azevedo and signed by 26 Brazilian educators. They were engaged around the struggle for the secularity of teaching, aiming the institutionalization and expansion of public schools, gender equality in the right to schooling and the State's obligation to assume the universal and free offer of education. They have found room for their claims in the Brazilian Association of Education (ABE) and in the National Conferences of Education.

From that movement on, gradually, the right of access to public education was incorporated by the Constitution of 1946, the Art. 168, items I and II, established the mandatory and gratuity of primary education of four years. The Guidelines and Bases of National Education Law (LDB), Law 4024/61, Art. 27, clarified that the obligation should occur from the age of seven (Brazil, 1961). Then, the Constitution of 1969 (Brazil, 1969), Art. 176, item II, established that primary education would be compulsory and free for all, from seven to fourteen years old; and in 1971, Law 5692/71 (Brazil, 1971) restructured the LDB, extending the time of mandatory and gratuity of studies from four to eight years, which means, from primary to mid school.

These political movements that occurred in Brazil from 1946 to 1964, according to Cunha (1995), can be characterized as the first democratic experiences. By that time, the political parties, especially the Brazilian Labor Party, had wide possibilities for action, advertisements and agreements in order to break with political power within the land-based oligarchies, due to the fact that elections were held by fraudulent proceedings and exclusion of the right to vote of women and illiterate.

However, since the 1960s, society has been divided into party blocs: one bloc in favor of reforms for the working class and another in defense of reforms that favor greater capital accumulation. This division, according to Cunha (1995), generated¹ fragility in the laws for the advancement of public education in relation

¹ This reflection is pertinent to the current context.

to access, permanence and quality. In 1964, the social, political and economic dominance of the second bloc was unleashed in defense of reforms for greater accumulation of capital, installing the military regime and reducing the spaces of political action (parties and trade unions).

In this context, mainly between 1970 and 1985, Cunha (1995) points out that the characteristic of Brazilian society lays on the tenuous civil organization, since, in a regime aimed at capitalist modernization, the priority was to repress the organization of society in political terms so that there are no threats to the bases of the regime. However, the negotiations that took place between the military groups and the opposition fronts (aligning liberals, communists and socialists) favored that, in January 1985, the electoral college elected, with a large majority, Tancredo Neves, from the Brazilian Democratic Movement Party (PMDB), as the first President of the Civil Republic, since April 1964.

With the end of the military regime, society sought to advance the process of building democracy. Then, the construction of a constituent began and Cunha (1995) shows that the Commission for Constitutional Studies, composed by people from different social sectors, handed over to the President of the Republic the draft the Constitution. In it, the basic formulation, regarding teaching, was that it is to be public, free and secular in all levels of education as a right of all Brazilian citizens, regardless of sex, race, age, religious confession, political affiliation or social class.

Therefore, the election of Tancredo Neves as President of the Republic in 1985 and the creation of the National Constituent Assembly in March 1987 marked the history of Brazil by the union of democratic and progressive forces, regardless of the guidelines and party programs.

It is in this context that the 1988 Constitution broke out in Brazil. In the construction of this document, social² movements had space to participate and defend their need regardless to the educational system. These intentions, according to Cunha (1995), revolved around the gratuity of public education, public resources being sent directly to public schools, and the democratization of Education, both in access and quality, and in the management of the school organization.

Such claims were reflected in the articles 205 to 208 of the CF of 1988 (Brazil, 1988), in which Education was expressed as a subjective public right for all, of a mandatory, secular and free nature in Elementary and High School; duty of the State and the family; and ensured the principle of democratic management of public education.

According to Mendonça (2000), the Federal Constitution of 1988, adopting the principles of the Social and Democratic State of Law, came into contradiction with the Brazilian legal culture, strongly marked by values inherent to the Liberal State of Rights. This achievement, although positive, reflected the degree of delay of the democratization of education in the country, hoped to be a right of all, public, secular and free, since the 1930s.

Therefore, the idea of democratization emerged to break with the hierarchical and authoritarian structure, increased by the dictatorial regime, and the incorporation of democratic management of public education in the Federal Constitution of 1988, more specifically in Art. 206, considered social participation³ in the formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of public policies, although dependent on specific regulation, to be endorsed in other specific laws (Brazil, 1988).

Starting from this historical context, considering that the objective of this study is to discuss the conception of education management assumed between 1990 to 2010, by the State Department of Education (SEED) in the state of Paraná, we initially highlight the conception of democratic educational/school management based on the writings of Lima (2001); Dourado (2007) and Souza (2009). Next, we score the main educational policies of the Federal scope, analyzing the LDB no. 9,394/96 (Brazil, 1996) and the National Education Plans: Law No. 10,172/2001 (PNE 2001-2010) (Brazil, 2001) and Law No. 13,005/2014 (PNE 2014-2024) (Brazil, 2014), and we have deepened the analysis of policies aimed at school management in the state of Paraná, such as the School Management Book Paths to Shared Management (Paraná, 1995); the Action Plan of the Department of Education of the State of Paraná - management 1995 - 1998; Quality Project in Basic Education (PQE) 2001 (Paraná, 2001); and Laws 14,231 of 11/26/2003; Law 15.329 of 15/12/2006 and Law 15.800 of 04/26/2008 - referring to the consultation of the school community to provide the position of school principal.

² IV Brazilian Conference on Education, held in Goiânia, in 1986, had Education and the Constituent as its central agenda, resulting in the approval of a document – Carta de Goiânia – containing the educators' proposals for the Education Chapter in the future Magna Carta of the country.

³ Social Participation, according to Gadotti (2014), occurs in spaces and mechanisms of social control, such as conferences, councils, ombudsmen, etc. It is essential for the control, inspection, monitoring and implementation of public policies, as well as for the exercise of dialogue and a more routine and organic relationship between governments and society.

For the analysis of the normative content of such policies, we seek for support in Cunha's (1995); Peroni and Flores' (2014); Souza and Pires' (2018); Zanardini's (2001), Feiges' (2013) studies, among others.

Democratic management of public schools: who, how, in what to participate?

We assume that democratic management is

[...] a process of learning and political struggle that is not limited to the boundaries of educational practice, but envisions, in the specificities of this social practice and its relative autonomy, the possibility of creating channels of effective participation and learning of the democratic 'game' and, consequently, of the rethinking of the structures of authoritarian power that permeate social relations and, within these, educational practices (Dourado, 2007, p. 79, author's italics).

Therefore, it is understood that democratic management is linked to the democratization of relations within the school and the educational system, that is, to participatory processes in the political and social spheres extended to the whole of civil society.

However, the absence of normative elements allows the formation of an open field, in which different conceptions and management logics are included.

Therefore, the concept of participation needs to be well defined, because it translates itself into a fundamental element, which can be transformed into a merely consultative and instrumental model, or as a transformative movement.

With regard to the first, we understand that Souza (2009) points out at least three important aspects, to record: the normalization and standardization of participation, which by promoting excessive discipline of the participation of the population, prevent unusual actions, which could surprise and pressure the rulers of the public thing itself; non-participation, ranging from simple disinterest to the discomfort caused by the consequences of participation; and finally, the defense of participation only in decision-making, disregarding that democratic participation demands a regulatory, supervisory, evaluating action, and decision-making on the direction of political and social life of school institutions and society.

In a bolder move, it is reasonable to consider Lima's (2014) definition of democratic management of the education system. In the last three decades, it encompasses three dimensions of extreme importance, associated and dependent, which are: election, collegiality and participation, constituting and legitimizing itself as an indispensable contribution to the process of materializing the right to education and the democratization of its school organizations, its structures, decision-making processes, power relations, educational practices and knowledge production, rights to exercise the democratic citizenship and the active participation of education professionals, students, families and the community, in a perspective of socio-community construction of the autonomy of the school, towards its self-government⁴.

That said, it is understood that public education policies, in a democratic way of governing, would provide conditions of participation for all social segments. It is not just about the democratic management of the school for the practical implementation of deliberations defined at the state summit.

This means that

[...] it is not inappropriate to understand that school is the epicenter of the educational system and, therefore, its management must be based on democratic principles and procedures. However, it is not enough, since it is reasonable to assume that principals will tend to act in relation to school workers and students and their families, in a similar way as they are treated by the system managers, that is, if we want more horizontal relationships in everyday school life, a good incentive to this is precisely to turn the relationships within the educational system itself horizontal. Thus, seeking ways to democratize the management of the educational system as a whole is urgent (Souza & Pires, 2018, p. 69)

In this sense, it is important to emphasize that democratic management is part of a broader chain of processes, procedures, instruments and mechanisms of actions, involving policy and educational planning.

The Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (9394/96)⁵, after the CF of 1988, reiterated the principle of democratic management, according to Art. 14:

Art. 14. Education systems will define the norms of democratic management of public education in basic education, according to their peculiarities and according to the following principles:

- I - participation of education professionals in the elaboration of the pedagogical project of the school;
- II - participation of school and local communities in school boards or equivalents (Brasil, 1996, p. 6).

⁴ Autonomy and decentralization not only of an executive, implementing or operational type, but based on active participation, debate and dialogue, on practices of direct democracy, whenever possible and appropriate, and on practices of representative democracy (Lima, 2014).

⁵ Considering it important, but respecting the limits of the article, the context of influence in the LDB processing process can be studied in Saviani (1997).

However, by focusing on democratic management with emphasis on the school space (restricted to the school environment, with the election of principals, school councils, and the collective construction of the Political Pedagogical Project), political and organizational relationships are disregarded in the sphere of the educational system as a whole.

Although it is extremely important that school relations are guided by democracy, discussion processes, collective decision-making, monitoring of actions and evaluation of results, it is insufficient to comply with the constitutional principle of a Social and Democratic State of Law⁶.

The dissatisfaction of the progressive forces of the educational community with the propositions of LDBEN 9394/96 led, according to Valente and Romano (2002), in the I and II National Congresses of Education (CONED), to the collective elaboration of the National Education Plan (PNE) of the Brazilian Society, by educators, education professionals, students and parents of students. It was embodied in Bill No. 4,155/98, headed by Congressman Ivan Valente⁷ and signed by more than 70 parliamentarians and all the leaders of the opposition parties of the House of Representatives.

This motion aimed to organize the educational management, demanding the strengthening of the state public school and full democratization as an axis of the effort to universalize Basic Education. This would imply proposing bold objectives, goals and means, including the expansion of total public budget for the maintenance and development of public education, and the implementation of a National Education System.

However, concomitantly to this project, the PNE project developed by Fernando Henrique Cardoso government, from the Brazilian Social Democratic Party (PSDB) under number 4,173/98 was processed in the Legislative Chamber, based on the maintenance of the educational policy sustained by the maximum centralization of decisions, especially in the federal sphere, of the formulation and educational political management, with the progressive removal, by the State, of the tasks of maintaining and developing education, transferring them, whenever possible, to society.

At the end of the entire process⁸, the PNE that was approved by Law 10.172/2001, from the vetoes of President Fernando Henrique Cardoso, referring to the financing, became, according to Valente and Romano (2002), a letter of intent. In other words, the president vetoed everything that could have the image of a plan, removing from the PNE mainly the provision of funds and the devices of direct participation in the deliberative processes, executives and evaluative sums of educational policies that popular pressure had forced them to insert.

In addition, for the management of education, the PNE (2001 - 2010) affirmed the principle of democracy at the system management level, through Education Councils and, at the level of school units, through the formation of school boards for the participation of the educational community and ways of choosing school management that associates the guarantee of competence with the commitment to the pedagogical proposal longed from the school boards.

In the chapter related to the set of goals connected to funding and management, the orientation was that each education system should define democratic management standards of public education with the participation of the community; and the other goals included pointed to the administrative, pedagogical and financial autonomy of schools; the articulation with universities to offer continuing education, including to school principals, aiming at improving their performances; as well as the requirement to ensure, at the end of the decade, that all principals were graduated in higher education, preferably in specialization courses.

Such a proposal, although important, limited the participation to councils⁹, i.e. representative democracy. Therefore, it cannot be denied that there have been advances in representative participation, the search for autonomy and democratic management in school, but according to Gadotti (2014), in relation to effective popular¹⁰ participation in the planning and organization of National Education, the pace of these advances has not been the same.

Regarding school management, the PNE (2001 - 2010) was still flawed in not recognizing the need to ensure that, leaders are chosen by the community through direct voting in all public schools, of all levels, stages or

⁶ One of the foundations of the Social and Democratic State of Law resides in the possibility of everyone's participation in the collective goods and better distribution of these goods (Duarte, 2004).

⁷ From the 1980s to 2005 he was a member of the Workers' Party (PT), from 2006 onwards he joined the Socialism and Freedom Party (PSOL).

⁸ The tensions and contradictions of the procedure, until the approval of Law 10172/2001 of the National Education Plan (2001 - 2010), are highlighted in detail in Valente and Romano (2002).

⁹ National Council of Education (CNE), State Council of Education (CEE), Municipal Council of Education (CME), School Councils, University Councils and others, such as the National Union of Municipal Education Councils (Uneme), the National Council of State Secretaries of Education (Consed) and the National Union of Municipal Education Directors (Undime).

¹⁰ Popular Participation, according to Gadotti (2014), corresponds to the most independent and autonomous forms of organization and political action of popular and working class groups, which constitute social movements, neighborhood associations, union struggles, among others.

modalities. In this question, Gouveia and Souza (2010) ponder the need to define whether the school management is a public office or a public function, because,

[...] it was understood as a position (career), the Federal Constitution does not allow any form of provision other than the public contest (except for cases typified in the Constitution itself, in Article 37). However, it seems to us that such a discussion could take another step, including overcoming the currently accused unconstitutionality against the laws that exist and regulating election procedures for school management, if it is considered that, at least in basic education, it is a function to be performed by the holders of the public office of teacher/teacher/educator/pedagogue; because, thus, there is the possibility of electing educators to assume the school direction, who will temporarily perform this function (during a term or two) and then return to their function of origin, tied to the position for which they were appointed (Gouveia & Souza, 2010, p. 800).

Considering these inconsistent points, the PNE (2001 - 2010) that was approved, partially expressed the needs and proposals from the society by that time. In 2010, at the Education conferences, a preparatory to the first National Conference on Education - Conae 2010, the process of developing a new PNE was triggered.

The Reference Document prepared by the Organizing Committee of Conae, which was delivered to the MEC to constitute the basis of the Bill of Law (PL) referring to the new PNE, according to Peroni and Flores (2014), presented proposals for the commitment of the public power to the financing of a Social Quality Education for all, consolidated due to the implementation of a 'National Articulated System of Education' and with the guarantee of investments appropriate to an offer quality public education.

However, in the correlation of forces between civil society entities organized by the National Forum in Defense of Public School and the Federal Government, during the procedure¹¹ of PL 8.035/10 related to the new PNE, until Law 13.005/2014, which approved PNE - 2014-2024, the text was amended by the Special Committee of the House. It was presented, at the end, with “[...] timid goals and strategies that are not proposed for educational levels, stages and modalities, disregarding a substantial part of the recommendations present in the Final Conae Document” (Peroni & Flores, 2014, p. 183).

In relation to democratic management, the National Education Plan (PNE (2014 - 2024), in its 19th objective, established a 2 years’ deadline for the implementation of democratic management of Education, associated with technical criteria of merit and performance and public consultation with the school community, within public schools, providing resources and technical support of the Union to do so. This goal points to 08 strategies for the implementation of democratic management in Education: 19.1 - Legislation for Democratic Management in Schools; 19.2 - Formation of Counselors; 19.3 - Creation of permanent education forums; 19.4; Formation of the Guild and Association of Parents and Teachers (APMs); 19.5 - Strengthening the Councils; 19.6 - Participation in the Political-Pedagogical Project; 19.7 - Autonomy of Schools; 19.8 - National Selective Test of Directors.

Agreeing with Souza and Pires (2018), when examining the 19th goal and its strategies, it is observed that the principle of democratic management remains, regrettably, only circumscribed to the school, because it indicates few tools of democratic management of education systems, even being mentioned in some Conferences, Forums and Education Councils

Moreover, the proposal of 19th Goal, according to Peroni and Flores (2014), establishes the management model by pointing out, in a generic way, the participation of the school community; associating democracy with the definition of technical criteria of merit and performance, restricting the effectiveness of the principle; and to reduce the direct election of school leaders with the expression 'public consultation'.

Summing up, this legal framework at the national level, synthesizes that the democratization of Education or the instruments of participation, management and decision of the directions of Education resulted in educational reforms, mainly in the 1990s, that reduced human learning to attitudes and competences aimed at the market and consumer society, while “[...] aspects of broader democratization, which relates the democratization of education with the democratization of society and to the historical and social processes in our country, were gradually relegated to a background position or forgotten” (Machado, 2006, p. 165).

In the state of Paraná, the reflection of federal educational policies influenced both mandates of Governor Jaime Lerner, affiliated to the Democratic Party (DEM), from 1995 to 2002. He maintained the discourse that schools with problems of evasion, repetition and violence would be those poorly managed. Therefore, it was necessary to encourage a new management model to face the school's efficiency crisis and ensure the effectiveness and quality of the school unit's operation.

¹¹ The tensions and contradictions in the processing of PL 8.035/10, referring to the new PNE, up to Law 13.005/2014, which approved PNE – 2014-2024, are pointed out in Peroni and Flores (2014).

In the light of this principle, it was defined that

This management is guided by the valorization of the school and its teachers, so that they take, in their context, a dynamic and effective work that increasingly enables the permanence of the student successfully in the system, also marked by a broad sense of collegiate work, involving the community outside the school (Paraná, 1995, p. 5).

Therefore, the School Management Book, Paths to Shared Management (1995); the Action Plan of the Department of Education of the State of Paraná - from 1995 - 1998; and the Quality Project in Basic Education (PQE) from 2001, directed the responsibility to the school, for the efficiency and effectiveness of the system. Consequently, the school manager's tasks have been strengthened. As responsible for local education, he would need to lead, form, control and evaluate internal processes with creativity, flexibility and productive innovation.

Zanardini, Blun and Michellon (2013) state that

[...] the materialization of the categories decentralization, participation and autonomy in their liberal meaning, is well illustrated by the proposal of shared management implemented in the State of Paraná in the 1990s, particularly from 1995 on, when the first management of the Jaime Lerner government began (1995-2002). This proposal is implemented based on the Financial, Technical, Political and Pedagogical Guidelines of the World Bank, under the pretext that peripheral countries would be inefficient in administering their public policies (Zanardini et al., 2013, p. 141).

This shared management model, which requires administrative capacity in its various instances, such as schools, parents and teachers' associations, groups and secretariats, aimed to articulate several actions in order to obtain the expected results, through the rationalization of costs and increase of productivity.

This conception of school management expressed in the SEED-PR documents emphasizes the performance of individuals, pointing them as the main responsible for the success or failure of the school, and it is built based on a market perspective, "[...] since it attaches great importance to customer satisfaction (community/student), leadership role played by the director and community involvement" (Zanardini, 2001, p. 62).

From 2002 on, Roberto Requião administration (2003 - 2010) from Brazilian Democratic Movement Party (PMDB) began. According to Zanardini et al. (2013), he announced, as principles of educational policy: a) Education as a citizen's right; b) universalization of education; c) free and qualified public school; d) fighting illiteracy; e) support cultural diversity; f) collective organization of work; and g) democratic management with emphasis and encouragement to the organization and functioning of the so-called Association of Parents, Teachers and Employees (APMF).

According to Nadal (2007), the actions developed during both Requião administrations (2003-2006 and 2007-2010) in Paraná, incorporated the democratic management discourse as a topic of educational policy and priority in the creation of the State Education Plan, creation of the Training Coordination, the Support Coordination to the Direction and the Support Book for the Elaboration of the School Rules. Thus, his first administration did not effectuate a governmental project, because it developed the first State Education Plan (PEE-PR)¹² to introduce changes, resize and regularize the work conditions and organization Paraná schools.

In the document,

The proposal for managing schools that belong to the State Education System is based on the democratization of relations within the school, based on the development of their autonomy and political-pedagogical actions that value all education workers. To this end, it encourages democratic management, through the shared participation of all school groups, namely: class council, school board, student association and the Association of Parents and Teachers and Employees (APMF) (Paraná, 2005, p. 76).

This legal precision, as can be seen, regulates participation in the scope of public education in Basic Education, which, both in the pedagogical proposal and in school councils or other collegiate bodies, occurs through aspects of the local school reality, that is, the propositions of democratic management were limited to the scope of the school unit.

In this scenario, other regulations resumed the democratization of school management through the approval of specific legislation - Law 14,231 of 11/26/2003 (Paraná, 2003); Law 15,329 of 15/12/2006 (Paraná, 2006)¹³ and Law 15,800 of 04/26/2008 (Paraná, 2008) - referring to the consultation of the school community

¹² State Education Plan – PEE PR A collective construction (Preliminary version) Document prepared for presentation at a Public Hearing. Paraná State College, October 6, 2005. Retrieved from http://www.diaadiaeducacao.pr.gov.br/portals/portal/pee/construcao_coletiva.pdf

¹³ Revoked by Bill 631/2015.

to provide the position of school principal, thus establishing the democratic management of the school as a state policy.

However, Vieira (2007) points out brilliantly that limiting democratic management to the school sphere is something that is far from achieving the expectations of educators who, moreover, want to be agents of policy formulation and management.

Therefore,

[...] democratic management of public schools cannot be reduced to the existence and functioning of the process of election to school principal. The elective process of choosing principals by the school community is an integral part of a much broader process (Feiges, 2013, p. 32).

We believe that the participation of actors in several situations involving social decisions for the group would establish new social and political bases, which could reverse administrative, financial and pedagogical agreements between the ruling classes.

In this way,

[...] the management practice in a democratizing purpose visualizes the development of a political participation, from which the subjects assume a critical and active position, because the school space strengthens the construction of the collective, capable of participative in all spheres of public life, since educational issues go beyond the school universe and constitute public problems (Andrade, 2011, p. 306).

By agreeing with Feiges (2013), we understand that the Roberto Requião management advocated for a social and educational policy of confronting the neoliberal model of his predecessor, towards democratization policies, opposing the previous management.

However, democratic management in Education is a part and also a challenge (at the same time) of the project to build the democratization of Brazilian society, because the

[...] political-pedagogical project, participation in school councils, the election for principals, the exercise of financial autonomy, are pedagogical processes of learning democracy, both for the school community and for the community in general, because participation requires a long process of construction in which democratic management is an end, but also a mean (Peroni & Flores, 2014, p. 186).

Management, from a democratic perspective, is only effective and implies power when subjects are called to participate (directly and indirectly) knowing and being aware of the implications of their participation, managing to unravel the various facets that involve a decision-making process.

Summing up, the federal and state policies movements in Paraná, from 1990 to 2010, it is perceived “[...] a recess in the ascending process of organization and in the great mobilizations that characterized the educational field in the 1980s” (Saviani, 1997, p. 235).

The PNE (2001 - 2010), as well as, the first PEE-PR of 2005, failed to overcome the forces opposed to the institutionalization of democratic management in its fullness (System, networks and schools). Such policies did not direct the possibility of broadening and articulating discussions for collective decision and deliberation for national education, demonstrating the lack of common objectives for education. This is because it is not foreseen procedurally, for example, the strengthening of the National Education Forum, state, city and district education forums, National Conference of Education, National Council of Education (CNE), state (EEC) and city councils (CME); collegiate bodies of higher education institutions and school boards. Furthermore, in the context of educational institutions, there are also few (or non-existent) predictions and moments for the collective construction of institutional development plans and political-pedagogical projects.

The lack of a national education system for the constitution/strengthening of mechanisms of social control and democratization of education management in municipalities, states and the Union implies in disconnected policies of common objectives, still generating mistaken understandings of democracy in school, such as, for example, by sizing democratic management only in the existence of elections for directors.

Conclusion

Pointing out the historical path of political constitution around the framework of democratic management at different moments of federal and state governments, between 1990 and 2010, passing by the LDB no. 9,394/96 (Brazil, 1996); National Education Plans: Law No. 10,172/2001 (PNE 2001-2010) (Brazil, 2001) and

Law No. 13,005/2014 (PNE 2014-2024) (Brazil, 2014), and the analysis of policies aimed at school management in the state of Paraná, such as the School Management Notebook Paths to Shared Management (1995); the Action Plan of the Department of Education of the State of Paraná - management 1995 - 1998; the Quality Project in Basic Education (PQE) 2001; and Laws 14,231 of 11/26/2003; Law 15,329 of 12/15/2006 and Law 15,800 of 04/26/2008 - referring to the consultation with the school community to provide the position of school principal, we perceive a field of disputes in which governing is a synonym of momentary interests and conveniences of specific groups that encompass minority portions of the population, not advancing in the constitution of a national education system, nor in the formulation of a democratic management policy for the State.

As a result, it generates, according to Cunha (1995), 'zig-zagging' standards of public management. They are constituted for different reasons and interests, making each Secretary of Education having their career plan, their curriculum proposal, their type of school architecture, their priorities, that every four years (or possibly in less time, or more, in case of two consecutive terms) is changed.

In this 'zig-zag' standard of administration, the policies are designed to meet voters objectives (search for educational policies that cause an impact capable of bringing results in the election polls, either aiming at the election of the Secretary of Education for deputy, or giving the governor a motto capable of attracting votes even in presidential elections); pedagogical experimentalism (results from enthusiasm with proposals elaborated without scientific bases, announced as capable of solving educational problems, rashly extended to the whole network before being sufficiently tested); or ideological voluntarism (generous attitude of wanting to end the school education evils, and even of society as a whole, in the short space of an administration, sometimes within a year – is the case of a curricular proposal that intends to dissolve or compensate for the effects of the alienation of work, or even the dominant ideology).

We conclude that the inconstancy of educational policies has harmful consequences for public schools, because, observing the changes that are waved at each beginning of a new administration, as much positive and appropriate they may be, they end up generating in teachers, whether teachers or managers, a conformism behavior. This is because they have not even begun to assert the effects of one policy, they are already moving in another direction. Thus, democratic management in the education system remains a challenge to be conquered.

References

- Andrade, M. E. (2011). Gestão democrática na escola pública. In A. M. Gomes (Org.), *Políticas públicas e gestão da educação* (p. 297-328). Campinas, SP: Mercado das Letras.
- Brasil. (1946). *Constituição De 1946*. Recuperado de <https://bitlybr.com/6NKqYrR>
- Brasil. (1961). *Lei 4.024, de 20 de dezembro de 1961. Fixa as Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional*. Brasília: DF. Recuperado de <https://bitlybr.com/9rCTc>
- Brasil. (1969). *Emenda Constitucional nº 1 de 17 de outubro de 1969*. Recuperado de <https://bitlybr.com/nqGui>
- Brasil. (1971). *Lei nº 5.692 de 11 de agosto de 1971*. Recuperado de <https://bitlybr.com/MAfGUmUw>
- Brasil. (1996). *Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional*. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, Casa Civil, Subchefia para Assuntos Jurídicos. Recuperado de http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/19394.htm
- Brasil. (2001). *Lei 10.172, de 9 de janeiro de 2001. Aprova o Plano Nacional de Educação e dá outras providências*. *Diário Oficial da União*, Brasília, DF. Recuperado de <https://bitlybr.com/uiYq6Y>
- Brasil. (2014). *Lei nº 13.005, de 25 de junho de 2014. Aprova o Plano Nacional de Educação - PNE e dá outras providências – Plano Nacional de Educação 2014-2024*. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, Casa Civil, Subchefia para Assuntos Jurídicos. Recuperado de <https://bitlybr.com/6XAX8>
- Brasil (1988). *Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil*. Brasília, DF. Recuperado de <https://bitlybr.com/vHm1>
- Cunha, L. A. (1995). *Educação, estado e democracia no Brasil*. São Paulo, SP: Cortez; Niterói, RJ: Editora da Universidade Federal Fluminense; Brasília,DF: LASCO do Brasil.
- Dourado, L. F. (2007). Políticas e gestão da educação básica no Brasil: limites e perspectivas. *Educação & Sociedade*, 28(100), 921-946. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0101-73302007000300014>

- Duarte, C. S. (2004). Direito Público Subjetivo e Políticas Educacionais. *Revista São Paulo em Perspectiva*, 18(2), 113-118. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0102-88392004000200012>
- Feiges, M. M. F. (2013). *Eleição de diretores no Paraná: uma análise dos planos de ação na gestão das escolas estaduais de Curitiba - triênio 2012-2014* (Tese de Doutorado em Educação). Universidade Federal do Paraná, Curitiba. Recuperado de <https://acervodigital.ufpr.br/handle/1884/31891>
- Gadotti, M. (2014). *Gestão democrática da educação com participação popular no planejamento e na organização da educação nacional*. Recuperado de <https://bitlybr.com/XBB5>
- Gouveia, A. B., & Souza, Â. R. (2010). Perspectivas e desafios no debate sobre financiamento e gestão da educação: da conae a um novo PNE. *Educação & Sociedade*, 31(112), 789-807. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0101-73302010000300008>
- Lima, L. (2001). *A Escola como organização educativa: uma abordagem sociológica*. São Paulo, SP: Cortez.
- Lima, L. (2014). A Gestão democrática das escolas: do autogoverno à ascensão de uma pós-democracia gestonária? *Educação & Sociedade*, 35(129), 1067-1083. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/ES0101-73302014142170>
- Machado, C. R. S. (2006). A gestão democrática no sistema educacional. In B. Luce, & I. L. P. Medeiros. *Gestão escolar democrática: concepções e vivências* (p. 163-173). Porto Alegre, RS: UFRGS.
- Mendonça, E. F. (2000). *A regra e o jogo: democracia e patrimonialismo na educação brasileira*. Campinas, SP: Unicamp.
- Nadal, B. G. (2007). Política educacional paranaense para formação de professores: um olhar à luz dos textos políticos. In *XXIII Anais do Simpósio brasileiro; V Congresso Luso-Brasileiro; I Colóquio Ibero-Americano de Política e Administração Da Educação*, Niterói, RJ; Porto Alegre, RS: ANPAE/UFRGS/FACED/PPGEDU. Recuperado de www.anpae.org.br/congressos_antigos/simposio2007/47.pdf
- Paraná (2005). *Plano Estadual de Educação – PEE PR: Uma construção coletiva* (Versão preliminar). Curitiba, PR: Secretaria de Estado da Educação.
- Paraná. (1995). *Caderno de Gestão Escolar Caminhos para a Gestão Compartilhada*. Curitiba. Recuperado em www.diaadiaeducacao.pr.gov.br
- Paraná. (1998). *Plano de Ação da Secretaria de Estado da Educação do Paraná – 1995 – 1998*. Curitiba. Recuperado de <https://bitlybr.com/ev9me>
- Paraná. (2001). *PQE-Projeto Qualidade no Ensino Público do Paraná*. Curitiba, PR: Secretaria de Estado da Educação. Recuperado de www.pr.gov.br/seed/projetoq
- Paraná. (2003). Lei n. 14.231, de 26 de novembro de 2003. Define critérios de escolha, mediante consulta à Comunidade Escolar, para designação de Diretores e Diretores Auxiliares da Rede Estadual de Educação Básica do Paraná. *Diário Oficial do Estado do Paraná*, Curitiba, PR. Recuperado de <https://bitlybr.com/acVRX>
- Paraná. (2006). Lei n. 15.329, de 15 de dezembro de 2006. Altera a redação dos dispositivos que especifica, da Lei n° 14.231/2003, que dispõe sobre consulta para designação de Diretores e Diretores Auxiliares dos estabelecimentos de ensino. *Diário Oficial do Estado do Paraná*, Curitiba, PR. Recuperado de <https://bitlybr.com/MajS5IA>
- Paraná. (2008). Lei n. 15.800, de 16 de abril de 2008. Dá nova redação ao art. 6º, da Lei n° 15.329, de 15 de dezembro de 2006, conforme especifica. *Diário Oficial do Estado do Paraná*, Curitiba, PR. Recuperado de <https://bitlybr.com/J5C0y>
- Peroni, V. M. V., & Flores, M. L. R. (2014). Sistema nacional, plano nacional e gestão democrática da educação no Brasil: articulações e tensões. *Educação*, 37(2), 180-189. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15448/1981-2582.2014.2.16342>
- Saviani, D. (1997). *A nova lei da Educação: LDB trajetória limites e perspectivas*. Campinas, SP: Autores Associados.
- Souza, A. R. (2009). Explorando e construindo um conceito de gestão escolar democrática. *Educação em Revista*, 25(3), 123-140. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0102-46982009000300007>
- Souza, A. R., & Pires, P. A. G. (2018). As leis de gestão democrática da Educação nos estados brasileiros. *Educação em Revista*, 34(68), 65-87. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0104-4060.57216>
- Valente, I., & Romano, R. (2002). PNE: Plano Nacional de Educação ou carta de intenção? *Educação & Sociedade*, 23(80), 96-107. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0101-733020020008000007>

- Vieira, S. L. (2007). Políticas e gestão da educação básica: revisitando conceitos simples. *Revista Brasileira de Política e Administração da Educação*, 23(1), 53-69. Recuperado de <https://bitlybr.com/S1NtMo>
- Zanardini, I. M. (2001). *A gestão compartilhada implementada no estado do Paraná e as orientações do Banco Mundial (1995-2000)* (Dissertação de Mestrado em Educação). Universidade Estadual de Maringá, Maringá.
- Zanardini, I. M., Blum, M. S. R., & Michellon, E. A. (2013). Uma Análise das políticas de gestão escolar no Paraná e no Brasil entre os anos de 1980 e 2006. *Revista Educação e Fronteiras On-Line*, 3(7), 131-139. Recuperado de <https://ojs.ufgd.edu.br/index.php/educacao/article/viewFile/2778/1562>

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Rayane Regina Scheidt Gasparelo: Pedagogue graduated from the State University of the Midwest - Campus Irati. Specialist in School Management. Master in Education - PPGE - UNICENTRO/PR - CAPES Scholarship Holder. PhD candidate in Education - PPGE - UNICAMP/LAGE (Educational Management Laboratory). Experience in Teaching in Early Childhood Education and Higher Education. Professor at the State University of the Midwest - Irati/Pr. Member of the research groups: Research Group Laboratory in Educational Management (LAGE) - UNICAMP/SP; State, Policy and Education Management (EPGE) Research Group - UNICENTRO/PR.
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7787-8458>.
E-mail: rayanegasparelo.0706@gmail.com

Pedro Ganzeli: Free Professor, Faculty of Education, State University of Campinas. Department of Policy, Administration and Educational Systems (DEPASE), coordinator of the Educational Management Laboratory (LAGE). He holds a degree in Pedagogy from the State University of Campinas (1986), a Master's degree in Education from the State University of Campinas (1993) and a Doctorate in Education from the State University of Campinas (2000). Director of the National Association of Education Policy and Administration - São Paulo Section (ANPAE/SP) management 2011/2015 and member of the national board 2016/2017.
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6237-5110>
E-mail: pedro.ganzeli@gmail.com

Note:

The authors are responsible for the conception, analysis and interpretation of the data, writing and critical review of the content of the manuscript and, also, approval of the final version to be published.