

TRUNCATED MODERNITY AND DECENTRALIZATION OF EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT IN PERU: ASPECTS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF MUNICIPALIZATION (2006-2011)

MODERNIDADE TRUNCADA E DESCENTRALIZAÇÃO DA GESTÃO EDUCACIONAL NO PERÚ: ASPECTOS DA IMPLEMENTAÇÃO DA MUNICIPALIZAÇÃO (2006-2011)

MODERNIDAD TRUNCA Y DESCENTRALIZACIÓN DE LA GESTIÓN EDUCATIVA EN PERÚ: ASPECTOS DE LA IMPLEMENTACIÓN DE LA MUNICIPALIZACIÓN (2006-2011)

Haydeé Liliana Vera ROJAS¹
Antonia Almeida SILVA²

ABSTRACT: This article analyses the relationship between the modernization and the decentralization of education in Peru during the Alan García Pérez government (2006-2011), when the *Plano de Municipalização da Gestão Educativa e Delineamentos do Plano Piloto 2007* was founded. With a dialectical approach, the study suggests a historical incursion, and utilizes document analysis as a central procedure to the research, having official documents (printed or digitalized), along with newspapers and the area's qualified bibliography as fonts. The categories guiding the analysis are: management, decentralization and modernity. This research has found that the management decentralization process has translated into the fragmentation of the State's actions and the promotion of autonomy by decree. The modernity has been expressed, in context, as an ideological persuasion ingredient in favor of private interests, and has not achieved changes regarding the deregulation and devolution of the State's power to society.

KEYWORDS: Decentralization. Modernization. Educational management. Municipalization. Implementation.

RESUMO: *Este artigo analisa a relação entre modernização e descentralização da educação no Peru, no governo do presidente Alan García Pérez, de 2006 a 2011, quando foi instituído o Plano de Municipalização da Gestão Educativa e Delineamentos do Plano Piloto em 2007. Trata-se de uma investigação de natureza documental, com enfoque crítico, tendo como fontes documentos oficiais, impressos ou digitais, além da bibliografia qualificada da área. Orientam as análises as categorias: gestão, descentralização e modernidade. A investigação revelou que a implementação da política de descentralização da gestão, amparada na municipalização,*

¹ Feira de Santana State University (UEFS) – BA – Brazil. Master in Education. Research supported by CAPES, through a master's scholarship. Basic education teacher in Peru. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7770-5875>. E-mail: hveraro2@ucv.edu.pe

² Feira de Santana State University (UEFS), Feira de Santana – BA – Brazil. Professor of Educational Policy at the Department of Education. PhD in Education (USP). Member of the Network for Studies on Implementation of Public Educational Policies. (REIPPE). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6790-7761>. E-mail: antoniasilva@uefs.br

traduziu-se na fragmentação das ações do Estado e na promoção da autonomia por decreto. A modernidade se expressou, no contexto, como ingrediente de persuasão ideológica em favor dos interesses privados e não alcançou mudanças quanto à desregulação e devolução do poder do Estado à sociedade.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Descentralização. Modernização. Gestão da educação. Municipalização. Implementação.*

RESUMEN: *Este artículo analiza la relación entre modernización y descentralización de la educación en el Perú, durante el gobierno del presidente Alan García Pérez, de 2006 a 2011, cuando se instituyó el Plan de Municipalización de la Gestión Educativa y el Esquema del Plan Piloto 2007. Es una investigación documental, con un enfoque crítico, teniendo como fuentes documentos oficiales, impresos o digitales, además de la bibliografía calificada. Las siguientes categorías orientan el análisis: gestión, descentralización y modernidad. La investigación reveló que la implementación de la política de descentralización de la gestión, apoyada en la municipalización, resultó en la fragmentación de las acciones del Estado y la promoción de la autonomía por decreto. La modernidad se expresó, en el contexto, como un ingrediente de la persuasión ideológica a favor de los intereses privados y no ha logrado cambios en términos de desregulación y retorno del poder del Estado a la sociedad.*

PALABRAS CLAVES: *Descentralización. Modernización. Gestión educativa. Municipalización. Implementación.*

Introduction

This article, based on the idea that Peru is a country designated by "a kind of truncated or incomplete modernity" (TANAKA, 2016, p. 14, our translation), proposes to problematize the project of modernization and decentralization of education, based on the *Plano de Municipalização da Gestão Educativa e Delineamentos do Plano Piloto* - Plan for Municipalization of Educational Management and the Guidelines of the 2007 Pilot Plan - hereafter, the PPM in the Portuguese acronym, instituted under the government of Alan García Pérez, from 2006 to 2011. Therefore, we are interested in analyzing the political relations involved in the trilogy modernization, decentralization, and educational management, where we will analyze the implementation process of the PPM and its repercussions. Thus, it will be possible to demonstrate the vision of educational management and its intertwining with the revision of the role of the State in its post-bureaucratic version.

The process of modernizing Peruvian educational management through decentralization is a current issue, since it has been seen that one of the major problems affecting the development and equitable progress of the regions is centralism, since in the city of Lima all

powers are concentrated and is the political and economic axis of the country. which affects the rest of the provinces and departments.

One of the areas where centralism has caused serious problems is the educational field, which is evident in the inequalities between sectors of the country, in this case between Lima and the rest of the regions. The educational gap is worrisome because it maintains a complex cycle of production and increased social inequality for people who directly suffer exploitation, discrimination, and exclusion.

As Tanaka (2016, p. 15, our translation) points out in his brief overview of social relations and the production of inequality in Peru:

All this would have as a consequence the need to explain how in Peru injustice in social relations crosses class, ethnic, regional, and gender components, among others. Although this configuration crosses the entire social structure, one sector is special and historically oppressed, while injustices against it tend to overlap: the poor population, Andean or Amazonian, of indigenous origin, rural, female. Any emancipatory or egalitarian project must consider this complex configuration, which is also expressed in an extremely heterogeneous and fragmented social order.

Given this, thinking about the educational proposals presented in the name of modernization challenges us to look beyond and unveil the rhetoric it contains. The study proposed here, in this sense, articulates relevant political elements to the concepts and, through them, examines the PPM guidelines and their implications, based on the critical approach. This is understood "as one who questions the status quo and the social relations of exploitation, discrimination, or exclusion associated with it" (TANAKA, 2016, p. 13, our translation).

The research used documentary analysis as a central procedure, taking as sources official documents, printed or digital, as well as newspapers. The following analytical categories were adopted: management, decentralization, and modernity. Management was identified in the study as the main axis of the idea of change that was intended to be achieved with the implementation of the PPM. To go beyond the formal notion of management, the study was inspired by the notion raised by Cassasus (2002), because for him management models are based on some theory of human action within organizations, which allows the concept to be understood in different political biases. Educational management has become the core of the reforms that have been implemented in Latin American education since the 1980s due to the political, social, and economic changes that have taken place in the countries of the region (CASSASUS, 2002). It has a theoretical-practical character and is influenced by the discourse of educational policy, that is, it is part of the implementation of proposals by the national

government or international organizations, which are framed in a particular political and economic thought. As a theoretical discipline,

Its disciplinary content is determined as much by the content of management as by its everyday practice. Educational management is constituted by the implementation of the general principles of management and those of education. In this sense, it is an applied discipline, a field of action (CASSASUS, 2002, p. 49, our translation).

The categories of decentralization and modernization were positioned as structuring ideas for the formation of consensus around the assumptions of State Reform undertaken since the 1970s in the different national states. This ideal places the market as a central agent for the balance of power relations and a strategic role for the ideology of the minimal State, in favor of liberal doctrines and policies. As Boron (2003) points out, the use of the word reform mentions the supposed desire for a positive meaning, according to the Western philosophical tradition. In Latin America, however, state reforms went in the opposite direction. "[...] Therefore, more than reforms, the more correct term would be to say that they were processes of counter-reform, processes of destruction, processes that had consequences processes of de-citizenship. [...]" (BORON, 2003, p. 33, our translation).

The shared analyses give visibility to the processes of municipalization experienced in Peru and the contradictions of the proposals based on the flattening of the state. From a counter-hegemonic perspective, the abandonment of the problem of social justice and its relation to collective solidarity is questioned.

The article is structured in four parts, including this introduction. The other parts address, respectively, conceptual aspects and guidelines of educational management in the Peruvian context, then, the institution and unfoldings of the Municipalization Pilot Plan, as an instrument of educational policy. Finally, the conclusions are presented.

The political dimensions of the relationship between modernization, decentralization, and educational management

The question of modernization in Latin America is marked by the controversial aspects of the expansion of capitalism in the continent, on the one hand, the subordination of the assumed projects to the interests of the local dominant factions, on the other hand, the preservation of the dynamics of overexploitation of subordinate classes in the various spheres of social life. In this sense, modernization refers to complex movements of political-institutional realignments, guided by species of interest clubs that act within political and civil

society to protect private interests, especially those of three large groups that, despite their heterogeneous characteristics, manage to maintain alignments for their self-protection: military, business, and bureaucratic party associations.

Dardot and Laval (2016), however, show that the size of our misfortune transcends borders, as elites and "new lefts" converted to the rationalization of public policies tend to consent to neoliberalism under the arguments of "modernity." The contradictory character of modernity, however, is not new, but has been amplified in the neoliberal context, which has brought with it attacks against egalitarianism and collective solidarity. At the same time, the notion of social justice is hollowed out and the notions of individual freedom and the market are strengthened through the combined lexicons of management and performance. (DARDOT; LAVAL, 2016).

These situations illustrate the trends that run through the notions of modernization in dispute and point to their limits when they are professed by sectors historically committed to power relations of colonial origin. Along these lines, one can also observe the conceptions of decentralization and management, as a rule limited to administrative procedures of transferring responsibilities among government entities, with strong control by the central power. In this sense, it is possible to understand the centrality that these issues have been acquiring for educational reforms, as part of the State Reform agenda.

However, we have seen that the processes of deconcentration and decentralization in Latin America present a multiplicity of variables that serve an ambiguous use of terms, most often fulfilling a political role of spreading the idea of administrative inefficiency and invisibilizing the emancipatory or egalitarian project. Political proposals in this regard therefore aim at reducing decentralization through greater parental involvement in the school or transferring new responsibilities to governments. Local; while for others it amounts to privatizing and reducing state spending. Moreover, as Cassasus (2002) notes, decentralization of educational management in Latin America has gained great centrality as part of neoliberal reforms since the 1980s in the face of the political, social, and economic changes that have occurred in countries in the region. Its reference to this period does not prevent us from realizing that, throughout time, the diverse possible mediations between society and the State were built around the modernizing pretensions of the economically and culturally dominant sectors, which assumed that, in order to achieve this end, it was necessary to overcome the contradictions between nation and anti-nation, technical and non-technical, leaving the struggle between

capital and labor in a secondary plane. Decentralization appears in this process as part of the strategies to overcome the "non-technical" models and to broaden the management models.

According to this ideology, one can affirm that the market is a central agent for the balance of power relations and must occupy a strategic role in spaces hitherto identified as belonging to the State, cornering them to favor the ideology of the minimal State, under the neoliberal gaze.

Barring the various experiences that each country was going through, the sectors of civil society experienced the initial trance of slipping the sense of "class autonomy. Such a slip was accompanied by the overvaluation of the immediate discourses of each organization. This new form of popular organization, although with a critical bias, somehow favored the fragmentation of collective struggles and gave rise to ideas of inefficiency of the State and the role of civil society, confusing resistance with assimilation of key ideas of neoliberalism.

In a study conducted on educational policies, Rivas and Sánchez (2016) mention common trends on educational measures in Latin America focused on seven countries (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, and Uruguay) and point out that educational rights have expanded, but there are many challenges regarding access at all levels, growth of state funding, and recognition of rights for marginalized populations. In almost all countries except Peru, teaching hours have been extended and the education budget has been significantly increased. Political decentralization has been observed as a current rhetoric of education ministries. The school curriculum is ambivalent, as it develops between prescription and expansion. Along with this, curriculum materials are very prescriptive or normative, while curriculum designs tend to be very broad, due to excess content. However, there are discussions about the school curriculum with a gender focus, which has caused conflicts between conservative and progressive groups. Another trend is the incorporation of mechanisms to evaluate the quality of education. Related to this, there has been the strengthening of the training and selection of school principals. As far as teaching is concerned, new evaluation systems have been created, careers linked to merit, appointments through competitive examinations, and even differentiated payments according to the learning results of the students. These actions leave no doubt about the contradictory character of the educational reforms in the context of the so-called post-bureaucratic state, established in processes of de-citizenship.

Stramiello (2010) points out that in Latin America educational modernization has been presented through three regional trends: modernization as chaos management, modernization as economic-social development, and modernization as recognition of diversity. In his

understanding, modernization as chaos management has prioritized the creation of educational planning offices within ministerial units. This means the establishment of an organization to improve the educational system. Modernization as economic-social development has expressed itself through the proposals of technical and vocational education as the basis for the take-off of underdeveloped nations; In addition, adult education and training plans have been implemented to correct the educational deficiencies of the population and improve the labor force. Modernization as recognition of diversity was manifested through various measures such as the inclusion of indigenous languages in curricula, attention to linguistic interculturality, and proposals for decentralization (administrative, pedagogical, or financial) to meet regional needs, give importance to educational institutions, and provide assistance to vulnerable groups.

In Peru, these changes are crossed by tensions that express the multiplicity of interests at stake, including the constant negative processes of change by sectors that protect colonial lineages. Thus, the inclusion of indigenous languages, for example, was managed from overcoming racist discourses that pointed out that these languages were useless for learning and that only Spanish should be spoken, and secondarily English. Moreover, opposing ideas of modernity clashed in this regard, as some scholars considered that the modern was precisely the expansion of Spanish throughout Peru and the disappearance of indigenous languages, while others sought to revalue indigenous languages as part of strengthening national identity and for a better understanding of what was taught in the classroom to the student with the first indigenous language. Meanwhile, backwardness and underdevelopment are not only explained at the administrative level, but concern political choices, that is, who the adopted development projects serve.

Educational Decentralization and the Municipalization Pilot Plan

Decentralization in Peru is not recent, with the Organic Law of Public Education in 1941 as an important milestone, as witnessed by Laveriano (2010). In the context of the implementation of the Pilot Plan, decentralization was based on a process of transferring functions from central to regional governments.

In the words of Olarte and Echeverría (2008), educational decentralization undertaken in Peru became a goal of governments after the dictatorship of Fujimori, a government marked by strong centralism.

The first period of educational decentralization, corresponding to the same process throughout the country, would be between 2001 and 2006. It has its

origin [...] in the reestablishment of social and political participation of citizens and decentralization in the agenda of the democratic transition, which broke with the centralism of Alberto Fujimori's regime. Centralism and autocracy in power explain the speed with which the decentralization process was resumed (OLARTE; ECHEVERRÍA, 2008, p. 25, our translation).

Therefore, to influence educational decentralization, it was considered that this would be administered by municipal governments, since they were closer to the population and students, and their problems, and schools would have greater decision-making power and autonomy.

For this, the necessary legal basis was given through the Constitutional Reform Law of Chapter XIV of Title IV, on Decentralization, in 2002 (PERU, 2002a), which established the division of power into three levels of government (national, regional, and local) with economic, political, and administrative autonomy, and the Law of Decentralization Bases. No. 27783 (PERU, 2002b), which created the National Decentralization Council (CND in the Portuguese acronym), responsible for directing and conducting the process (article 22). The Law defined the model and covered decentralization, including how the transfer of responsibilities from the central government to subnational governments would be carried out, as stated in Chapter II, Transitional Provisions, divided into four central phases: First Phase: Installation of regional governments on a departmental basis, transfer of the assets and liabilities of the Transitional Councils of Regional Administration, and election of the first regional authorities; Second Stage: Consolidation of the regionalization process, referring to the formulation and approval of the national decentralized investment plan, dissemination of the national regionalization plan, and promotion and technical assistance for the formation of the regions. Third Stage: Transfer of sectoral functions, except health and education. Fourth Stage: Transfer and receipt of sectoral competencies in health and education to regional and local governments with NDC responsibilities (PERU, 2002b).

The laws ordering decentralization were complemented by the Organic Law of Regional Governments (hereafter LOGR) (PERU, 2002c) and the Organic Law of Municipalities (LOM in the Portuguese acronym) (PERU, 2003a), which established the functions that corresponded to each instance, plus the General Law of Education (PERU, 2003b). The LOGR established a series of measures to modernize decentralized educational management systems in coordination with local governments, while the LOM established the Educational Coordination and Management Units (PERU, 2003a).

Despite the order given by the Basic Decentralization Law (PERU, 2002b), Law No. 27902 (PERU, 2003a) amended the fourth, complementary and final transitory provision of the

LOGR, establishing a policy of functions in a rapid and parallel manner, including health and education. They were also included in the 2006 Annual Sectoral Competencies Transfer Plan and applied in 2007.

With this legal framework, the Education sector had its own strategy defined in the "2005-2009 Five Year Transfer of Competencies Plan of the Health and Education Sectors" (PERU, 2005). The Ombudsman followed the decentralization process in each of its stages, and thus prepared a report entitled "Knowing the Plan for the Transfer of Competencies for the Five-Year Period 2005-2009 of the Health and Education Sectors from a Rights-Based Approach", in which it reported on the difficulties faced by the educational decentralization process. Among its conclusions are: the lack of clarity and precision to define which competencies correspond to each level of government; equal lack of demarcation between the functions of provincial and district municipalities; absence of articulation mechanisms between levels of government for the coordination of the functions of the Local Units of Educational Management (hereafter UGEL). As Muñoz (2013, p. 6) reminds us, in the analysis of educational management and its decentralization, it is essential to evaluate the functioning of the different regional governments, "what their institutional capacities are and how they define and use their organizational resources," including the composition of the cadres of bureaucrats who routinely operate educational policies and maintain relative autonomy from the authorities.

As can be seen, the Plan for Municipalization of Educational Management was instituted within a sequence of dissemination of the principles of the new public management, initiated earlier. Thus, through Supreme Decree No. 078-2006-PCM (PERU, 2006b), President Alan García authorized the Ministry of Education, led by José Antonio Chang Escobedo, to carry out its proposal, starting January 1, 2007. The MHP combined the need to decentralize education by assigning this responsibility to the municipalities, and the formulation of guidelines for its application, including a Municipalization Compensation Fund (Foncomuge) and its budget. Its stated goal was to "overcome a long history of unfavorable learning outcomes for children and youth in the country" (PERU, 2006a, p. 17, our translation).

In the implementation of this project, the dynamics of education development focused on the district municipality. Initially it would be executed and as a test between 2007 and 2008, and as it progressed, it would be evaluated and expanded throughout the country. The implementation and rollout strategy had three stages: initiation, expansion, and generalization. As shown in Table 1, each stage had a process and its end was defined by the achievement of its progress.

Table1 – Stages of the PPM

Stage	Process	Advances
Initiation Stage	Pilot Plan 2007-2008. Implementation of the management model and administrative transfer to the municipalities	56 municipalities in 26 regions. Initial and primary education institutions. In 2008, 88 new municipalities were incorporated.
Expansion Stage	Increase in the number of districts and provinces that make up the municipalization of educational management, 2009-2010.	2009 134 municipalities incorporated, 10 municipalities removed from PPM.
Generalization Stage	Significant growth in the number of districts and provinces; 2011-2015 period.	In 2011, Ollanta Humala's government repealed the PPM's education policy.

Source: Pilot Plan for Municipalization of Education, 2007 (PERU, 2006a)

In the first phase of the Pilot Plan, 56 district municipalities from 26 regions were assigned to carry it out, without consulting the regional governments. According to Díaz and Valdivia (2007) there were 206 UGELs distributed in 26 Regional Education Directorates. Moments of uncontrollable administrative chaos arose due to the lack of a vision of what kind of management structure the educational system should require. Regional Directions with and without an execution area; that is, management of educational centers; Regional Sub-directions in some and not in others; Educational Service Units in some Regions, while in others - in addition to these bodies - there were Educational Development Areas. Initially, 80 municipalities were on the waiting list and only 56 participated.

The PPM handed over extensive powers to the municipalities through its strategy of involving local governments with the educational institutions, mediated by the technical secretariat, which would perform the operational functions (PERU, 2006a, p. 16). The 56 district municipalities selected to begin implementing the Plan had a large contingent under their jurisdiction, as can be seen in detail in Table 2.

Table 2 – Number of institutions and participants involved in the Municipalization of Education Pilot Plan

Educational Level	Educational Institutions	Teachers	Students
Initial	651	2,166	51,223
Primary	1232	5,657	134,941
Total	1,883	7,823	186,164

Source: Pilot Plan for Municipalization of Education, 2007 (PERU, 2006a)

According to the form of organization designed, each municipality would have a Municipal Education Council (CEM), composed of representatives of the Institutional Education Councils (CONEI) of the educational institutions, presided over by the mayor and with a technical secretariat responsible for implementing the CEM agreements. This CEM was in charge of managing the municipalization process through coordination with the educational institutions formed by the CONEI, the principals, teachers and students, and the Parents' Association (APAFA).

The CONEI was composed of the director of the Educational Institution, who chairs it, the vice-directors, one representative of the teachers per educational level, one representative of the elementary and high school students, two representatives of the parents, one representative of the alumni, one representative of the administrative staff, and representatives of the community institutions could also participate (PERU, 2006a).

The functions of the CEM were to be the center of the modernization of educational management by promoting citizen participation in order to carry out coordinated work where not only officials and authorities are involved, but also teachers and parents, and even students (PERÚ, 2006a). The CEM established policy guidelines, directed management actions, approved the execution of educational plans and the budget, ensured the fulfillment of objectives and goals, established indicators, promoted and approved the training of teachers and administrators, established transparency and accountability mechanisms, and coordinated with the Minedu, the GORE, the DRE, and the UGEL (PERU, 2006a).

The Technical Secretariat, in turn, operationalized the policy guidelines of the CEM, formulated and executed the operational plans, coordinated with the EIs in training and technical assistance, supported the mayor, and also coordinated with the DRE and the UGEL the pedagogical and institutional technical support, and the administrative processes (PERU, 2006a).

Through the specific objectives, one can see that the mobilization of different agents and the transfer of responsibilities from the central governments to the regional governments were structural.

- a. Municipalities manage Basic Education service in their jurisdictional area.
- b. The educational community participates in local educational management through the Institutional Educational Councils-CONEI.
- c. The learning level of children and adolescents improves, is verifiable through outcome indicators.
- d. Institutional, pedagogical and administrative management is more efficient in educational institutions that are led by the local government.

- e. Coverage is expanded and educational inequality is reduced at the local level with the intervention of the municipality and educational actors and agents.
- f. The municipality articulates intersectoral intervention (health, food, etc.) in support of educational management (PERU, 2006a, p. 38, our translation).

When the PPM was announced, education experts working in UGEL, DREL and the Ministry of Education itself, advisors among others, gave a favorable opinion to it, but with caveats, such as starting the pilot in the Metropolitan Municipality of Lima, the richest in Peru, and then moving to other municipalities equally ordered and with a budget that covers the expectations that the project is viable. adding that this proposal should not be used politically (DIARIO EL COMERCIO, 2007).

The National Education Council requested the suspension of the PPM because, among other reasons, it proposed a single model of municipal decentralization, despite the intrinsic differences in the various provinces and districts of the country, which expressed an evident improvisation, haste and lack of rigor in its formulation (PERU, 2006a).

Several of the decisions made by the Ministry of Education in the PPM process were unfounded, such as the increase in the number of municipalities in the initial phase (2007-2008) and the incorporation of the secondary level, starting with 56 municipalities and ending this year with 88, without the ability to resolve the bureaucratic obstacles that prevented the launch of Foncomuge, which was intended to compensate for the lack of budget of the municipalities in the educational issue and overcome the historical inequality of educational service. Without this compensation fund, the municipalities that lacked trained human resources, the necessary technology and logistics, and the necessary revenue to cover their expenses, were doomed to failure in their attempts to meet the programmed goals. The municipalities had differentiated and heterogeneous installed capacities, where the budget imbalance, the staff capacity and the municipal experience in the educational area were fundamental in the application of the PPM, since the priorities would also be differentiated and heterogeneous; while some municipalities might privilege infrastructure and others capacity building, and these situations were not foreseen in the PPM design. Thus, the implementation dynamics ignored the warning about the centrality of bureaucrats, as Muñoz (2013) points out.

The project proposed by the government of Alan García did not know how to properly deal with the process of educational decentralization, proposed a municipal strategy that was never clear, neither normative nor at the time of its execution, where the duplication of functions, vertical relations, political use, lack of coordination and articulation, the null

participation of various educational actors, The geographic, economic and cultural diversity, among other characteristics, was taken into account in the formulation and design of the PPM.

The controversial character of this process is that the failure of educational municipalization further configured the inequality gap in the educational service, where the poorest continued to be educated with serious deficiencies, while the Administrative Reforms were identified as alternatives to the supposed crisis of the State. within the framework of implementing a neoliberal economy that favored certain actors for economic profit, thus generating an insurmountable vicious circle until today.

Despite the political rhetoric to push decentralization for the improvement of educational management, under Alan García's government, it was not working as expected by the mayors. As can be seen in the minutes of the December 18, 2009, second ordinary session of the Metropolitan Assembly of Lima, the articulatory space of Lima's municipalities, the information gap on how the municipalization process was progressing was evident.

The purpose of the meeting was to identify progress in decentralization and the status of the transfer process. At the end of his presentation, the Regional Sub-Manager of Decentralization, Jorge Montoya Maquín, it was evident that education, among other priority issues, was not so much for Metropolitan management or the National Government, being located in Transfer Group IV with direct coordination between Government and municipalities, without the Metropolitan administration having any kind of deanery.

It is worth noting that how many provisions were issued by the higher entity: the MED, which was carried out equally for rural and urban areas, unfortunately did not take into account contexts of any kind that affected the execution of the PPM.

In 2011, the outgoing government of Alan García programmed the last "decentralization shock" for regional governments, that is, a hasty transfer of resources that had not been transferred in the respective years, which "turned accreditation into a 'checklist' designed to verify the existence of physical or mobile infrastructure, exacerbating the problem of the emphasis on formal aspects and absence of mechanisms to verify real capacities" (ALCÁZAR; VALDIVIA, 2011, p. 13, our translation).

In 2011, the government of Ollanta Humala (2012-2016) deactivated the pilot plan through Supreme Decree No. 019-2011-ED (PERU, 2011), and the Minister of Education, Patricia Salas, began implementing the National Education Project and Decentralized Educational Management (PERU, 2015), proposals prepared by the National Education

Council. However, recent studies indicate that even this measure has not broken the truncated and incomplete cycle of modernization.

The transfer of responsibility for delivery to regional sub-levels of government has generated a number of problems in the design of the new institutional framework and major challenges related to management capacities. In the Peruvian case, the diagnoses carried out recognized the existence of problems in the institutional design of the decentralization reform, since there are duplications, gaps, and contradictions between the functions exercised by the Ministry of Education and those exercised by regional and local governments. For some, regional governments and municipalities present a series of limitations for efficient management due to bureaucratic obstacles in their administrative apparatus, the scarcity of qualified personnel in specialized areas, and the lack of use of empirical evidence for the delimitation of their educational policies and programs.

We believe that a model linked to de-citizenship processes has been applied, as Boron (2003) states, since plans and projects seek an improvement in results, while scapegoating and reducing investments. For this reason, national and international evaluations were promoted, such as participation in the PISA test, in which poor results were obtained, reflecting minimal progress. This model is also reflected in the implementation of technological resources, and not in the content; well, the purchase of computers was made, especially in urban areas, but there was not much progress in rural areas, which is a sign of the technological and educational gap between municipal and rural schools. It was realized that although these models present themselves as a management alternative, with repercussions in education, they are far from really promoting the decentralization of the educational system. Among the impediments to this achievement are the hasty manner in which it was carried out in the period 2006-2011, including the preservation of pedagogical political foundations. Examples of this are the denialism that reflects conservative thinking, above all, denying the gender approach and the support for the teaching of religion in schools. The problem with current policies is that the idea that the low quality of public education is due to teacher deficiencies has dominated; Therefore, investment has been made in teacher training programs. This shows that the idea of quality that has been imposed has been the logic of efficiency and competitiveness that serves the political trend and the neoliberal economic model that has been followed since the 1990s. It is worth remembering that the reduction of the planning and administrative powers of any state, ceding autonomy to the schools themselves and using as a motivating factor the possibility of self-management, producing what Domingo (1999, p. 5, our translation) calls autonomy by decree, that is,

"paradoxical of the discourse and proposals about autonomy is found in that they seem to be, at the same time, new systems for regulating work and institutions, as well as New spaces for freer and more creative action". However, the rhetoric on autonomy changes the ultimate values of the state with the public, and decentralization is equated with deregulation and the abandonment of public services to the fate of citizens.

Conclusion

As we have seen, the political decentralization of the State is a process developed in several Latin American countries. The reforms carried out have been guided by different motives, among them the search for greater efficiency in public spending and greater user control over service management.

It should not be forgotten that the Pilot Plan was conceived in association with the rhetoric of decentralizing the administration of educational institutions to make them more effective. The Pilot Plan still does not take into account the different realities of the regions, besides the fact that the roles of regional government and municipal government are not well defined. The research found that the education decentralization process, far from closing the inequality gap between the capital, Lima, and the rest of the country, has deepened it, by failing to articulate a policy that takes into account the disadvantages and differences between local governments, where they have not received the total budget agreed upon or the funds necessary to execute and achieve the proposed objectives. Having to assume, especially the poorest municipalities, part of the municipalization expenses that corresponded to the central government.

The evidence of the frustrations caused by the Plan and the sequence of reforms based on colonial visions, here also called visions that profess a truncated modernity, in the terms indicated by Tanaka (2016), is not lacking and can be verified by the exclusionary characteristics, even in relation to the dominant logic, such as the international assessments, like Pisa. In the test conducted in 2012, Peru ranked last among 65 countries; in the 2015 test, it ranked 63rd among 69 countries, while in 2018, obtaining as results in reading comprehension 54% of fifteen-year-olds have a very low level, in the area of mathematics, 60% of young people are in the lowest levels of proficiency, in the area of science, about 55% of students have low performance (BOS; VITERI; ZOIDO, 2019). Rural education is developed under worse conditions than urban education. In 451 educational institutions that were visited by the Ombudsman, it was found that the conditions for studying are very difficult, especially because

of an infrastructure that is continuously confronted with weather phenomena. Access to water, electricity, telephone, internet and public services is also insufficient, in addition to the shortage of teachers, even after the issues raised by the Ombudsman (2009). The weakness of educational policies, improvisation, lack of qualified human resources, added to structural problems such as poverty, racism and corruption, for which to this day there is a strong power crisis, and the interests of private groups, especially religious and business groups, contribute to educational inequality in Peru, which allows us to corroborate the repercussions on attempts at educational decentralization and the difficulties in promoting educational reforms as is the case we are seeing in the Municipalization of Education Plan.

The results achieved are ambiguous and reflect serious limitations in relation to equity and social efficiency. They mainly reflect the contradictions of societies historically marked by inequality and still fragile in the struggles between capital and labor, ethnic diversity, and the social place of the original peoples of the Americas in their multiple forms of production of life and culture. It was observed that educational decentralization presents the same problems that have characterized political decentralization, such as the inefficiency of local authorities and the increase of inequalities between regions. In fact, from a critical perspective, decentralization is not limited to the articulation of strategies (norms) and tactics (means) to overcome "dysfunctions" in any area, much less education. In the situation seen, therefore, the ambiguity of the term informs the dispute of meanings and, to some extent, its appropriation by classes and social groups committed to the doctrinal assumptions of state regulation. Moreover, it is important to note that the multiplication of approaches to the issue is part of the struggle for hegemony and expansion of the areas of influence of different interest groups.

In this sense, we should consider the warning of Juan Carlos Tedesco (1993) when he states that autonomy can be very close to isolation. If decentralization and institutional autonomy are confused with leaving schools to their fate, the effect is guaranteed: it will be the legitimization of inequality.

REFERENCES

- ALCÁZAR, L.; VALDIVIA, N. Descentralización y presupuesto de la educación pública en el Perú: avances y desafíos. **Revista Peruana de Investigación Científica**, v. 3, n. 3, p. 7-51, 2011. Available at: <http://3.20.45.153/index.php/RPIE/article/view/15>. Access on: 11 Sept. 2022.
- BORON, A. A. El Estado y las “reformas del Estado orientadas al mercado”. Los “desempeños” de la democracia en América Latina. In: BORON, A. *et al.* **América Latina: Estado e reforma numa perspectiva comparada**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2003.
- BOS, M. S.; VITERI, A.; ZOIDO, P. **PISA 2018 en América Latina: ¿Cómo nos fue en lectura?** OECD, 2019. Available at: https://publications.iadb.org/publications/spanish/document/Nota_PISA_18_PISA_2018_en_Am%C3%A9rica_Latina_C%C3%B3mo_nos_fue_en_lectura_es.pdf. Access on: 12 Jan. 2022.
- CASSASUS, J. Problemas de la gestión educativa en América Latina: La tensión entre los paradigmas de tipo A y el tipo B. **Em Aberto**, Brasília, v. 19, n. 75, p. 49-69, 2002. Available at: <http://emaberto.inep.gov.br/ojs3/index.php/emaberto/article/view/2570/2308>. Access on: 10 Jan. 2022.
- DARDOT, P.; LAVAL, C. **A nova razão do mundo: Ensaio sobre a sociedade neoliberal**. Tradução: Mariana Echalar. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2016.
- DEFENSORÍA DEL PUEBLO. **Primera supervisión del “Plan de municipalización de la gestión educativa”**: Aportes para su implementación. Informe N.º 148. Lima: Defensoría del Pueblo, 2009.
- DIARIO EL COMERCIO. **Una mirada sobre la descentralización**. Lima-Perú. Jul. 2007
- DÍAZ, H.; VALDIVIA, N. **Descentralización educativa y niveles intermedios. Algunos temas pendientes sobre el rol de la UGEL**. Lima: Foro Educativo, 2007.
- DOMINGO, J. C. Autonomía por decreto? **Education Policy Analysis Archives**, v. 7, n. 17, p. 1-28, abr. 1999. Available at: http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/coedu_pub/243. Access on: 05 Jan. 2022.
- LAVERIANO, A. La descentralización educativa en el Perú. **Educación**, v. 19, n. 37, p. 7-26, Sep. 2010. Available at: <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=5056880>. Access on: 10 Feb. 2022.
- MUÑOZ, F. Una mirada a la gestión educativa local en el marco de la descentralización. El caso de dos municipalidades en Perú. **Archivos Analíticos de Políticas Educativas**, v. 21, n. 91, p.1-24, Ene. 2013. Available at: <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/2750/275029728090.pdf>. Access on: 08 Feb. 2022.
- OLARTE, E. G.; ECHEVERRÍA, J. M. I. **Desarrollo Económico y Bienestar**. San Miguel: Fondo Editorial PUCP, 2008.

PERU. **Ley de Reforma Constitucional 27860, 07 de marzo de 2002.** Ley de Reforma Constitucional del capítulo XIV del título IV, sobre descentralización. Lima-Perú: Presidente de la República, 2002a. Available at:

[http://www2.congreso.gob.pe/Sicr/TraDocEstProc/tradoc_condoc_2001.nsf/d99575da99ebfbc305256f2e006d1cf0/b6a105f9fa4d6e72052574ab0069e412/\\$FILE/L27680.pdf](http://www2.congreso.gob.pe/Sicr/TraDocEstProc/tradoc_condoc_2001.nsf/d99575da99ebfbc305256f2e006d1cf0/b6a105f9fa4d6e72052574ab0069e412/$FILE/L27680.pdf). Access on: 09 Feb. 2022.

PERU. **Ley de Bases de la Descentralización 27783.** Ley Orgánica desarrolla el Capítulo de la Constitución Política sobre Descentralización, que regula la estructura y organización del Estado en forma democrática, descentralizada y desconcentrada. Lima-Perú: Presidente de la República, 2002b. Available at: <https://www.mef.gob.pe/es/normatividad/por-temas/descentralizacion/6833-ley-n-27783-3/file>. Access on: 12 Feb 2022.

PERU. **Ley Orgánica de Gobiernos Regionales 27867, 18 de noviembre de 2002.** Ley Orgánica establece y norma la estructura, organización, competencias y funciones de los gobiernos regionales. Lima-Perú: Presidente de la República, 2002c. Available at: https://portal.jne.gob.pe/portal_documentos/files/informacionlegal/Constitucin%20y%20Leyes1/LEY%20ORGANICA%20DE%20GOBIERNOS%20REGIONALES.pdf. Access on: 27 Feb. 2018.

PERU. **Ley Orgánica de Municipalidades 27972.** Sistema Peruano de Información Jurídica. Lima-Perú, 06 May. 2003a.

PERU. **Ley General de Educación 28044, 17 de Julio de 2003.** Lima-Perú: Ministerio de Educación (MINEDU), 2003b. Available at: https://cdn.www.gob.pe/uploads/document/file/105107/_28044_-_31-10-2012_11_31_34_-LEY_28044.pdf?v=1607376440. Access on: 10 Feb. 2022.

PERU. **Plan de Transferencia Sectorial del Quinquenio 2005-2009.** Lima-Perú: Consejo Nacional de Descentralización (CND), 2005.

PERU. **Plan de Municipalización de la Gestión Educativa y Lineamientos del Plan Piloto 2007.** Lima-Perú: Ministerio de Educación de la República del Perú. Plan de Educación, 2006a.

PERU. **Decreto Supremo N° 78-2006-PCM.** Ministério de Educação (MINEDU). Lima-Perú, Oct. 2006b. Available at: <http://www.minedu.gob.pe/normatividad/decretos/DS-078-2006-PCM.php>. Access on: 15 Dec. 2018.

PERU. **Decreto Supremo N. 019-2011-ED.** Dan por finalizado el Plan Piloto de Municipalización de la Gestión Educativa de los niveles educativos de Inicial y Primaria autorizado por el D.S. N° 078-2006-PCM y de nivel Secundario por el D.S. N° 005-2008-ED. Lima-Perú: Presidente de la República, 2011. Available at: <https://www.gob.pe/institucion/minedu/normas-legales/118244-019-2011-ed>. Access on: 12 Sept. 2022.

PERU. **Resolución de Secretaría General 938 – 215, 31 de diciembre de 2015, aprueba los lineamientos para la Gestión Educativa Descentralizada.** Lima-Perú: MINEDU, 2015. Available at: <http://www.minedu.gob.pe/gestion-educativa-descentralizada/pdf/rsg-n-938-2015-minedu.pdf>. Access on: 20 Feb. 2022.

RIVAS, A.; SANCHEZ, B. Políticas y resultados educativos en América Latina: Un mapa comparado de siete países (2000-2015). **RELIEVE**, v. 22, n. 1, p.1-30, 2016. Available at: <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/916/91649056006.pdf>. Access on: 11 Feb. 2022.

STRAMIELLO, C. I. Sistemas Educativos Modernos para América Latina. **Revista Española de Educación Comparada**, v. 16, p. 393-412, 2010. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307726780_Sistemas_educativos_modernos_para_America_Latina. Access on: 12 Feb. 2022.

TANAKA, M. Introducción. Referentes del pensamiento social crítico em el Perú, 1964-2014. *In*: MARUJA BARRIG *et al.* **Antología del pensamiento crítico peruano contemporáneo**. 1. ed. Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2016.

TEDESCO, J. C. Educación y sociedad en América Latina: Algunos cambios conceptuales y políticos. **Revista Colombia de Educación**, v. 27, p. 13-32, 1993. Available at: <https://revistas.pedagogica.edu.co/index.php/RCE/article/view/5305>. Access on: 06 Feb. 2022.

How to reference this article

ROJAS, H. L. V.; SILVA, A. A. Truncated modernity and decentralization of educational management in Peru: Aspects of the implementation of municipalization (2006-2011). **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 17, n. esp. 3, p. 2448-2467, nov. 2022. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v17iesp.3.16622>.

Submitted: 09/02/2022

Revisions required 24/07/2022

Approved: 13/09/2022

Published: 30/11/2022

Processing and publication by the Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação.

Correction, formatting, standardization and translation.

