TOWARDS A PARTICIPATORY CONSTRUCTION OF EDUCATION POLICY: THE SCHOOL SUCCESS PROJECT IN VALPARAÍSO AS AN ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL

EM DIREÇÃO A UMA CONSTRUÇÃO PARTICIPATIVA DA POLÍTICA EDUCACIONAL: A PROPOSTA ALTERNATIVA DO PROJETO DE ÊXITO ESCOLAR EM VALPARAÍSO

HACIA UNA CONSTRUCCIÓN PARTICIPATIVA DE LA POLÍTICA EDUCACIONAL: LA PROPUESTA ALTERNATIVA DEL PROYECTO DE ÉXITO ESCOLAR EN VALPARAÍSO

María Teresa Flórez PETOUR[1]
José Miguel Olave ASTORGA[2]

ABSTRACT: The article addresses currently predominant means of construction of education policy from a critical perspective, drawing from the results of a study that analyses the case of the national curriculum assessment system in Chile (SIMCE). In particular, we focus on those findings that reveal the predominance of a top-down approach to the understanding of education policy. We argue that this approach raises issues related to social justice, specifically in the dimension of parity of participation. As an alternative approach, a case related to a second project is presented, which consists of the participatory construction of the bases for a large-scale assessment system with a formative purpose, developed in the Municipality of Valparaíso, Chile. On the basis of this experience, the need for more democratic and, therefore, socially fairer processes of policy construction are highlighted.

KEYWORDS: Policy. Education. Justice. Participation. Assessment.

RESUMO: O artigo propõe uma visão crítica acerca das atuais formas predominantes de construção da política educacional, a partir dos resultados de uma investigação que considera o caso do sistema de avaliação nacional do currículo no Chile (SIMCE). Em particular, nos focamos naqueles resultados que dão conta de uma conceitualização vertical da política educacional. Propomos que uma concepção como esta levanta problemáticas de justiça social, especificamente no âmbito da paridade de participação. Como proposta alternativa, se apresenta o caso de outro projeto, que consiste na construção participativa das bases para um sistema de avaliação em grande escala de orientação formativa, desenvolvido na comuna de Valparaíso, Chile. A partir desta experiência, se propõe a necessidade de avançar em direção a processos de construção da política educacional mais democráticos e, por isso, mais justos.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Política. Educação. Justiça. Participação. Avaliação.

[1] University of Chile, Santiago - Metropolitan region - Chile. Assistant Professor, Department of Pedagogical Studies (DEP). ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3704-726X. E-mail: mtflorez@uchile.cl
[2] University of Chile, Santiago - Metropolitan region - Chile. Adjunct Professor, Teaching Knowledge Center. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9809-1304. E-mail: jose.olave@uchile.cl

RESUMEN: *El artículo plantea una visión crítica acerca de lasactuales formas predominantes de construcción de la política educacional, a partir de los resultados de una investigación que toma el caso del sistema de evaluación nacional delcurrículumen Chile (SIMCE). En particular, nos centramos enaquellos resultados que dancuenta de una conceptualización vertical de la política educacional. Planteamos que una concepción como esta levanta problemáticas de justicia social, específicamenteenelámbito de laparidad de participación. Como propuesta alternativa, se presenta el caso de otroproyecto, que consiste enlaconstrucción participativa de las bases para un sistema de evaluación a gran escala de orientación formativa, desarrolladoenla comuna de Valparaíso, Chile. A partir de esta experiencia, se plantealanecesidad de avanzarhaciaprocesos de construcción de la política educacional más democráticos y, por ello, más justos.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Política. Educación. Justicia. Participación. Evaluación*

Tensions and issues of participatory justice in the construction processes of educational policy

Our starting point in this article is the criticism of the linear top-down implementation of educational policies, guided by a *normal justice* paradigm (FRASER, 2008), that is, which operates under the logic of building standards of coexistence based on the production of a hegemonic knowledge / power, which revolves around the idea of homogeneous societies that organize themselves in the form of national states. The suspicion of another rationality motivates us to ask for the construction of public policies that disengage themselves from this hegemonic logic and that explore horizons of justice guided by considering the diversity of educational contexts and actors.

In this sense, in this article we seek to tension and problematize the ways in which the articulation between policy managers is understood and the demands for greater justice between the groups that are at the base of social and cultural life. This implies a critical analysis of the way in which these demands are (or are not) acquired by agents / institutions that develop public policies in favor of putting these demands for justice into practice, which have been generated in the social, economic and cultural life of each society. Hence the need to observe how public policies are constructed from a social justice perspective, where the diverse demands that currently challenge educational systems are integrated and that currently cannot only respond to market pressures, but must also integrate a diversity of approaches, including struggles for gender, ethnic and generational identities. This diversity forces us to seek a paradigm of justice in the development of educational policies that integrates what political philosophy has distinguished as demands for distributive justice, recognition and participation (FRASER, 2003).

When we decide to look at the design of public policies under these inclusive criteria of justice, it is a question of resolving the questions by the content of justice (which), the identities represented and their demands (who), and the way that these demands (how) become public policy.This task, in the context of the West, mainly plays out in the public space, which is not unrelated to already institutionalized hegemonies, cultural knowledge already validated and elaboration methods that tension for different interest groups. Therefore, the search for a fair principle regarding this complex elaboration becomes important to ensure a fair process in the formulation of the rules. We propose the analysis of this elaboration process considering the principle of *participatory parity* (FRASER, 2008) formulated by Nancy Fraser (2008) in her work *Escalas de Justicia*. The author exposes a principle that helps us to overcome inequity problems in the development of norms that overcome structural economic tensions in the distribution or possible erroneous acknowledgments that over-represent participation, silencing the relevant voices. Given that,

> [...] justice needs social agreements that allow everyone to participate as peers in social life. From the perspective of justice, as a *participatory parity*, overcoming injustice means dismantling the institutionalized obstacles that prevent some from participating in an equal plan with others, as partners with full rights in social interaction (p. 117, author' highlights).[3]

From the area of educational policy studies, there are several approaches to the questions: the why, by whom and the how of the dilemmas that we connect here with the dimension of participation in social justice. At the international level, a line of theoretical investigative development has been built for several decades around critical studies of educational policy (*criticalpolicyscholarship*), whose effort is not focused on conducting research *for* politics, but also *of* politics, that is, its focus is in the study of the construction of educational policy as a space of dispute for meaning among different interest groups, rather than proposing measures that improve current policies, assuming its legitimacy. In the nineties, authors such as Bowe, Ball and Gold (1992) proposed a questioning of the vertical or linear readings of politics, which they distinguish as a look that intensifies from the installation of managerial logics in education, from which promotes a view of periods of policy *generation and implementation* as separate spaces. This linear perspective rests on the assumptions of one-sidedness in the direction of the policy-making process, where a group of "experts" draws

---

[3] [...] a justiça necessita de acordos sociais que permitam a todos participar como pares na vida social. Desde a perspectiva de justiça, como *paridade participativa,* superar a injustiça significa desmantelar os obstáculos institucionalizados que impedem alguns de participar em um plano de igualdade com os demais, como sócios com plenos direitos na interação social (p. 117, grifos do autor).

certain guidelines and actors at the local level and the school community are seen as mere executors of this design.

Against the naturalization of this way of understanding politics from that investigation that is proposed *in function* of it and its 'improvement', the critical tradition centered its studies on the understanding of the functioning of the current "polycentric" governance structures (BALL; JUNNEMAN, 2012), in which politics is understood as a complex process of construction that occurs in "multiple agencies and places of discourse production"[4] (BALL; EXLEY, 2010, p. 151). Thus, educational policy is understood as the interaction between different interest groups that, with power differentials, seek to dominate the struggle for the meaning of what is understood as desirable in education. In this scenario, the configuration of discourses on education is generated from the construction of complex networks of actors that include politicians, supranational organizations, groups of specialists, educational institutions, intellectuals, educational companies, media, among others (BALL; JUNEMANN, 2012). The policy, in this sense, is permanently reframed and recontextualized, which also includes the school, which is not seen here as the place of mere "implementation", but rather as a space for *intertwining*, where politics reinterprets itself, translate, adapt, resist and ignore (BALL; MAGUIRE; BRAUN, 2012), in the context of the power relations typical of the school's micropolitics (BALL, 2012).

Questioning the linear view of policy design allows, in turn, to rethink in a more radical way the way in which the participatory dimension of educational policy is being considered. First, because it de-naturalizes the separation between generation and implementation, since the authors of the practice do not have a greater degree of impact on the formulation of the policy and, when this occurs, it is limited to consultation processes on a text already formulated. Second, it opens up the space to imagine new configurations of actors, which subvert the current power logic in the processes of building politics. The development of this type of studies is still scarce at the national and Latin American level, although, in recent years, one can speak of an incipient and growing development of this line in Chile and other countries. It is to this line of studies that this article is added.

Thus, in this article we will observe the difficulties in the elaboration of public policies and their implementation, identifying elements that tension / favor the effective participation of the actors in these processes. Our central questions, then, revolve around two axes of problematization: 1) How does the process of construction of educational policy currently take

---

v[4] "múltiplas agências e lugares de produção de discursos"

place, in terms of who participates in it, how do they do it and how are their interests represented?; 2) How could/should the educational policy construction processes be rethought, due to a greater parity of participation and, thus, a greater articulation with the emerging demands of social justice?

In particular, we will present results from two different projects. The first one asks how educational policy is constructed in Chile, using the Education Quality Measurement System (SIMCE) as a case. This will allow, first, to carry out a critical analysis about the configurations of actors and discourses that permeate this process, with emphasis on the way in which the dimension of participation of different interest groups is considered there. Secondly, we will refer to a project developed in the municipality of Valparaíso, Chile, whose objective was to develop an alternative system of large-scale assessment that would dispute the space that is currently dominated by SIMCE. The presentation of this experience intends to offer, from a concrete initiative, to open up the possibilities of considering the processes of construction of educational policy from alternative logics, in which there is greater participatory justice, according to the current emerging horizons of social justice.

How does the process of constructing educational policy currently take place and what are its implications for participatory justice?

Theoretical-methodological framework of the project

The findings presented in this section correspond to a research project in which an interdisciplinary team, coordinated by the first author of this article, gathered their knowledge in the areas of study of communication and media, education and pedagogy, ethnography, sociology of education and analysis of discourse, to answer the question how educational policy was built in Chile, understanding these processes from a critical, complex and dynamic perspective. For this, we call for the use of a varied methodological "toolbox", since we believe, together with authors like Larner (2011), that it is imperative today to overcome the disciplinary limits in order to be able to answer the current dilemmas that arise in understanding educational policy.

As a general theoretical framework, we place ourselves in the notion of *policy cycle*, initially developed by Bowe, Ball and Gold (1992), which addresses the construction of politics in its synchronous trajectory and in time, and considering its multiple domains of circulation and problematization, which are synthesized by these authors in the scope of the *context of influence*, the *context of production of policy texts* and the *context of practice*. The *context of*

influence refers to the processes of mediation of politics by different interest groups in the field of education, which seek to dominate the dispute for meaning. It should be noted that, in later developments in the theory of the policy cycle, the need to expand the construction of the political landscape is recognized but beyond the national one, seeking to represent in this the role that international organizations and other private organizations currently have in the construction process of politics, an extension that was considered in this study (LINGARD; SELLAR, 2013). The *context of production of the policy* texts refers to the representation of the disputed speeches through their codification in official documents, instructions, public speeches, press communications, etc., where the guidelines of what is thought as what should be the education are established. Despite being written in a language of general public good (BOWE; BALL; GOLD, 1992), these texts are far from being coherent and in them the marks of tensions that guide their elaboration persist, frequently erased through discursive strategies, whose analysis makes possible to detect that voices, among the interest groups, that were finally the hegemonic ones, and that perspectives that were erased, silenced or represented in the process. The *practice context*, in turn, refers to the ways in which school communities translate, reinterpret, resist these policies, which, in later developments, Ball and his collaborators recognize as the intertwining of politics (BALL; MAGUIRE; BRAUN, 2012).

As a case for our analysis, we chose the Education Quality Measurement System (SIMCE), consisting of a battery of standardized tests in the areas of Language and Mathematics and, for some levels of the school system, History and Natural Sciences. We chose this policy due to the increasingly crucial role it acquired, from its beginnings in 1988 to today, as a pillar of the market model in education in Chile, since it is used as the main indicator of quality in that market, and there are multiple consequences associated with its results, in the logic of incentives/consequences that characterize this conception of educational systems, having an impact on teachers' salaries, the public image of schools, the financing of establishments and the possibility of their closure (FLÓREZ, 2018). In this sense, SIMCE is a case with a high investigative potential, in terms of how educational market policy was built in Chile, where the last three decades are far from overcoming this model, they have intensified it (BELLEI, 2015).

Thus, the project to which we alluded here aimed to understand the processes of construction of educational policy in Chile, taking SIMCE as a case, asking its main actors, their interactions, interpretations and the speeches that circulated among them about this policy.

In terms of methodology, as highlighted, the project put into action a combination of tools, in order to be able to approach the phenomenon with the required complexity. As sources

of analysis, media texts on educational policy, interviews with key actors and ethnographic work with schools were considered. For media texts, two rounds of selection and analysis of editorials and news from two newspapers with national circulation were carried out: *El Mercurio* and *La Tercera*, considering several points in the period from 2000 to 2014. In the case of policy texts, an initial selection of 272 expert texts, legal documents oriented to policy users, considering SIMCE's trajectory from 1988 to 2015. After an initial scan of the texts, 7 of them were selected for an in-depth analysis, based on the degree in which they represented the political tensions for each period. Based on this initial reading, 12 key authors were also selected, with whom semi-structured interviews were conducted, in order to enrich the data obtained in the documents. Finally, the project's ethnographic line addressed the translation and interpretation of this policy through sustained fieldwork in three establishments in the same geographical area, with different classifications, according to their performance in SIMCE (here called with the pseudonyms of "South School", "Pink School" and "New School"). As analysis strategies, framing analysis (ENTMAN, 2007), typical of media studies, was combined with Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and iterative coding in the specific case of ethnographic material. The interdisciplinary team held several meetings throughout the project, in order to reach consensus on methodological aspects and to connect the data and discoveries through a collective interpretation.

It should be noted that, as can be inferred, the findings derived from a project of this scope are multiple, and what is presented here is only a part of them, due to the axes of discussion on which we want to emphasize this article, that is, the content of justice (that), the representation of identities and their interests (who) and the ways in which from these demands until the formulation of policies (how) are reached.

Main findings in connection with the dimension of participation in the construction of educational policy

An important first discovery emerges from the framing analysis work, specifically in terms of the consideration that actors appear in media and policy texts as direct sources, that is, they are cited within these texts, and those that appear mediated or "spoken" within of these texts. Within the policy texts, those who appear predominantly as a direct source are the authors who respond to the categories of: Executive Power and Bureaucracy; *Legal Documents and Decrees; Experts; International Organizations*. Since 2003, *Thought Centers* and *Private Foundations* have also appeared as relevant direct sources. On the other hand, those authors

who are in the School Community category, have a very little direct voice in these documents, appearing, in the vast majority of cases, as "spoken" or re-represented in the speech of the dominant voices, which are the ones that allude to the what teachers should do or are doing inappropriately, or how parents and students see themselves benefited or harmed by certain actions or simply what is expected of them in the system. Similarly, of the 452 authors and 691 sources that emerged in the media analysis between 2000 and 2014, the main direct voices corresponded to the profile of the *Executive Branch and Bureaucracy and Specialists*. The presence of authors from the *School Community* category as a direct source is comparatively less and, moreover, their presence is limited to showing cases of successful schools in their results, despite the precarious conditions, or the denunciation of cases of corruption in the evaluation system.

In terms of what are the predominant perspectives of these authors, an important finding is related to a pattern in the data over time, both in the policy texts and in the media texts. In none of these texts is SIMCE as a policy questioned, on the contrary, its need is insisted upon and its positive effects and credibility are naturalized. When the need for changes in this policy is recognized, it refers to specific and feasible adjustments to the instrument, in addition to the importance of intensifying its impact and effects.

At the level of in-depth analysis of policy and media texts, on the other hand, relevant findings emerge in terms of the way in which those authors who do not have a main voice are re-presented, silenced or neutralized through a series of strategies discursive. One of them we call "positivization", and it relates to the presentation in positive terms of aspects perceived by other actors as negative. The ethnographic work was consistent in revealing the way in which the schools' experience with SIMCE was characterized by emotions associated with stress, fear, the sensation of permanent failure, as the following quotes illustrate:

> *[...] No, I would say it is chaotic at times. There is much stress* (Pink School Teacher).[5]

> *So, I worry about the fact that my colleagues, [...] the new ones, the youngsters, do not have a job source, because you know that a school with poor SIMCE results can even be closed* (New School Teacher).[6]

> *[...] that's how they challenge you. The Education Department calls us, they make a meeting with their graphics by school. So it's like something doesn't*

---

[5] *[...] Não, eu diria que caótico em alguns momentos. O estresse é muito* (Professor Escola Rosa).
[6] *Então me preocupa o fato de que meus colegas, [...] os novos, os jovens, não tenham fonte laboral, porque você sabe que uma escola com maus resultados SIMCE pode ser até fechada* (Professora Escola Nova).

> *work well. If we went lower, because here it is oscillating [...] We feel terrible.*
> *Because we try to do our best* (Pink School Teacher).[7]

These experiences, derived from the intertwining processes of politics in schools, are not presented directly in policy texts or in the media. On the contrary, in documents such as the *SIMCE Commission Executive Report 2014* (2015) it is possible to see the way in which these experiences are presented as a positive aspect of SIMCE, in the sense that it would have generated "an urgency for improvement", which is interpreted as focus on learning. Along with positivization, we also see, from these quotes, a strategy of silencing, since the voice of the actors of the school communities around this distressing experience of SIMCE appears erased from the texts of the public space, both media and politics.

A particularly interesting moment to analyze in the course of SIMCE's policy is the year 2014, since, for the first time, authors who support a critical view of this system, both in the media and in the policy texts, are beginning to appear. Until then, the discussion had continued among the authors mentioned above as predominant voices, and differences in perspective were limited to whether the results should be used as a pressure and control device directed at schools, or as a basis for measures of economic and educational support. In 2014, however, actors such as secondary students, *Alto ao SIMCE*[8], or Education 2020, together with a group of academics with a more critical tendency, as voices that propose a deeper questioning to SIMCE and the educational market model that supports it. The perspective of these actors, however, in addition to being a minority in terms of appearance in the media texts, is presented based on strategies of delegitimization and distrust of the other, from which it presents itself in negative terms. Thus, illustrates the following fragment of an editorial text, referring to the boycott of SIMCE organized by secondary students:

> *[...] the attempt to boycott the trial is absurd, since it goes to waste of themselves and their own schools. Although it is a perfectible instrument and should be complemented with other measurements, it is one of the few tools currently used by the school education system to measure students' level of learning, and it is an input that allows to know which is their advances and their formative weaknesses, which allows them to correct the educational processes. In turn, it is a mechanism that provides parents with useful information when choosing a school for their children; it is also used as a factor in the delivery of income grants; Students must assume that actions of this type are unconditional and reflect an inconsistency with their own*

---

[7] *[...] aí é como te desafiam. O Departamento de Educação nos chama, fazem conosco uma reunião com seus gráficos por escola. Então é como se algo não funcionasse bem. Se a gente baixou, porque aqui é oscilante [...] A gente se sente péssimo. Porque a gente trata de fazer o melhor* (Professora Escola Rosa).
[8] A melhor tradução seria abaixo ao SIMCE!

demands that aim to strengthen school education (Editorial A Terceira on the resistance of students to SIMCE).[9]

Along with the aforementioned naturalization of the positive effects of SIMCE and its associated policies, and with that of the market model in education, and the limitation of its problematic aspects to specific adjustments of a technical type, it is observed, in this fragment, the presentation in negative terms of students' demands. Along with this, a strategy of *appropriating* the slogan that characterized student movements in recent years for quality education for all is put into action, highlighting that SIMCE would be a tool in favor of these demands, which would convert its protest action in absurdity.

In the same period, the *SIMCE Commission Executive Report 2014* (2015), in turn, highlights in its introduction that the call for this commission to critically review SIMCE is motivated, among other factors, by the demands of these new actors that appear in the panorama of politics, seeking to dispute the *context of influence*. In this sense, there is an apparent opening to listen to the perspective of these new voices. When analyzing the document, however, it is observed, first, that the composition of the committee members includes the actors who were the predominant voices throughout the trajectory of this policy, and these actors are excluded, or, in the case of teachers, are minority represented. Thus, the committee's sections are included within the guests, whose members would listen to their perspective in terms of considering it in their recommendations. When analyzing the document, however, we see that about the students only a footnote saying that they were invited stand out, but they were unable to attend the meetings. With respect to organizations like *Alto ao SIMCE*, it is indicated that their perspective does not stand out explicitly in the document, but that their views are recovered throughout its content, thus erasing the point of view that this actor might have proposed from the textual surface, becoming invisible to the reader. Finally, the teachers' voice is spoken again, since it is presented in a synthesis, which brings together in the same paragraph the look of supporters, directors and teachers, as if all these actors were in agreement and there were no nuances or disagreements in this look. Thus, what initially appeared as an opening to new actors

---

[9] *[...] a tentativa de boicote à prova é absurda, toda vez que vai em desperdício deles mesmos e de seus próprios colégios. Ainda que seja um instrumento perfectível e que deva ser complementado com outras medições, se trata de uma das poucas ferramentas com que conta, atualmente, o sistema de educação escolar para medir o nível de aprendizagem dos estudantes, e é um insumo que permite conhecer quais são seus avanços e suas debilidades formativas, o que permite ir corrigindo os processos educacionais. Por sua vez, se trata de um mecanismo que proporciona aos pais informação útil na escolha do colégio para seus filhos; também se utiliza como fator na entrega de subvenções por rendimento"; "Os estudantes devem assumir que ações deste tipo são incondizentes e refletem uma inconsistência com suas próprias demandas que apontam a fortalecer o ensino escolar* (Editorial *A Terceira* sobre a resistência dos estudantes diante do SIMCE).

in the process of constructing SIMCE's policy, ends up being a gesture, aimed at generating an illusion of consensus, neutralizing the perspective of dissident voices.

In terms of participatory justice, following Fraser (2008), from this analysis, we see first that **the construction of educational policy in Chile follows traditional standards in terms of how to define why public policy**. This role is centered on the "specialists" of the national and international scientific community, in articulation with governmental actors, and it is from there that the parameters of the problems to be resolved are decided, which remain within the framework of the education market system and legitimize policies that support it, among them, SIMCE. The voice of other actors is appropriated by political and scientific actors, making it functional to the logic from which politics is thought. When dissent becomes more visible, these voices are neutralized, appropriated and delegitimized, their experience and critical perspective being erased from the space of dispute for meaning, which is facilitated by the privileged access of the dominant actors in the media, academic public discourse and policy. **There is, therefore, no parity of participation** (FRASER, 2008) since a legitimate dialogue that considers all interest groups, especially those most disadvantaged in representation, since the policy design stage. Students, social organizations, teachers and the critical academy would not be able to be members of the policy-making processes - we can see, for example, in the composition of the SIMCE Commissions in 2003 and 2014 - as their participation is limited to consultation or to the audience or a minority presence, without guarantees of considering their perspective in the final decision-making. It is not strange, then, that these actors live these policies as foreign, external, punitive and not relevant to their daily practice, as they are not born of a diagnosis that they feel is their own. In the policy texts, however, this distance is presented as a bankruptcy attributed to SIMCE users, who would not know how to properly interpret or use its results.

With regard to this point, there is one last set of relevant findings that we wanted to add to the discussion around participation, which says that it relates to what Fraser (2008) highlights as **the essence of the identity of the other** among the obstacles to participatory parity. The project's interviews reveal the way in which the different actors in the SIMCE policy landscape perceive each other and we believe that this is the root of another central problem in the search for participatory justice. Table 1 shows the contrast between the way in which an interviewee in the category of *Specialist* and with roles of *Executive Power and Bureaucracy* sees the role of teachers in the construction of politics, and the way in which a former head of the College of Teachers sees a technical expert in charge of creating SIMCE:

Table 1 – Interview contrast

"**Interviewer**: How do you see it should be and what is the role of teachers in the construction of educational policy? How do you believe it is and how it should be, according to your criteria? **Interviewee**: Look, the topic of teachers in Chile is very complicated, because teachers, especially teachers from the Basic network, know very little, that is, it is difficult that they can contribute with a lot of information to a well-designed policy. I would spend all the money in the world on forming teachers well, but I know it's super difficult".[10] (Interview with expert profile, government member and private education foundations)	"**Interviewee**: I believe that there is a weight of the technician on life, so, with all the respect I have for (name of the academic responsible for the design of SIMCE). [She] only had a technical vision, real life was not inserted there, and in real life, this technique worked as it did and that she came to experience later. But already in the commission she had a little, as that guided her to direct the commission. "[11] (Interview with former study area director of School of Teachers, participant in SIMCE Commissions)

Source: Devised by the authors

We observed in this illustrative contrast two patterns that emerged in the interviews that the teachers appear presented in the language of the specialists as actors without relevant knowledge in the processes of policy formulation. On the contrary, we observe how experts are represented in the language of teachers as people with technical knowledge that would not be useful in practice, being far from this experiential knowledge. Thus, it is not possible to generate a genuine interaction in which there is mutual recognition between the actors, from which a parity of participation in the design of public policy derives. We also see in the following fragment the way in which an interviewee from SIMCE's Technical *Specialist* profile sees her work as dissociated from the intentions of politics:

> *In other words, I believe that what should be looked at are the consequences, not the test. If the test is well constructed and what is the objective of applying it, that is, the consequences are political decisions [...]. So, if the political deviations, as far as the political consequences are concerned, is that right?. But in other words, the big policies, right? it has a milestone that goes beyond SIMCE in every way* (Interview with SIMCE Technical Specialist).[12]

---

[10] "***Entrevistadora:*** Como você vê que deveria ser e o que é o papel dos professores, na construção da política educacional? Como você acredita que é e como deveria ser, conforme o teu critério?
Entrevistada: Olha, é bem complicado o tema dos professores no Chile, porque os professores, principalmente os professores da rede Básica, sabem bem pouco, ou seja, é difícil que eles possam contribuir com muita informação a uma política bem desenhada. Eu gastaria todo o dinheiro do mundo em formar bem aos professores, mas sei que é super difícil."

[11] "***Entrevistado:*** eu acredito que há um peso do técnico sobre a vida, então, com todo o respeito que eu tenho à (nome da acadêmica responsável pelo desenho do SIMCE). [Ela] só tinha uma visão técnica, a vida real não estava inserida aí, e na vida real, essa técnica funcionou como funcionou e isso ela veio a vivenciar depois. Mas já na comissão ela tinha um pouco, como que isso a orientava para dirigir a comissão."

[12] *Ou seja, eu acredito que o que se deve olhar são as consequências, não a prova. Se a prova está bem construída e qual é o objetivo de aplicá-la, ou seja, as consequências são decisões políticas [...]. Então, se os desvios políticos, quanto incidem as consequências políticas, não é certo?, de política. Mas ou seja as grandes políticas, não é*

It is possible to observe in this excerpt that the specialist limits her work to the instrument, as if it could be dissociated from the purposes that the policy attributed to it from the beginning, attributing the responsibility for the problems associated with SIMCE to the policy managers. Thus, its role is somewhat protected and restricted, from a scientific-technical intention of a neutral character, dissociated from the political discussion at the service of which SIMCE has always been placed. Finally, the following quote from a relevant actor in governmental instances illustrates the way in which he understands the role of social movements in the construction of politics:

> *In other words, the movements are translated into certain ideas, forces that have never and never intended, a movement that can raise are demands, can articulate a discourse, [for] technical solutions, but part of the movement's task is to follow this exercise of influence and pressure. So, many times, when you argue, you cannot leave the slogan and the slogan adds wills, but wills that think differently and very differently. And when you express it in technical solutions, look at what happens now, it ends up where nobody is in agreement and in agreement with nothing* (Interview with Specialist with government role in educational policy).[13]

The fragment makes manifest the conception of technical experts and governmental actors as the only called to design, in concrete terms, the solutions that, since politics, would be proposed in response to the demands of social actors. Based on this view, which restricts the role of movements as a mere exercise of pressure and raising general ideas, actors in school communities and civil society should never be called upon to take an active role in policy making. This translates, as we have seen, into technical solutions that are not perceived or linked by the actors of the school community as being consistent with the needs and problems they diagnose.

To what extent, and how it would be possible to rethink the processes of construction of educational policy, in a sense that overcomes the current obstacles of participatory justice, is what we will address in the following section, based on the findings of another project, which

---

certo? tem um marco que vai más além do SIMCE de todas as maneiras (Entrevista à Especialista Técnica SIMCE).

[13] *Ou seja, os movimentos se traduzem em certas ideias forças, que não tem nunca e nunca é a pretensão, um movimento o que pode levantar são demandas, pode articular um discurso, [para] soluções técnicas, mas parte do ofício dos movimentos é seguir esse exercício de influência e de pressão. Então, muitas vezes, quando você discute, não pode sair do slogan e o slogan soma vontades, mas vontades que pensam diversamente e de maneira muito diferente. E quando você o expressa em soluções técnicas, olha o que passa agora, o que termina em que ninguém está conforme e de acordo com nada* (Entrevista a Especialista com papel de governo em política educacional).

presents a concrete experience of reframing the processes of participation in the Commune of Valparaíso, Chile.

How could/should the processes of building educational policy be rethought due to greater participatory justice?

Rethink politics from the collective sense of the School Success project

Who could oppose this idea of elaborating inclusive public policies that put boys, girls and young people from the Valparaíso commune in the center, so they do not desert and see the public school system as a significant opportunity for their lives. The problem of developing a policy of this nature was not in the sense of the proposal, but in how it was carried out, guaranteeing participatory parity for all actors in its process. In this context, the Citizen City Hall of Valparaíso opens the space of political opportunity for an alternative proposal, promoting the Successful Project of School Trajectory, which considers as one of its lines of action the practice of a Communal Evaluation System, co-built with the actors of the Municipal Education Corporation (CORMUVAL). In order to operate this line of action, the municipal actor seeks collaboration with a team of academics from the University of Chile, together with a group of professionals from different areas participating in the *Alto ao SIMCE* (AaS) collective, who share the criticism of standardized assessment systems and the need to develop more inclusive education. A first point to consider as divergent from the prevailing logics, is that, since the beginning of the project, four actors (municipal political actor, school communities, social organizations and academia) come together in a horizontal dialogical relationship, according to a common objective. This is based on instances of field work in each of the schools that are part of the project, spaces that bring together all the schools (plenary sessions) and moments of interaction between the actors of the communal level and the school communities. The following quote is illustrative of the sense of collective sense that predominates in those who participate:

> *Those of us here are looking for tools to transform our assessment practices, to change the paradigm and understand that assessment must be part of the formative process of all students and that it accounts for the meaningful learning of all teachers and students* (Workshop plenary 1, 2018).[14]

---

[14] *Os que estamos aqui buscamos ferramentas para transformar nossas práticas avaliativas, para mudar o paradigma e compreender que a avaliação deve ser parte do processo formativo de todas e todos os estudantes e que dê conta da aprendizagem significativa de todos e todas, professores e estudantes* (Oficina plenária 1, 2018).

As a first deliberative step in the construction of the policy, a participatory diagnosis was made, which results in the elaboration of a set of principles as an ethical-political framework of the proposal. This diagnosis was made by searching in field and plenary workshops the perspectives of CORMUVAL pedagogical coordinators and directors, teachers, members of the management teams and the School Integration Program - PIE of the establishments and students. From a critical diagnosis, shared by the evaluative culture prevalent in external and classroom evaluation, the defined principles are related to a communal evaluation system that it hopes to be: contextualized to the commune and each establishment; respectful of diversity in its different dimensions; with a purely formative purpose; democratic and participatory; and focused on the progression of meaningful learning. This is in contrast to a view of current systems as generic, homogenizing, with summative and punitive logic, vertical and external, in addition to focusing on the entertainment of routine tasks.

Based on these principles, criteria for communal evaluation are developed, which emerge from an interactive process of contextualized reflection of the national curriculum, considering the relevance of these learnings in the context of the lives of the students of Valparaíso, as well as the meaning of these learnings for the participation as citizens with full rights. In this sense, the construct of the evaluation arises from a collective construction, which results in a sense of "our" criteria, avoiding the feeling of distance generated by external standards.

Based on these criteria, schools themselves design their assessment scenarios, thus allowing contextualization and respect for diversity, as they are constituted by series of activities over time that favor the demonstration of learning in different ways, as well as monitoring and progression feedback over time. The processes associated with the validity and reliability of these scenarios are in the hands of the establishment's own professionals and CORMUVAL, who in local panels by schools and communal panels, discuss the coherence of the scenarios with the criteria and regulate the calibration of their evaluative judgment, in addition to systematize the information about the evidenced learnings and to design the decision making based on that.

These instances are recognized by the same participants as spaces of high professionalization, since decisions between teachers are validated, practices are enriched and evaluative judgment is calibrated, thanks to dialogue and feedback between peers. Furthermore, these spaces have the particularity of breaking with the traditional hierarchy in decision-making, since the dialogue is horizontal and argumentative, based on trust and solidarity. Thus, illustrates the following quote:

> *[...] I highlight the conversation that was generated between the teams, promoted since a previous reflection of the own experience of the pedagogical leaders and coordinators in the schools. This instance allows to develop conviction and clarity in what to do* (Participating Teacher Communal Panel, 2018).[15]

Another virtue observed by the project in the constant integration of the views of each establishment with the communal and national ones, which avoids reducing the discussion to private areas only. The articulation from the bottom up is typical of a system that wants to avoid reducing focus or generalizing decisions, as exemplified by the following quote:

> [...] decentralizing the look to establishments, emphasizing the teaching and learning processes of students, thus being able to educate not only students, but also the entire educational system, including the empowered, to break with the old evaluation paradigm (Plenary Summary 3, 2018).[16]

The empowerment that produces participation in different spaces and with different actors generates a way of doing educational policy that calls for collective meanings, as well as the recognition of different approaches and attitudes. These instances were defining purpose of the policy, who participates and how to develop it. What are the obstacles to participation if they were drawn and what possibilities open up to being able to draw them, are points that will be reviewed in the following excerpt.

Overcoming obstacles, promoting participation

A first discussion is to avoid some problems about the reason for the policy, from an operation that makes sense of the *participatory parity* criterion, where all subjects who participate in the implementation of a public policy can be included under conditions of deliberative equality. Therefore, the first consideration is how to define the content of what we want to develop as a public policy. Since then, the School Success Project has tried to avoid some problems that, from the traditional perspective of elaboration and implementation, are often invisible. We saw in the results of the first project that nourishes this article that the traditional logic of building public policy highlights its origin in the parameters that the scientific community gives us as causes of the problem of injustice, **that is, it is possible to**

---

[15] *[...] destaco a conversação que se gerou entre as equipes, promovida desde uma reflexão prévia da própria experiência dos líderes pedagógicos e coordenadores nas escolas. Esta instância permite desenvolver convicção e clareza no que se deve fazer* (Professor Participante Painel Comunal, 2018).

[16] *[...] descentralizar o olhar para os estabelecimentos dando ênfase aos processos de ensino e aprendizagem dos estudantes, assim poder educar não somente os estudantes, como também todo o sistema educativo, incluindo os apoderados, para romper com o antigo paradigma da avaliação* (Síntese Plenária 3, 2018).

make visible only those problems that the sciences and their methods can support. The School Success project, on the contrary, had the advantage of taking *a multidimensional approach* and a *collective construction of the principles that guide the project*, thus giving a broader understanding of the problem. Thus, one tries to overcome, for example, the belief that the permanent inversion in evaluations of high consequences with implications for pedagogy and the coverage of the study plan, can raise educational results alone (LINGARD; KEDDIE, 2013; STOBART, 2010).

Another important aspect to avoid a reduction in focus was the search to ensure, in an institutional way, the participation space of the different actors: teachers, directors, pedagogical coordinators, who are, at the same time, employees of the municipal corporation, through allocation of protected hours and spaces to participants, under an inclusive criterion.

Another relevant dimension is related to the determination of **who should participate**. From the results of the investigation previously exposed, we saw that a problem is given by the critique of **the determination of member condition**. This is because public policy arbitrarily determines who should be part of the design and implementation of the policy, generating what Nancy Fraser (2008) calls a **"failed representation of ordinary politics"**, since those usually called are part of the hegemonic governance body or participate in structures of knowledge and power that allow them to participate in the elaboration of public policies. We saw in the previous section the way in which this traditional look is leaving out to different actors who are properly affected and who traditionally have no deliberative power in these types of issues.

The experience of the School Success project can jump this obstacle from a different logic, since the principle that guided the determination of who should participate in the construction of a policy sought to **represent all the actors affected**. The School Success Project raises a more inclusive participation criterion, by integrating, for example, the participation of Alto ao SIMCE, a group composed of different social actors, from different professions of origin, who have in common a critical reading of the hegemonic ways of political construction, in particular on standardized evaluation policies. Also, in this framework, the participation of the academy is not conceived from a hierarchy of knowledge, but rather as an actor that contributes to the dialogue of political, scientific, experiential, pedagogical knowledge, all with equal value for the project. This *principle of participation, which includes all those affected*, goes beyond the initial framework of membership, since boys and girls in all their diversity, teachers, directors and employees of the municipality are integrated, at the same time academics, together with social groups such as AaS. A point still pending in the project, in this sense, is a greater inclusion of parents and those empowered as a relevant actor. This

local structure is constituted by the intersubjective experience of a common affectation, which could be understood by a structure of collective governance, which includes the different actors in their diversity of affectation, given a problem that afflicts them individually and collectively.

As we reviewed in the previous section, a third obstacle that can affect participatory parity is the **problem of the essence of Identity** (LINGARD; KEDDIE, 2013; KEDDIE, 2012; FRASER, 2008). From traditional logic, we reviewed the way in which stereotyped views about the identity and the role of the Other in the construction of public policy, did not contribute to a dialogue on equal terms and that recognized the voice of the various actors in the process. In this case, the principle that was used in the School Success project is *the dialogue of knowledge* (DE SOUSA, 2014), which allows the generation of reciprocal recognition processes. The experience of an academic with his group of tutors is discussed with the knowledge that teachers have, and it is as valid as the knowledge of students who participate and are subject to an educational policy, as expressed in the following quote:

> CORMUVAL brings together around this pilot project four distinct knowledges: the **pedagogical knowledge** of five schools in the commune that experience the problems of failure and school success day by day; the **academic knowledge** of the Department of Pedagogical Studies (DEP) and the Continuing Education Program for Teachers (PEC, currently Teaching Knowledge Center), both from the University of Chile, who know in depth other ways of evaluating such as, for example, the model Assessment for Learning (EpA); the **critical knowledge** towards the standardization system that the Alto ao SIMCE Campaign developed against policies such as SIMCE and the obstacles it generates in the capacity generating formative processes; and, the **leadership and management knowledge** of professionals working in CORMUVAL (Final Report, University of Chile, 2018).[17]

To respect these experiences, public and deliberative dialogue becomes a tool that allows the exchange of points of view, producing agreements, as well as recognizing dissent, avoiding the idealization of each participating identity group as a homogeneous whole, for example, becomes a merit of the project being able to systematize both agreements and disagreements, an issue that ultimately produces a process of non-subordinate reciprocal recognition (OLAVE, 2018), safeguarding that it does not generate hierarchies of power in its own execution. The recognition of these diversities can help to build better educational policies,

---

[17] CORMUVAL reúne em torno deste projeto piloto quatro saberes distintos: o **saber pedagógico** de cinco escolas da comuna que experimentam dia a dia os problemas do fracasso e o êxito escolar; o **saber acadêmico** do Departamento de Estudos Pedagógicos (DEP) e o Programa de Educação Contínua para o Magistério (PEC, atualmente Centro Saberes Docentes), ambos da Universidade do Chile, que conhecem em profundidade outras maneiras de avaliar como, por exemplo, o modelo de Avaliação para a Aprendizagem (EpA); o **saber crítico** em direção ao sistema de padronização que a Campanha Alto ao SIMCE elaborou contra políticas como o SIMCE e os obstáculos que gera em poder gerar processos formativos; e, o **saber de liderança e gestão** das profissionais e dos profissionais que trabalham em CORMUVAL (Relatório Final, Universidade do Chile, 2018).

while understanding that these issues are part of more structural processes, in this sense, "it is important that this suggestion does not treat erroneous recognition as <<autonomous cultural damage>>, but rather that it understands its location within the broader social and structural conditions in which poor distribution seriously impedes school participation and success"[18] (LINGARD; KEDDIE, p. 270).

Final considerations

The cases addressed in this article allow us to see, through empirical evidence, the issues of participatory justice that derive from the current ways of thinking about the construction of educational policies, anchored in managerial and vertical perspectives, from which obstacles to participation emerge, mainly derived from the way in which are defined the why, who, how and since the Other's vision and these policies are designed and implemented. We can also see a concrete case in which these obstacles are overcome, by subverting the traditional logic of the construction of politics. Table 2 presents, in a synthetic way, the comparison between these two logics.

Table 2 - Comparative synthesis of approaches to policy making

Participatory justice dimensions	Current logic Policy making	Alternative logic Policy making
Why	The problems, the diagnosis and the decisions related to the design of the policy respond to the traditional logic, in which the technical-scientific knowledge derived from specialists is the only parameter, in addition to the educational model proposed by the authorities.	A participatory diagnosis is co-constructed, which considers the issues raised by different relevant actors in relation to the scope that belongs to a determined policy, and it is from there that principles and devices for the design of the policy are raised, which maintain their participatory character.
Who/how	Government experts and actors are mostly considered to be members of the group of actors who make decisions about policy design, while actors from school communities, social organizations and critical academy are included in a minority, in a logic of consultation on policies already designed. The traditional view, moreover, addresses the actors	The reaction between actors is horizontal and proposes from a parity of participation, that is, all relevant actors (specialists, politicians, teachers, parents, students, social movements) are considered from the beginning as groups whose interests must be represented in the policy design, in addition to being protagonists in the processes of putting into action and permanent evaluation

---

[18] "é importante que esta sugestão não trate o reconhecimento errôneo como um <<dano cultural autônomo>>, mas sim que compreenda a sua localização dentro das condições sociais e estruturais mais amplas nas que a má distribuição impede seriamente a participação e o êxito escolar"

	of the practice as those whose main role is to implement policies properly.	of said policy. This ensures that the proposals designed are perceived as their own and make more sense.
View of the Other	There is a distance between the actors seen as policy managers (specialists, government), and those charged with implementing policies in practice, which causes a lack of mutual recognition of each other's knowledge and experiences, from an essence of their identities.	The actors dialogue from principles of trust and solidarity on an equal basis with participating actors, which generates mutual recognition of their knowledge and experiences, all of which are considered relevant in the process of building and triggering the policy.

Source: Devised by the authors

The call, then, is towards the need for a new profound proposal of the way in which educational policy decision-making processes are conceptualized in the present. Firstly, the national and international evidence was forceful in highlighting that the currently prevalent logic is far from being effective in terms of achieving a policy activation that result in an improvement of the educational experience of the actors of the school communities and, in terms of that policy intentions are fulfilled in practice. Second, the current approach is confronted with a series of obstacles associated with the injustices of participation, from which negative consequences emerge that prevent the construction of shared meanings, and, from there, policies that are perceived as positive and beneficial by all actors. Thus, we must propose in the future a policy design that includes, from the beginning, the perspective of all the interest groups involved, with parity of participation and from horizontal, respectful and genuinely dialogical relationships. All these visions must be represented in what is designed, assuming a reflexive co-responsibility throughout the process, something that we could connect with Fraser's (2008) principle of *reflexive justice*, in terms of the capacity to generate reflective policies, both in its elaboration as in its implementation, open to what the conditions of justice and injustice are dynamic, with the aim that the advance in participatory parity today does not become an obstacle in the future.

want to recognize the participation of Silvana Sáez, Pamela Soto and Claudia Rojas, in addition to the coordinators and pedagogical coordinators of CORMUVAL. On the part of AaS: Álvaro Ayala, Javier Campos, Catalina Cuenca, Beatriz Fernández, Fernanda del Pozo, Tamara Rozas, Felipe Acuña, Manuela Mendoza, Jorge Muñoz, Evelyn Palma, Patricia Guerrero, Paulina Castillo and Francisca Corbalán. As part of the University of Chile team: Rebeca Soto, Pilar Guzmán, Andrea Carrasco, Pamela Valenzuela, María Olga Gallardo, Alejandra Farías, Constanza Caracci, Mariana Cornejo, Sandra Rivera, Claudio Fuentes, Paula Rebolledo, Daniela Pitrón and Javier Álvarez. Also recognize the pedagogical leaders of the five pilot schools: Pablo Álvarez, Ángela Concha, Rodrigo Valenzuela, BelénVillena, Francisca Lastra, Yudis Jiménez, Angiara Aedo and Carla Pagliattini, together with School Success teams and teachers from these and other schools who got involved and believed in the project.

REFERENCES

BOWE, R.; BALL, S.; GOLD, A. **Reforming education and changing schools**. Case studies in policy sociology. 1. ed. Londres: Routledge, 1992. p. 192.

BALL, S. J.; JUNEMANN, C. **Networks, new governance and education**. 1. ed. Bristol, UK: The Policy Press, 2012, p. 167.

BALL, S. J.; EXLEY, S. Making policy with 'good ideas': Policy networks and the 'intellectuals'of New Labour. **Journal of Education Policy**, ReinoUnido, v. 25, n. 2, p. 151-169, 2010.

BALL, S.; MAGUIRE, M.; BRAUN, A. **How schools do policy**: Policy enactments in secondary schools. 1. ed. Londres: Routledge, 2012. p. 173.

BALL, S. J. **The micro-politics of the school**. Towards a theory of school organization. 1. ed. Londres y Nueva York: Routledge, 2012. p. 307.

BELLEI, C. **El gran experimento**: Mercado y privatización de la educaciónchilena. 1. ed. Santiago de Chile: LOM, 2015. p. 254.

DE SOUSA, B. **Descolonizar el saber, reinventar el poder**. 1. ed. Santiago de Chile: LOM, 2013. p. 117.

ENTMAN, R. Framing bias: Media in the distribution of power. **Journal of Communication**, Reino Unido, v. 57, n. 1, p. 163-173, 2007.

FLÓREZ, T. Repensar laevaluación a gran escala enfunción de una formación integral: análisis crítico de los sistemas vigentes y posiblescaminos alternativos. *In*: ARRATIA, A.; OSANDÓN, L. (Eds.). **Políticas para el desarrollo del currículum**: reflexiones y propuestas. Santiago: UCE-MINEDUC y UNESCO, 2018. p. 417-456

FRASER, N. **Escalas de justicia**. 1. ed. Barcelona: Herder, 2008. p. 294.

KEDDIE, A. Schooling and social justice through the lenses of Nancy Fraser. **Critical Studies in Education**, Queensland, Australia, v. 53, n. 3, p. 263-279, 2012.

LARNER, W. C-change? Geographies of crisis. **Dialogues in Human Geography**, EE.UU., v. 1, n. 3, p. 319-335, 2011.

LINGARD, B.; SELLAR, S. Globalization, edu-business and network governance: the policy sociology of Stephen J. Ball and rethinking education policy analysis. **London Review of Education**, ReinoUnido, v. 11, n. 3, p. 265-280, 2013.

LINGARD, B.; KEDDIE, A.Redistribution, recognition and representation: working against pedagogies of indifference. **Pedagogy, Culture&Society**, Queensland, Australia, v. 21, n. 3, p. 427-447, 2013.

OLAVE, J.M. **Relatos de experiencias de evaluación**. ComprensionesDecoloniales de laescuela Chilena 2013-2018. 2018. Tesis (Doctoral) - Universidad de Manizales Centro Avanzado de Niñez y Juventud, 2018. p. 243.

STOBART, G. **Tiempos de pruebas**: Los usos y abusos de laevaluación. 2. ed. Madrid, España: Morata. 2010. p. 236.

How to quote this article