

State Education Plan of Paraná: the dismantling of federative coordination and the fragility of the socio-state interface^{1*}

Elisangela Alves da Silva Scaff²

ORCID: 0000-0002-7682-0879

Abstract

This study aims to identify the characteristics of the socio-state interface established in the methodology of elaboration, monitoring, and evaluation of the State Education Plan of Paraná (PEE-PR). The focus is to indicate how the processes are carried out, especially considering the social participation required in the guidelines established by the National Education Plan (PNE). The methodology used is a qualitative approach based on documental research and developed through a data survey on the websites of the PNE of the Paraná State Department of Education (Seed-PR), of the Paraná State Board of Education (CEE/PR), the Education State Forum (FEE-PR), and the Paraná Institute for Economic and Social Development (IPARDES). The results point to the central role the Union has in coordinating actions related to the PEE-PR, especially with regard to the socio-state interface as a fundamental principle for the construction of public policies. The post-2016 political scenario, marked by the contraction of this movement by the federal government, has weakened the collective construction of the monitoring and evaluation stages of the ten-year education plans in local federative entities, especially in the state of Paraná. Thus, the collective construction is vulnerable to the most varied political interests manifested in the local federative entities, which compromises any prospect of consolidating a national education system, the primary objective of the PNE (2014-2024).

Keywords

Educational Planning – Socio-state interface – National education plan – State education plan – Federative coordination.

* English version by Centro de Assessoria de Publicação Acadêmica da UFPR. The author takes full responsibility for the translation of the text, including titles of books/articles and the quotations originally published in Portuguese.

1- Text from a research project funded by the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq), Research Productivity Grant. Support: Academic Publication Advisory Center of the Federal University of Paraná.

2- Universidade Federal do Paraná, Curitiba, PR, Brazil. Contact: elisscaff@gmail.com



<https://doi.org/10.1590/S1678-4634202349256316eng>
This content is licensed under a Creative Commons attribution-type BY 4.0.

Introduction

The Federal Constitution of 1988 establishes the collaboration regime as a principle for the organization of education in its Art. 211. Even though the Union does not have a defined regulation, it took over the coordination of public policies, especially from the 1990s onwards, when the creation of the Fund for Maintenance and Development of Elementary Education and the Valorization of Magisterium (Fundef) marked one of the first educational policies developed in this direction (ABRAMO; LICIO, 2020). The movement of coordinating public policies by the Union gained strength in the first decade of the 21st century through the Target Plan Commitment All for Education, which expanded to the Joint Action Plan and other educational policies that culminated in the National Education Plan (PNE 2014-2024) (LICIO; BRIDGES, 2020).

The PNE (2014-2024), instituted by Law no. 13,005/2014, assigned to other Brazilian federative entities the obligation to prepare or reformulate their respective state and/or municipal plans to be aligned to the national plan in a participatory and democratic way and to be permanently monitored and evaluated for being organized based on the same methodology (BRASIL, 2014b). To make this premise effective, the federal government has adopted a series of policies and incentives that involve creating a specific Secretariat within the Ministry of Education (MEC), elaborating norms, manuals, and textbooks, and guaranteeing the financing of actions developed by states, municipalities, and the Federal District to fulfill this purpose.

The approval of state, district, and municipal education plans between the years 2014 and 2019 was the result of the federative coordination process in all Brazilian federative entities, with the exception of the state of Rio de Janeiro, which had not yet sanctioned the State Education Plan (PEE) law by that time (SCAFF; OLIVEIRA, 2019). However, it is noted the retraction of this movement in relation to the monitoring and evaluation of the plans, which have taken place in a fragmented manner and with restricted adherence (SCAFF; OLIVEIRA, 2019).

Thus, this study aims to identify how the elaboration, monitoring, and evaluation of the State Education Plan of Paraná (PEE-PR) were and are being carried out, especially regarding the socio-state interface foreseen in the guidelines established by the PNE. The concept of socio-state interface is understood as an institutional architecture of participation in which social and state subjects negotiate and dispute the spaces for defining public policies (VERA; LAVALLE, 2012).

The research was developed through a qualitative methodology of a document-based character. The data sources were the official websites of the Paraná State Department of Education (Seed-PR), the Paraná State Board of Education (CEE-PR), the Education State Forum (FEE-PR), and the Paraná Institute for Economic and Social Development (IPARDES).

The world wide web has enabled the contribution of new sources, as analyzed by Almeida (2011). However, its use demands care, given the low quality of a large amount of the material, the inconstant nature of the records, and the need to assess the authenticity of the documentation (ALMEIDA, 2011). For this reason, documents published on the

official pages of the researched entities were selected, such as laws, deliberations, and publicly disclosed reports.

The study comprised the period from 2015 to 2020, from the approval of the PEE-PR until the closing of the third cycle of the plan's monitoring and evaluation, which should be carried out every two years, as established in the document itself (PARANÁ, 2015b).

The socio-state interface as a principle of federative coordination in the ten-year education plans

The institutionalization of social participation in the elaboration and the monitoring of public policies in Brazil, established as a principle in the Federal Constitution of 1988, strengthened with the rise of governments with democratic-popular orientation (2003–2016), whose institutional architectures of participation in policy design were incorporated into the federal government's agenda. At the same time, the Union assumed more categorically the role of coordination in relation to the other federative entities -- a movement that is fundamentally expressed in the formulation of policies, programs, and national plans that aim to integrate the actions of the different government entities (LOTTA; GONÇALVES; BITEMAN, 2014).

The debate is not devoid of contradictions since it implies a certain degree of centralization of the federal government mainly linked to advantages offered to states when joining policies and programs coordinated by the Union through "pre-established conditionalities" (LOTTA; GONÇALVES; BITEMAN, 2014. p. 6).

On the one hand, such actions are understood as intervening in the principle of decentralization of public policies supported by the Constitution of 1988, as they undermine the autonomy of municipalities and assign them the role of executors of policies developed at the federal level (ARRETCHE, 2005). On the other hand, they favor the development of more homogeneous public policies for states and municipalities, taking into account the differences in financial, institutional, political, and technical-administrative conditions of the subnational entities that interfere with the ability to respond to the demands of the population (LOTTA; GONÇALVES; BITEMAN, 2014).

When questioning the relationship between decentralization and federalism in Brazil, Abrucio (2002) points out that the concept of federation refers to "a pact between territorial units that choose to establish a partnership, forming a nation" (ABRUCIO, 2002, p. 19), and is materialized by the "sharing of sovereignty between the Union or Federal Government – and the subnational governments" (ABRUCIO, 2002, p. 20). This is only maintained by balancing the autonomy of the parties and the interdependence between them. In this scenario,

[...] the federative interdependence cannot be achieved by the mere imposing and pyramidal action of a Central Government, as in a Unitary State, since a Federation supposes a more matrix structure, supported by a shared sovereignty – in fact, as mentioned before, that is why in federalism there is Union (or the Federal Government) and not Central Government. (ABRUCIO, 2002, p. 21).

Federative coordination, in this context, is a key element to understand the production of public policies in the contemporary federative structure, which “depends a lot on the role of higher levels of government in the face of decentralization, especially on the action of the Federal Government” (ABRUCIO, 2002, p. 26).

In the area of education, the federative coordination of the Union is essential to guarantee the articulation of the other federative entities towards the consolidation of the national education system, since “artificial autonomy” can lead local instances to isolation, “leaving them, in a way, to their own fate” (SAVIANI, 2010, p. 388) and becoming the *mother of segregation*, as Abrucio (2002) points out, using Remy Prud’Homme. From this perspective, Saviani (2010) highlights that

[...] isolation tends to degenerate diversity into inequality, crystallizing it through the maintenance of local deficiencies. Inversely, articulated in the system, it is possible to reverse the deficiencies, which will result in the strengthening of diversities for the benefit of the entire system. (SAVIANI, 2010, p. 384).

The need to organize a national education system is a historical demand of Brazilian education that was established during the Manifest of the Pioneers of New Education in 1932 and resumed from 2010 on, on the occasion of the elaboration of a new national education plan in light of the end of the PNE’s validity (2001-2011). According to Saviani (2010), a strict relationship was established between planning and the system. For the author, the education system requires an “articulated ordering of the various elements necessary for the execution of the educational objectives advocated for the population for which it is intended,” which presupposes planning.

And the educational plan is exactly the instrument that aims to introduce rationality into educational practice as a condition to overcome spontaneity and improvisation, which are the opposite of systematized education and its organization in the form of a system. (SAVIANI, 2010, p. 389).

During the elaboration of the education plans, the federative coordination was actively undertaken by the Union, from the end of the 2010, through the technical, political, and financial organization of the educational planning process to be developed by all federative entities. The federal government defined the methodology for organizing the debate around the country’s educational planning based on the national conferences, which constituted the most important and comprehensive participatory policy in Brazil after the Federal Constitution of 1988, and which impacted the legislative power by boosting the activities of the National Congress and corroborating the strengthening of the representative democracy in Brazil (AVRITZER, 2012).

Beyond the “collective exercise of political power” (SANTOS; AVRITZER, 2002, p. 53), the conferences, especially after the promulgation of the Constitution of 1988, are also understood as an effective mechanism of a socio-state interface, called “instances of densification of consensus and definition of priorities” (VERA; LAVALLE, 2012, p. 113), and designed to produce agreements to guide policy decisions. Lüchmann (2020) notes

that public policy conferences have occupied a prominent place in studies on participatory innovations in Brazil.

Conferences are considered relatively well institutionalized socio-state interfaces in Brazil in the period from 2002 to 2010 since they are “supported by normative acts and specific legislation which regulate their existence, functioning, composition, and internal and decision-making procedures” (PIRES; VAZ, 2014, p. 70). This participation architecture gains importance by “recognizing and articulating the different spaces – and moments – based on assumptions of participation, representation, and deliberation” (LÜCHMANN, 2020, p. 16).

The conference was the socio-state interface mechanism chosen by the federal government for the elaboration and follow-up of the plans at federal, state, district, and municipal levels in order to guarantee collective spaces for the dialogue between governmental instances and social segments. Thus, the National Conference on Education (Conae) should be held in all states and in the Federal District and involve the respective municipalities in municipal or inter-municipal activities with broad social participation and funding from the Ministry of Education.

The 1st Conae, in 2010, had *Building the Articulated National System of Education: the National Education Plan, Guidelines, and Strategies* as its theme. It took place between March 28 and April 1st, 2010 in Brasília, in the Federal District, and was preceded by municipal, inter-municipal, state, and district conferences. The national stage had 3,889 participants and 5,300 proposals for amendments or new paragraphs presented by state and Federal District commissions (BRASIL, 2010).

To coordinate this process, the federal government created the Secretariat of Articulation with Education Systems (Sase) in 2011, justifying it as a demand from Conae 2010. All the documents that guide the elaboration or reformulation, monitoring, and evaluation processes of the ten-year education plans came from Sase. Such documents establish guidelines, methodological orientations, manuals, and forms to support states, municipalities, and the Federal District in conducting educational planning at the local level. Among them is the *Reference Document for the National Conference on Education* (BRASIL, 2010), which states:

Conae should, therefore, become a social space for the discussion of Brazilian education, articulating the different institutional agents of the civil society and of the governments in favor of the creation of a national education project and a state policy. Thus, it is essential to guarantee broad mobilization and democratic participation in municipal and state conferences to ensure greater representation and participation in the National Conference. (BRASIL, 2010, p. 4).

The document *Planning the next decade: aligning education plans* assumes that education plans “require institutional links and social participation for their preparation or adaptation, their monitoring and their evaluation” (BRASIL, 2014b, p. 5).

From this perspective, social participation is understood as an inseparable element of education planning, being responsible “for the qualification of social demands and the guarantee of greater governability for the achievement of goals” (BRASIL, 2014b, p. 9).

Among the guidelines established in the document, the following stand out: “b) community mobilization, including the submission of a baseline document for the elaboration or adequacy of the plan” (BRASIL, 2014b, p. 16).

As members of the organizing committee, the Conae - 2010 final document presents eleven Secretaries of the Ministry of Education, two representatives of the legislative power, one representative of the National Council of Education (CNE), ten associations and councils of directors in the area of public and private education, three associations representing parents and students, three associations of research in the area, and six entities representing the working class in the area. Equivalent representation has become a requirement established by the Union for the organization of conferences in states, municipalities, and the Federal District.

The approval of the PNE text occurred through Law no. 13,005/2014 after the conclusion of two Conaes (2010 and 2014). The law’s introduction highlights “the myriad of actors from the education sector that participated in the construction of the PNE 2014-2024” (BRASIL, 2014b, p. 19). In summary, it is constituted by: a) Government actors belonging to the executive and legislative powers; b) institutional education councils and forums: National Council of Education (CNE), National Forum of State Education Councils (FNCE), National Union of Municipal Education Councils (Uncme), National Education Forum (FNE); c) social movements, a category consisting of entities representing the segments of the educational community, scientific entities, and networks of social movements in the field of education; d) civil society, which consists of organizations representing managers of federated entities in the educational sphere, and the ones representing managers of federated entities in other sectors; e) groups linked to the private sector in the educational area; and f) civil society organizations and think tanks focused on the formulation of public policies (BRASIL, 2014a).

It is possible to verify that the guidelines regarding the socio-state interface were met in the process of elaborating the PNE (2014-2024), a precept guaranteed by law for the entire monitoring and evaluation continuum, as established in Art. 5 of the PNE:

The implementation of the PNE and the achievement of its goals will be subject to continuous monitoring and periodic evaluations carried out by the following authorities:

I - Ministry of Education - MEC;

II - The Education Commission of the House of Representatives and the Education, Culture, and Sports Commission of the Brazilian Senate;

III - National Council of Education - CNE;

IV - National Education Forum (BRASIL, 2014a, p. 1).

The federative coordination by the Union in strengthening social participation is maintained in the documents that guide the monitoring and evaluation processes of the education plans. Thus, the document entitled *Planning the Next Decade: Aligning Education Plans* defines, among its basic guidelines, the

Creation, in each federative entity, of a system for monitoring and evaluating the education plan and establishing the necessary mechanisms for its implementation. [...] This system should include the participation of social movements and other segments of organized civil society, and of political society through collegiate settings, such as education councils and other spaces for participation and mobilization. (BRASIL, 2014b, p. 19).

The step-by-step prepared by the Secretariat of Articulation with Education Systems from the Ministry of Education (Sase/MEC) (BRASIL, 2017a) complements the guidelines regarding the monitoring and evaluation of state, district, and municipal plans, clarifying that “in the laws and in the subnational Plans, similar responsibilities will be carried out within the scope of the states, the Federal District and municipalities by the authorities determined in their education plans” (BRASIL, 2017a, p. 2).

Parallel to Sase, the FNE was established as an important instance of articulation concerning the ten-year education plans. Vera and Lavalle (2012, p. 114) classify the forums as instances for building consensus and defining priorities among civil society actors, as emblematic examples of “democratic innovations in their respective contexts.”

Created as a result of the discussions at the Conae - 2010, the FNE should be represented by diverse social movements within the educational field, and be responsible for coordinating the Conae and monitoring PNE goals, providing support for the states and municipalities to create their local forums. In this direction,

The understanding was that the FNE and its corresponding Education State Forums (FEE), District Education Forum (FDE), and Municipal Education Forums (FME) would occupy a strategic position in the processes of collective decision-making regarding the education plans and the various education conferences. (AZEVEDO; OLIVEIRA, 2020, p. 628).

We can see from the citation that the Union’s coordination departs from the centralizing profile since it assigns the creation of local coordination instances to the states and municipalities, mainly through the state and municipal forums, which, in turn, must incorporate local demands into the unfolding processes. This institutional arrangement establishes principles that seek to guarantee the collective development of educational plans in all the Brazilian federal entities to promote broad social commitment towards the ten-year education plans. The goal is to guarantee its applicability in guiding public policies beyond the time span of a given government.

Pires and Vaz (2014, p. 82), when analyzing socio-state interaction patterns in programs developed by the federal government, highlight the “importance engagement has as a guide for the actions to be implemented by the government, especially with regard to the processes of planning and designing intervention strategies.”

The following section is meant to analyze how the state of Paraná adopted the national guidelines for the design, monitoring, and evaluation of the PEE-PR (2015-2015) (PARANÁ, 2015c), especially regarding social participation.

From design to monitoring the PEE-PR

The PEE-PR was published through State Law no. 18,492/2015 for the period between 2015 and 2025 (PARANÁ, 2015b). This document was based on State Decree no. 12,728/2014, which established the Management Committee linked to the Governor's Office, whose composition incorporated representatives from eleven institutions: Association of Public Higher Education Institutions of Paraná (APIESP); Paraná State Board of Education (CEE-PR); Paraná State Federation of Apaes (FEAPAEs-PR); Paraná State Trade Federation (Fecomércio-PR); Education State Forum (FEE-PR); Superintendence of Science, Technology, and Higher Education (Seti); State Department of Education (Seed-PR); Syndicate of Private Schools of Paraná (SINEPE); Union of Workers in Public Education of Paraná (APP - Sindicato); National Union of Municipal Director of Education (Undime-PR); and Federal University of Paraná (UFPR) (PARANÁ, 2015b, p. 14).

In the Managing Committee's constitution, the guidelines issued by Sase/MEC were observed, which was mentioned in the document's introduction as the instance guiding its elaboration.

Consistent with the guidelines of the Secretariat of Articulation with Education Systems (Sase) from MEC, the following script was adopted for structuring the PEE-PR [...]

- d) collective development of a reference-document involving sectors and segments, and its consolidation as a base-document;
- e) realization of 32 regional public hearings based in the Regional Education Centers strategically distributed in the Paraná territory [...]. (PARANÁ, 2015b, p. 97).

Also noteworthy is the involvement of the FEE-PR as part of the committee, which once again reinforces the guarantee of social representation beyond the federal government's guidelines. The FEE-PR was created by State Resolution no. 900/2013 Seed-PR, and replaced by State Resolution no. 1,221/2013 Seed-PR (PARANÁ, 2013), which states:

Art. 1 - To establish the Paraná Education State Forum - FEE-PR, with a permanent character, in order to: I - promote and coordinate the state education conferences; II - monitor and evaluate the implementation of conference deliberations; III - facilitate the necessary cooperation among other education forums; and IV - encourage, monitor, and evaluate the design and operation of the State, Municipal, and National Education Plans. (PARANÁ, 2013).

The constitution of the forum is linked to the Secretary of State for Education's office and was supposed to include representatives from more than thirty instances: three government agents, eleven union, fourteen from social movements, one business, from scientific entities and public institutions of higher education, and associations and forums. The documents suggest the active involvement of the FEE in the elaboration of the PEE-PR. One of its members is the coordinator of the Mobilization and Dissemination Commission of the FEE-PR, which is the author of the *Guidelines for the realization of municipal and inter-municipal conferences in the state of Paraná* (PARANÁ, 2013).

After the approval of the PEE-PR, it was not possible to identify public action by the FEE-PR. The Forum's electronic page has not been updated since 2016 and is currently configured as a non-existent page. Added to this is the remark in Oliveira's research (2020), in which the author indicates that the mandate of the last president of the Forum ended in 2019 without a new appointment.

The law that approves the PEE-PR establishes in Art. 5 that the execution of the plan's goals would be subject to continuous monitoring and periodic evaluations carried out every two years by the following instances:

- I - State Department of Education (SEED);
- II - Superintendence of Science, Technology, and Higher Education (SETI);
- III - Paraná State Board of Education (CEE-PR);
- IV - Education Commission of the Legislative Assembly of Paraná; and
- V - Education State Forum (FEE-PR) (PARANÁ, 2015a).

In §2º from Art. 5, the IPARDES is in charge of publishing studies to assess the progress of fulfilling the goals. Such studies should support the two state education conferences to be held every four years until the end of the decade, which would be preceded by municipal conferences articulated and coordinated by the FEE-PR, as established in Art. 6 (PARANÁ, 2015b). The operation of subsidiary agencies in monitoring and evaluating the state education plans is identified in the states of Paraná, São Paulo, and Espírito Santo (MENEZES; SOUZA, 2018).

Five years after the law was published, IPARDES released the report that presents the *Partial results from monitoring the goals of the PEE-PR 2015-2019* (IPARDES, 2020[?]). However, no conference was held to discuss or close the document.

The report was created based on Decree no. 6,674/2017 (PARANÁ, 2017a), and modified by Decree no. 7,223 of the June 27, 2017, which established the "Permanent Commission for Monitoring and Evaluating the State Education Plan" (PARANÁ, 2017c). These decrees were published right at the end of the first two-year period of the PEE-PR, when the first evaluation cycle should have been concluded.

The following institutions responsible for monitoring and evaluating the PEE-PR were nominated to be part of the commission: Seed; Seti and CEE/PR. Despite defining the participating agencies for the monitoring and evaluation of the PEE-PR, these decrees did not indicate their representatives, which was only put into effect by the Joint Resolution (Seed-PR and CEE-PR) no. 04/2019, which established the Technical Group to Support the Permanent Commission for Monitoring and Evaluation of the State Education Plan (GT-PEE/PR).

The members of the GT-PEE-PR are representatives of the agencies named in Decree no 6,674/2017 (PARANÁ, 2017b) with support from the IPARDES. Among these devices, there is the absence of the FEE-PR and the Education Commission of the Legislative Assembly of Paraná, which compromises the group's socio-state interface, an indispensable element for educational planning in this decade according to the guidelines in the PNE, the PEE-PR, and the Sase later.

Such facts seem to indicate the same emptying movement that the FNE went through as of 2017, as analyzed by Scaff, Oliveira, and Lima (2018) when pointing out the setback context in relation to the democratic achievements from the last two decades. It indicates the historical downturns in the field of Brazilian education planning “that once again tends to centralize the decisions within the federal government, overlooking decades spent developing a project of public, democratic, lay, and social quality education” (SCAFF; OLIVEIRA; LIMA, 2018, p. 918).

This regressive situation was institutionalized by the legislative-judicial-media strike of 2016 (AMARAL, 2017), which resulted in the deposition of the elected president Dilma Vana Rousseff, and the consequent reconfiguration of power relations in Brazil through conservative reforms mainly in the educational field. In this combination of forces, the federative structure developed as a basis to support the processes of elaboration, monitoring, and evaluation of the ten-year education plans was completely dismantled.

In 2017, the Decree from April 26, which summons the 3rd Conae, removed from the FNE the responsibility for organizing the conference and centers such functions in the Executive Secretariat of the MEC (BRASIL, 2017). The document revokes the call already made by president Dilma Rousseff via Decree from May 9, 2016, which assigned the FNE for the coordination of the process. In a complementary manner, the MEC published Ordinance no. 577/2017, which reconfigured the composition of the FNE, restricting social representation and centering the responsibility to arbitrate the composition of the forum on the Minister of Education (SCAFF; OLIVEIRA; LIMA, 2018).

In the same direction, we highlight the recomposition of the CNE through the replacement of entities representing the public sector by representatives of the private sector and the threat of extinction of the Sase, which was materialized through Decree no. 9,465 of January 2, 2019 (BRASIL, 2019).

In 2019, the FNE’s emptying and the Sase’s extinction indicate the retraction of the coordination movement by the federal government in relation to educational planning in local federative entities, which resulted in the apparent extinction of the FEE-PR, corroborating to the weakening of representative instances’ participation in the monitoring and evaluation of the state plan.

Considering the composition of the commission and the GT-PEE/PR, the CEE-PR is identified as the only agency representing civil society. Such information is consistent with the studies of Menezes and Souza (2018), who, when analyzing 24 state education plans, found the definition of CEE as responsible for the monitoring and evaluation processes in 87% of them.

In the state of Paraná, the CEE-PR remains a member from the elaboration committee to the monitoring and evaluation of the PEE-PR, which places it in a central position in the debate developed in this article. According to Art. 1 of its regiment, the CEE-PR is considered a “deliberative, normative, consultative, and educational policy orientation body of the Paraná State Education System, with autonomy and representativeness in its composition” (PARANÁ, 2012).

In front of this premise, we consulted the agency’s website to identify how it participated in the monitoring and evaluation of the PEE-PR. The minutes available on the

page refer only to the years 2020 and 2021, which means the documents with the greatest potential contribution to this research were the annual work plans for the years 2015 to 2020, the period from the approval of the PEE-PR to the present date.

Table 1 - Monitoring and Evaluation of the PEE-PR (2015-2020) in the documents of the Paraná State Board of Education

Deliberation nº. 03 of November 12, 2015 - Work Plan for 2016	It deals with the importance of following up and monitoring the execution of the PEE-PR in the following year.
Deliberation nº. 03 of September 09, 2016 - Work Plan for 2017	It points out the need to monitor the execution of the PEE-PR, which did not start within the specified period. Informs the presentation to the state government of a proposal to organize a Permanent Group.
Resolution nº. 03 of August 12, 2017 - Work Plan for 2018	Informs the publication of Decree nº. 6647/2017, which establishes the Permanent Commission for Monitoring and Evaluation of the PEE-PR, including the Council as a permanent member.
Resolution nº. 04 of June 06, 2018 - Work Plan for 2019	Informs the existence of an evaluation report of the PEE-PR without the knowledge of CEE-PR and recommends to Seed the proposition of the continuity of the work of the Monitoring and Evaluation Commission.
Deliberation nº. 02 of April 11, 2019 - Work Plan for 2020	It points out the need to propose the continuity of the work of the Monitoring and Evaluation Commission to Seed, warning that the work is not occurring in accordance with what is established by law.
Deliberation nº. 08 of November 30, 2020 - Work Plan for 2021	Announces the absence of a meeting of the Monitoring and Evaluation Committee of the PEE-PR during the year 2020. It suggests that the Council propose to Seed and Seti to rescue the work of the Monitoring and Evaluation Commission.

Source: Own elaboration based on the deliberations that define the Annual Work Plans (PARANÁ, 2015a, 2016, 2017a, 2018, 2019, 2020).

The analysis of these documents shows that the CEE-PR did not participate in the PEE-PR monitoring and evaluation process in the period from 2015 to 2020 since all the deliberations that establish the annual work plan of the said council in the period 2015 to 2018 expressly record the inexistence of actions in this direction by the government of the state of Paraná. Note that in 2017 the institution of the Permanent Commission for Monitoring and Evaluation of the PEE-PR stemmed from the management of CEE-PR with the state government – a decision made at the board meeting on December 9, 2016.

The plan prepared in December 2017 informs the knowledge, by CEE-PR councilors, of an evaluation report of the PEE-PR, which would have been prepared without the participation of the council representative in the commission. Although the report was in preparation in 2018, it was not published on the IPARDES and Seed-PR websites until 2020. However, the date of its publication does not appear on the identification pages.

Even after the publication of the report, entitled as partial, its content was not discussed with CEE-PR, which is evident in Deliberation no. 08/2020, which reports the lack of a meeting of the evaluation commission of the PEE-PR that year. The text suggests that the state secretariats of education and of Science, Technology, and Higher Education resume the work of the monitoring and evaluation commission of the state plan.

On the cover of the report published by IPARDES, it is possible to identify the CEE-PR logo, the information that since the “institution of the Permanent Commission and the Technical Group in Paraná, the monitoring work continues until the present date” (IPARDES, 2020 [?], p. 2).

Oliveira (2020), researching PEE-PR, conducted an interview with the CEE-PR member of the commission. His testimony claimed the monitoring and evaluation of the PEE-PR to be fiction, since “after four years only one report from the Technical Group was prepared, and it was not even examined by the Evaluation Commission” (OLIVEIRA, 2020, p. 141).

In this scenario, it is worth adding that the state governor dismissed the president of CEE-PR in March 2021 (LUC, 2021) and that the then secretary general of the council, a member of the GT-PEE/PR, was also replaced and is currently a substitute councilor.

Another contradiction evidenced in the PEE-PR evaluation report refers to the information that the commission adopted the guidelines of the Technical Assistance Network for the Monitoring and Evaluation of Education Plans, linked to the former Sase. However, the report does not present any information regarding social participation – an aspect emphasized both in the Sase guidelines and in the PEE-PR.

The contradictions evidenced in this process refer to the analysis of the relationships established between social actors and the state bureaucracy, whose history can lead to the conformation of more restricted and selective interfaces, as warned by Pires and Vaz (2014). LÜCHMANN (2020, p. 19) also warns about the new challenges posed by the proliferation of socio-state interfaces in Brazil since they “involve diverse actors, sectors, and resources and depend on different social, cultural, and institutional contexts.” In this scenario, they are not always constituted as integrated systems, sometimes functioning in a disjointed way, according to different contexts, areas, and institutional dynamics (LÜCHMANN, 2020).

The data identified in this research point to the construction of socio-state interfaces with very peculiar characteristics in the state of Paraná, permeated by consolidated power relations among the institutions involved. The result is a fragmented and weak action, which compromises the consolidation of democratic and participative institutional processes. Such data also corroborate the research by Menezes and Souza (2018), who emphasize little or none has been given to social participation in the monitoring and evaluation of state plans in 24 Brazilian states.

Different results are found in research carried out in other states of the country. Analyzing the PEE from the state of Maranhão, the authors Verde and Lima (2021) identify the forecast for a biennial evaluation of the plan, whose first report was presented in 2017 based on work coordinated by the FEE.

Also, in Mato Grosso do Sul, Scaff and Oliveira (2018) identify the State Education Plan Observatory, an instance provided for in the state’s PEE and created in 2015 under the PEE-MS Monitoring and Evaluation Commission, established by the state government and coordinated by the FEE. The aforementioned Forum was created in 1997 and identifies itself as a permanent State agency in its regiment, responsible for the articulation between government and organized civil society (SCAFF; OLIVEIRA, 2018). It is important to note that the researchers analyzed present data until 2019, when the extinction of Sase occurred. Observing the importance of this secretariat in the federative coordination of educational planning in Brazil, it is worth questioning whether such methodologies remain in place in the states of Maranhão and Mato Grosso do Sul since, in general, Menezes and Souza (2018) consider that

[...] monitoring and evaluation tend to be figured in the PEE studied: i) as a device external to planning and not as an element that integrates it; ii) as a mechanism to be implemented automatically or naturally, disregarding, therefore, the interactive and negotiated nature that such a process gives rise to; iii) as a formal activity, in compliance with the requirements of the PNE, and not explicitly committed to achieving the democratization of public management in the area of education; and, finally, iv) as a monolithic and static action, not inclined to movements to expand its meaning and sociopolitical practice. (MENEZES; SOUZA, 2018, p. 631).

The data for the Paraná confirm these findings and make it possible to identify the preliminary monitoring and evaluation report of the PEE-PR as a formal, monolithic, and static activity assigned to a subsidiary body as a process that is external to the educational planning and does not require social participation for its execution.

Final considerations³

This research highlights the importance of the federal government's, from 2010 to 2018, role in coordinating educational planning in the country. The creation of the FNE in 2010 and the Sase in 2011 are important milestones in this context, pointing to a decentralizing and participatory federative coordination that advanced in the perspective of the socio-state interface in elaborating public policies.

The theoretical framework researched revealed the need and relevance of federative coordination in order to reduce inequalities between states and municipalities and promote the consolidation of a national education system in which the autonomy of local federative entities is respected to meet their specific demands.

Thus, the complex arrangement created from the elaboration of the PNE (2014-2024), while determining a methodology based on the collective construction of educational planning at the local level through conferences and forums, among other mechanisms of the socio-state interface, does not disregard the independence of other federated entities. As such, it incorporates the debates held in Brazilian states, the Federal District, and municipalities into national planning, encouraging the development of plans and participatory instances at the local level.

The analysis of the elaboration, the monitoring, and the evaluation of the PEE-PR reaffirms the importance of the federative coordination by the Union carried out through Sase, whose orientations guided the plan and the Paraná report. In this regard, Lotta, Gonçalves, and Bitelman (2014) highlight the protagonism that the federal government occupied in the planning of public policies in Brazil in the 2000s by pointing to the federalization of social democratic controls as a breakthrough in Brazilian politics, an aspect also emphasized by Vera and Lavalle (2012). Pires and Vaz (2014) identified the relevant growth in the number of socio-state interfaces in federal government programs and agencies from 2002 to 2010.

3- The author would like to thank the Academic Publishing Advisory Center (*Centro de Assessoria de Publicação Acadêmica, CAPA* – www.capa.ufpr.br) of the Federal University of Paraná (UFPR) for assistance with English language translation and developmental editing.

However, the socio-state interface methodology defined by the Union was incorporated by the state of Paraná only at the time of the elaboration of the PEE-PR between 2014 and 2015, not being evidenced in the partial evaluation report published in 2020. This fact, associated with the decline of the FEE-PR in 2016 and its extinction in 2019, indicates the contraction of the social participation movement in the elaboration of educational policies in the state, which is aligned, in this way, to the policies developed by the Union in the last five years. This result is similar to that of the research developed by Menezes and Souza (2018), who identified the omission or scarcity of information about the social actors involved in the monitoring and evaluation plans in 24 Brazilian states.

The omission of the coordinating role of the Union after the impeachment of President Dilma Vana Rousseff in 2016, as well as the denial of social participation as an axis for the construction of public policies, especially after the 2018 elections, had drastic consequences for the ten-year education plans. They became vulnerable to the most varied order of political interests manifested in the local federative entities, which compromises any perspective of consolidating a national education system, the main objective of the PNE (2014-2024).

In the Paraná, this tendency is materialized by the elaboration of a monitoring and evaluation protocol report prepared on the margins of collective and democratic debate, an indispensable condition for state planning, whether in the field of education or in any other public policy. Thus, educational planning is reduced to a technical-bureaucratic activity, which largely distances it from the proposal of the ten-year education plans built from the guidelines of the federal government in the process of federative coordination in the second decade of the 2000s.

References

ABRAMO, Marta Wendel; LICIO, Elaine Cristina. Papel da união na coordenação federativa da política de educação básica. *In: JACCOUD, Luciana (org.). Coordenação e relações intergovernamentais nas políticas sociais brasileiras*. Brasília, DF: IPEA, 2020. p. 81-112.

ABRUCIO, Fernando Luiz. Descentralização e coordenação federativa no Brasil: lições dos anos FHC. *In: ABRUCIO, Fernando Luiz; LOUREIRO, Maria Rita Garcia (org.). O Estado numa era de reformas: os anos FHC: parte 2*. Brasília, DF: Ministério do Planejamento, Orçamento e Gestão, 2002. p. 41-67.

ALMEIDA, Fábio Chang de. O historiador e as fontes digitais: uma visão acerca da internet como fonte primária para pesquisas históricas. *Revista Aedos*, Porto Alegre, v. 3, n. 8, p. 9-30, 2011.

AMARAL, Nelson Cardoso. O “novo” ensino médio e o PNE: haverá recursos para essa política? *Retratos da Escola*, Brasília, DF, v. 11, n. 20, p. 91-108, 2017.

ARRETCHE, Marta. Quem taxa e quem gasta: a barganha federativa na federação brasileira. *Revista de Sociologia e Política*, Curitiba, n. 24, p. 69-85, 2005.

AVRITZER, Leonardo. *Conferências nacionais: ampliando e redefinindo os padrões de participação social no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: IPEA, 2012.

AZEVEDO, Janete Maria Lins de; OLIVEIRA, João Ferreira de. Gestão, monitoramento e avaliação dos planos de educação: retrocessos e desafios. **Retratos da Escola**, Brasília, DF, v. 14, n. 30, p. 662-638, 2020.

BRASIL. **Documento referência CONAE 2010**: construindo o Sistema Nacional Articulado de Educação: o Plano Nacional de Educação, Diretrizes e Estratégias de Ação. Brasília, DF: MEC, 2010.

BRASIL. Decreto de 26 de abril de 2017. Convoca a 3ª Conferência Nacional de Educação. **Diário Oficial da União**, Brasília, DF, 27 abr. 2017. Disponível em http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2017/dsn/dsn14456.htm. Acesso em 16 mar. 2023.

BRASIL. **Decreto nº 9.465, de 2 de janeiro de 2019**. Aprova a estrutura regimental e o quadro demonstrativo dos cargos em comissão e das funções de confiança do Ministério da Educação, remaneja cargos em comissão e funções de confiança e transforma cargos em comissão do Grupo-Direção e Assessoramento Superiores – DAS e Funções Comissionadas do Poder Executivo – FCPE. **Diário Oficial da União**, Brasília, DF, 2 jan. 2019.

BRASIL. **Lei nº 13.005, de 25 de junho de 2014**. Aprova o Plano Nacional de Educação – PNE e dá outras providências. **Diário Oficial da União**, Brasília, DF, 26 jun. 2014a.

BRASIL. **Orientações, passo a passo, de utilização de dois mecanismos para monitoramento e avaliação dos planos de educação**: audiências públicas e conferências. Brasília, DF: MEC, 2017a.

BRASIL. **Planejando a próxima década**: alinhando os planos de educação. Brasília, DF: MEC, 2014b.

IPARDES. Instituto Paranaense de Desenvolvimento Econômico e Social. **Resultados parciais do monitoramento das metas do Plano Estadual de Educação do Paraná do estado do Paraná 2015-2019**. Curitiba: IparDES, [2020?].

LICIO, Elaine Cristina; PONTES, Pedro. A agenda do sistema nacional de educação e suas instâncias de pactuação: uma análise das propostas. In: JACCOUD, Luciana (org.). **Coordenação e relações intergovernamentais nas políticas sociais brasileiras**. Brasília, DF: IPEA, 2020. p. 309-344.

LOTTA, Gabriela Spanghero; GONÇALVES, Renata; BITELMAN, Marina Farkas. A Coordenação Federativa de Políticas Públicas: uma análise das políticas brasileiras nas últimas décadas. **Cadernos Gestão Pública e Cidadania**, São Paulo, v. 19, n. 64, p. 2-18, 2014.

LUC, Mauren. Exoneração de conselheira escancara 'atritos' na Educação do Paraná. **Jornal Plural**, Curitiba, 26 mar. 2021. Disponível em: <https://www.plural.jor.br/noticias/vizinhanca/exoneracao-de-conselheira-escancara-atritos-na-educacao-do-parana/>. Acesso em: 11 maio 2022.

LÜCHMANN, Lígia Helena Hahn. Interfaces socioestatais e instituições participativas: dimensões analíticas. **Lua Nova**, São Paulo, n. 109, p. 13-49, 2020.

MENEZES, Janaína Specht da Silva; SOUZA, Donaldo Bello de. Monitoramento e avaliação nos Planos Estaduais de Educação consoantes ao novo PNE. **Pro-Posições**, Campinas, v. 29, n. 3, p. 614-639, 2018.

OLIVEIRA, Celso Augusto Souza de. **A atuação das instâncias definidas pela Lei Estadual nº 18.492/2015 no monitoramento e avaliação do Plano Estadual de Educação do Paraná 2015-2025. 2020.** Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade Federal do Paraná, Curitiba, 2020.

PARANÁ. **Decreto nº 5.499 de 3 de agosto de 2012.** Aprova do Regimento do Conselho Estadual de Educação do Paraná – CEE-PR. Curitiba: Governo do Estado do Paraná, 2012.

PARANÁ. **Decreto nº 6.674, de 12 de abril de 2017.** Institui a Comissão Permanente de Monitoramento e Avaliação do Plano Estadual de Educação do Paraná. Curitiba: Governo do Estado do Paraná, 2017b.

PARANÁ. **Decreto nº 7.223, de 27 de junho de 2017.** Institui a Comissão Permanente de Monitoramento e Avaliação do Plano Estadual de Educação do Paraná. Curitiba: Governo do Estado do Paraná, 2017c.

PARANÁ. **Lei no 18.492, de 24 de junho de 2015.** Aprova o Plano Estadual de Educação (PEE-PR), com vigência por dez anos [...]. Curitiba: Governo do Estado do Paraná, 2015b.

PARANÁ. **Plano Estadual de Educação do Paraná: 2015-2025.** Curitiba: Governo do Estado do Paraná, 2015c.

PARANÁ. **Resolução Estadual nº 1.221, de 18 de março de 2013.** Institui o Fórum Estadual de Educação do Paraná – FEE - PR. Diário Oficial do Paraná, Curitiba, 18 mar. 2013.

PARANÁ. Conselho Estadual de Educação. **Deliberação nº 02/2019.** Plano anual de trabalho do Conselho Estadual de Educação para o ano de 2020. Relatora Sandra Teresinha da Silva, 4 de novembro de 2019. Curitiba: CEE-PR, 2019.

PARANÁ. Conselho Estadual de Educação. **Deliberação nº 03/15.** Programa anual de trabalho do Conselho Estadual de Educação para o ano de 2016. Relatora Maria das Graças Figueiredo Saad, 11 de dezembro de 2015. Curitiba: CEE-PR, 2015a.

PARANÁ. Conselho Estadual de Educação. **Deliberação nº 03/16.** Plano anual de trabalho do Conselho Estadual de Educação do Paraná para o ano de 2017. Relatora Sandra Teresinha da Silva, 9 de dezembro de 2016. Curitiba: CEE-PR, 2016.

PARANÁ. Conselho Estadual de Educação. **Deliberação nº 03/17.** Plano anual de trabalho do Conselho Estadual de Educação para o ano de 2018. Relatora: Clemencia Maria Ferreira Ribas, 8 de dezembro de 2017. Curitiba: CEE-PR, 2017a.

PARANÁ. Conselho Estadual de Educação. **Deliberação nº 04/18.** Plano anual de trabalho do Conselho Estadual de Educação para o ano de 2019. Relatora Taís Maria Mendes, 6 de dezembro de 2018. Curitiba: CEE-PR, 2018.

PARANÁ. Conselho Estadual de Educação. **Deliberação nº 08/20.** Plano anual de trabalho do Conselho Estadual de Educação para o ano de 2021. Relatora Rita de Cassia Morais, 30 de novembro de 2020. Curitiba: CEE-PR, 2020.

PARANÁ. Fórum Estadual de Educação. **Orientações para a realização das conferências municipais e intermunicipais no estado do Paraná.** Curitiba, PR: Fórum Estadual de Educação, 2013.

PIRES, Roberto R. C.; VAZ, Alexander C. N. Para além da participação: interfaces socioestatais no governo federal. **Lua Nova**, São Paulo, n. 93, p. 61-91, 2014.

SANTOS, Boaventura de Sousa; AVRITZER, Leonardo. Para ampliar o cânone democrático. *In*: SANTOS, Boaventura de Souza (org.). **Democratizar a democracia**: os caminhos da democracia participativa. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2002. p. 39-42.

SAVIANI, Dermeval. Sistema Nacional de Educação articulado ao Plano Nacional de Educação. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 15, n. 44, p. 380-412, 2010.

SCAFF, Elisangela Alves da Silva; OLIVEIRA, Marli dos Santos. Planos decenais de educação: sistematização do monitoramento e avaliação nos cenários estadual e municipal. **Série-Estudos**, Campo Grande, v. 23, n. 47, p. 141-162, 2018.

SCAFF, Elisangela Alves da Silva; OLIVEIRA, Marli dos Santos; LIMA, Simone Estigarribia de. O planejamento educacional frente às fragilidades da democracia brasileira. **Educação e Temática Digital**, Campinas, v. 20, n. 4, p. 905-923, 2018.

SCAFF, Elisangela Alves da Silva; OLIVEIRA, Regina Tereza Cestari de. Fóruns de educação: instrumentos de participação e representação na gestão educacional brasileira. *In*: OLIVEIRA, Regina Tereza Cestari de (org.). **Educação e democracia**: políticas e direitos sociais. Campo Grande: Oeste, 2019. p. 187-202. Disponível em: https://57e0d89a-ae70-4a18-8d77-f49231e99306.filesusr.com/ugd/99bf86_e4843c8d9ec04fe6852972d57f7d31d5.pdf Acesso em: 11 maio 2022.

VERA, Ernesto Isunza; LAVALLE, Adrian Gurza. Arquitetura da participação e controles democráticos no Brasil e no México. **Novos Estudos Cebrap**, São Paulo, n. 92, p. 105-121, 2012.

VERDE, Alexandre; LIMA, Francisca das Chagas Silva. Gestão democrática da escola pública com base no monitoramento do PEE do estado do Maranhão. **Práxis Educacional**, Vitória da Conquista, v. 17, n. 48, p. 434-455, 2021.

Received on September 13, 2021

Reviewed on March 21, 2022

Accepted on October 10, 2022

Editor: Prof. Dr. Fernando Rodrigues de Oliveira

Elisangela Alves da Silva Scaff holds a PhD in education from the Universidade de São Paulo (USP), with a post-doctorate from the same University. Associate Professor at the Universidade Federal do Paraná (UFPR).