Rethinking Teaching from Territories: Approaches from Public Policy, Educational Policy, And Teacher Policy

Dr. Luis F. Vásquez Zora[1], Dr. Alex Dueñas Peña[2], Mg. Diana M. Cuellar Sánchez[3]

[1] Universidad Colegio Mayor de Cundinamarca, Bogotá D.C., Colombia.
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8172-0602
[2] Universidad Colegio Mayor de Cundinamarca, Funza, Colombia.
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2940-416X,
[3] Universidad Colegio Mayor de Cundinamarca, Funza, Colombia.
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9500-1799

Abstract
Reflecting on teachers' work based on the specific realities of each territory or local context, and from different public policy perspectives, remains a highly relevant topic. This paper proposes to analyze and reconsider teaching practice by taking local realities into account, addressing it across different policy levels: general public policy, educational policy, and teacher-specific policy. A qualitative and interpretive approach is adopted; therefore, a documentary analysis is conducted in which the meanings and interpretations attributed to various experiences are described, analyzed, and interpreted. The units of analysis underpinning the study include institutional discourses on teachers' work, conceptions of teaching embedded in policies, teaching experiences in territorial contexts, and public policy guidelines, among others. The paper provides findings that contribute to understanding how the social, economic, and cultural conditions of the context influence the way teaching work is carried out. Among the conclusions, it is highlighted that teaching must be analyzed from different angles: general regulatory frameworks, an understanding of the territories where teaching is practiced, and the need to rethink it in order to promote a more comprehensive, situated, and contextualized understanding of teachers' work.
Keywords: Teaching, public policy, educational policy, teacher policy, territory.

1. INTRODUCTION

Teaching, despite the multiple definitions that recognize it as a social practice responsible for transmitting knowledge from one generation to another (González, 2024; Vásquez, 2018; 2015; 2016; Durkheim, 1999), cannot be reduced solely to this function. It has also been historically shaped around its professional, labour, and political demands (Bocanegra, 2010; Peñuela, 2008; Castro et al., 2005; Castro, 2007; Popkewitz, 1995; Coral, 1980; Fecode, 1982). However, contemporary educational policies have tended to delimit teaching as a technical form of social action, subject to measurement, evaluation, and quantifiable control (Tello, 2011; Tello, 2013; Tardiff, 2012; UNESCO, 2011, 2013; Cox et al., 2011; Cuenca, 2015; Van Zanten, 2011).
In addition, teaching outcomes are increasingly incentivized through national and international awards and recognitions (Varkey Foundation: Global Teacher Prize, 2022; Fundación Compartir, 2014), introducing logics of competition and performance.

Likewise, teaching is now considered an instrument for the acquisition of goods and products within the learning and competency market (UNESCO, 2015; Mahatma Gandhi Institute, 2022). More recently, the shift toward coaching has reinforced a pedagogy centred on motivation and training aimed at achieving excellence (Fundación Compartir, 2014), oriented toward the development, management, and consumption of skills linked to entrepreneurship and innovation, facilitating individuals' insertion into the market of services, new technologies, and digital finance (Bedoya, 2018; Blondeau et al., 2021).

2. BACKGROUND

For more than four decades, numerous studies in Ibero-America have defined teaching as the activity responsible for the transmission of social knowledge, understood through different analytical categories: the *issue* (Castro et al., 2005; Peñuela et al., 2008), the *situation* (Coral, 1980; Parra, 1997; Tenti, 2006, 2007), the *profession* (Ibarra, 2010; Nóvoa, 2009; Pulido et al., 2005; Tardiff, 2012), *working conditions* (Castro, 2007; Popkewitz, 1995; Palamidessi, 2003), *precarisation* (Rodríguez, 2009; Vaillant, 2004), and, for other authors, the limits of militant practice (Coral, 1980; Le Bot, 1985; Parra, 1997; Rodríguez, 2009). This set of perspectives has made it possible to consolidate a field of knowledge about teaching that situates it as a historical, political, and social relationship, shaped by disputes over its status, recognition, and material conditions of existence.

Within the analysis of these categories, teaching appears as a practice whose common denominator refers to the relations inherent to political economy. From this perspective, it is either defended and claimed in response to its devaluation, or it is framed as an activity under question, conditioned in its transition between occupation, profession, and professionalism. Thus, across different historical moments, teaching has been understood as a subordinate social trade, subjugated or undervalued, and more recently, precarised. For some, it is an occupation that must be socially defended through union organization or activism (Murillo, 2001; Dal Rosso, 2011); for others, it is an activity that must be revalued and dignified. In both cases, critical approaches have constituted the main theoretical support.

However, this article proposes shifting the gaze toward another problem: the conditions for the transmission of social knowledge and the political powers that make it possible, in particular historical moments, to teach, educate, or learn. The aim is to interrogate teaching as a situated social production, by revealing the historical practices through which this activity has been constituted. It is therefore important to take distance from a certain disciplinary complicity with the injunctions of public policies promoted by international organizations, multinational corporations, business leaders, governments, foundations, and unions, which seek to impose a particular "truth" about what teaching should be.

From these diverse social fronts, teaching has been represented sometimes from the frontier of its claims, sometimes from its dignification, and sometimes from the assertion that social improvement depends on strengthening it. This reveals that teaching activity is constrained within categories such as training, career, and salary, which must be defended or reaffirmed, either through union struggle or through alignment with specific economic and social models (Vásquez, 2015b; 2016; 2018; 2022). Although relevant, this framing limits the analysis to a horizon that privileges the defense or revaluation of the

occupation, leaving in the background the interrogation of the political rationalities that constitute it.

For this reason, the article proposes moving through other spaces from which to think about teaching: political spaces. This implies recognizing the conditions for the formation, existence, and transformation of governmental techniques that take the population as their object, political economy as their overarching form, and security apparatuses as their essential technical instrument (Foucault, 2006). The goal is to investigate the rationalities that guide the selection of the knowledge to be transmitted and the intentions of institutions, collectives, and subjects that intervene in teaching activity. The aim is not only to show how society selects certain kinds of knowledge, but also how it configures what we call *teacher policy*: the way in which curricular knowledge is articulated with modes of government, interests, and strategies. From the perspective of knowledge, the analysis examines how it is prioritized and organized in curricula; from the perspective of conduct, how mechanisms and techniques seek to formalize practices and introduce behaviors consistent with an ideal model of society.

The proposed trajectory addresses the problematizations that emerge between public policy, educational policy, and teacher policy. In doing so, the paper distances itself from a certain "academic Marxism" that seeks in economic conditions a reflection in consciousness (Foucault, 1996), and adopts instead the concern that we know economic structures better than political power relations (Foucault, 1996). The analysis is therefore oriented toward the power relations that condition the existence of knowledge about teaching, with its discursive regularities, objects, concepts, and specific strategies. Rather than describing the integration of knowledge under socioeconomic conditions or teachers' working conditions, the paper assumes that discourses do not merely reflect reality, but also construct it (Fairclough, 2001). From a genealogical perspective, the issue, the situation, and socioeconomic conditions represent only part of the problem. Teaching, as the practice of articulating social knowledge, entails the formation of subjects and conduct—that is, a teacher policy.

This gives rise to questions: why are analyses of political practices as configurators of objects and strategies for governing teaching scarce in Latin America? Why are the arts of governing teaching not examined? What technologies of power seek to impose certain practices? Are there forms of knowledge that silence ethical or aesthetic modalities exercised in school settings? The aim here is not to reiterate the widely studied society–education–work relationship (Coral, 1980; Jiménez & Estrada, 1993; Nóvoa, 2009; Tenti, 2006, 2007; Tardiff, 2012), nor to describe in a linear way figures such as the preceptor or the trainer. Nor does the article assume teaching as a direct relation to rent and capital, or as a training device for economic growth, although historical examples exist, such as teacher-training colleges (*normales*), conceived as state devices for producing teachers.

The paper also distances itself from Marxist analyses of value theory and labour (Frigotto, 1984) and from debates on surplus value and the social function of the teacher (Marx, 2002; Torres, 2000; Avalos, 2011; Tenti, 2006). It does not adopt the reading of teaching as a mere transmitter of class ideology (Marx, 1848), nor the discussion of state education and productive labour (Marx, 2002). Beyond teaching as exchange value or indirect social function, the interest lies in teacher policies. The focus is on the government of teaching: the rationalities, mechanisms, and procedures that seek to conduct it, religious practices of spiritual care, bodily disciplines, timetables, surveillance, hygiene, normalization, and technical training. From teaching as a mediation between the individual and society, the

article seeks to show how, for example, in the first half of the twentieth century labour became a measure of value and educational policies oriented the training of "personnel" (OIE, 1934), turning teaching into a resource for producing vigorous subjects for the factory, the army, or the family.

We thus witness the invention of the educator as both object and instrument of government. Training the educator entails transforming them into a technician of population management, an actor who acts in the name of the State. The challenge is to show how certain forms of knowledge construct discursive regimes in which objects and subjects are produced, controlled, and redistributed (Foucault, 1992). In sum, the purpose is to describe the governmental practices that define and attempt to impose rules for the formation, existence, and disappearance of the teacher as a singular modality of social discourse in Colombia—that is, to analyze teacher policy as a specific field of knowledge and power.

3. METHODOLOGY

The study process is developed from a qualitative approach with an interpretive orientation, based on documentary and critical analysis, since it is inspired by genealogical and archaeological perspectives for analyzing power and knowledge, as proposed by Foucault (1996) and Popkewitz and Brennan (2000). In this way, through archaeological analytics, the study describes the integration, dispersion, and articulation of teacher-policy authorship and discursive formations. This approach makes it possible to understand teaching not only as a formal practice, but as a set of situated experiences, discourses, and practices configured in relation to public, educational, and teacher policies. It does not seek to measure impacts or evaluate efficiency, but rather to analyze the discourses, conceptions, and practices that shape teaching, as well as the knowledge–power regimes that influence its production and its interpretation across different territorial contexts.

The study considered as units of analysis the incorporation of both normative frameworks and institutional discourses, academic production, and situated practices, in order to identify the tensions, forms of resistance, and adaptations that emerge in teaching as a historical and social practice. This makes it possible to recognize that teaching is not reducible to a set of regulated functions, but that it is configured through the interaction between public policies, pedagogical knowledge, and teachers' concrete experiences, all of which are traversed by regimes of knowledge and technologies of power. In coherence with the above, the exclusion criteria discard approaches centered on quantitative measurement, administrative efficiency, or decontextualized analysis, since such perspectives limit the understanding of the political and social processes that structure teaching activity. Thus, the research directs its analysis toward teaching as a socially and politically situated practice, whose regulation, meaning, and transformation can only be understood by articulating norm, discourse, and practice.

The methodology comprises the following phases:

o Information gathering: conducted through the archaeological analysis of policy archives and documents (recommendations, laws, decrees, programmes, minutes, resolutions, communications, among others).

o Exploratory phase: includes the identification of discursive orders, which make visible the relationships between policy and territory.

o Definition of the sample through purposive selection: involves defining the policy modalities, their properties and characteristics—that is, the policy series.
o Guiding themes: based on the exploratory phase and the definition of the purposively selected documentary sample, guiding themes are established and the conditions of existence, emergence, and possibility of policy themes are analyzed.
o Establishment of describable systems: an analysis is conducted of policy discourses, as well as the division and organization of guiding themes. Cross-analyses are then carried out between thematic series and series of thematized records. In other words, relationships emerging within fields of political discourse are established. The correlations made visible therein configure "describable systems, that is, sets of relationships in which discourses are not only articulated but also practiced in the territory" (Ríos et al., 2010, p. 9). In our case, this refers to the description of policies, understood as a problematization between teaching and territories.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Public Policy
What differences exist between public policies, educational policies, and teacher policies? Some authors define public policies as the symbiosis between political science and public administration emerging in the aftermath of World War II (Ball & Mainardes, 2011), or as an approach in which the social sciences are put into practice (Reis, 2003). In this view, public policy would be responsible for identifying, formulating, implementing, and evaluating the actions of the State, governments, or civil society in public affairs (Meny & Thoening, 1992).
Defining public policy as a measure of actions upon the public sphere from the mid-twentieth century onward involved the relationship between epistemic areas such as jurisprudence, administration, law, and sociology, which tended toward the constitution of a discipline of its own: the policy sciences. This discipline, argued for by European and North American academies, would redefine the social sciences through the re-elaboration of knowledge about the public sphere, demanded by the renewal of a historical context that required a different rationality to confront challenges such as the reordering processes imposed by urban-industrial life in post-war contexts (Ball & Mainardes, 2011).
In this way, the social sciences first shifted toward re-signifying action upon the public sphere. This meant moving from disciplinary areas proper to political science—strongly influenced by political and legal philosophy—toward a sociological approach that developed a discipline oriented to solving public problems through planning, multidisciplinarity, and the establishment of laws and norms according to social characteristics and values (Easton, 1968; Kingdon, 1984). Second, the policy sciences reconciled "two rationalities: scientific and academic knowledge with the empirical production carried out by governments" (Souza, 2007, p. 67). Third, authors such as Easton (1968, 1992), Allison (1971), Lindblom (1991), and Kingdon (1984) would represent the elaboration of three initial streams of public policy within a first period of public policy studies, or within a set of surfaces of emergence, instances of delimitation, and the delimitation of the policy sciences.
As a discipline concerned with governmental actions in the public sphere, Easton (1968) proposes analyzing actions as functional parts of social and political systems. He

denounces the failure of political science as a discipline in search of a universal reason for political facts. By contrast, the policy sciences would enable the study of government and its acts in society: "What might be called a science of pure politics is the result of a retreat in which there has hardly been any science applied to government, to a public application worthy of that name" (Easton, 1968, p. 36). It is as if the study of politics had no meaning unless it were through the application of State action to social life; as if public policies aimed at the "knowledge of certain social behaviors and values in which the State intervenes" (Easton, 1992, p. 9).

The policy sciences would form part of a discipline with "objects and political relations of human beings insofar as behaviors, methods such as systems analysis, and a specific method for analyzing behaviors" (Easton, 1968, p. 47). That is, as a discipline, public policy is the social science of behaviors regarding the public sphere implicit in the social and political system. For this, Easton defines instruments such as a body of regular propositions about political behavior, quantification, systematization, integration, and techniques that define the functions of those behaviors and the decisions and actions of public policy.

The policy sciences would be consolidated as a discipline within a context of public policy reorganization, through the definition of objects, concepts, propositions, rules, techniques, and instruments, under the condition of the type of behaviors related to public affairs. The deployment of this type of analysis/action within a system of behaviors is the movement that constitutes what is called the social sciences in practice, from the mid-twentieth century onward. Easton (1968) proposes a functional-systemic policy approach that balances the political system through the set of actions and political decisions involved in public affairs, so that the State and governments determine public actions.

Lindblom (1991), for his part, proposes the incremental approach, defined as the public policy process through which social goals and ends are achieved by relating alternatives to the means necessary to reach them. That is, public policies would not follow a systemic or rational sociological model of policy production, but rather a comparative perspective based on continuous and limited successions through which policies gradually change their decisions incrementally. In other words, they are established through a reduced diagnosis of existing policies; the history of decisions is evaluated in greater detail; information is gathered about successes and failures; and "policies are gradually adjusted, step by step, to society's goals and to the objectives of government" (Lindblom, 1991, p. 16).

Allison (1971) presents the rational approach, in which policy decisions are made on an economic basis related to identifying problems, alternatives, and the maximization of objectives, so that control is established between inputs (human, physical, and financial resources, etc.) and outputs (built infrastructure, children or young people enrolled in school, among others). Kingdon (1984) describes the public policy formulation process as composed of three policy processes: identification of public problems, construction of alternatives, and the political process, or power struggles to impose interests and implement them.

The policy sciences thus emerge as a discipline of planning the public sphere for the reorganization of social affairs through the formulation of behaviors, actions, comparisons of decisions, planning, identification, formulation, implementation, and evaluation of political acts upon society. Public policies, whether as streams or

approaches within the social sciences focused on public actions, or as social sciences brought into practice, demonstrate a highly specific applicability in the definition and analysis of each action upon the public sphere.

Another approach to analyzing public policy is that proposed by Fairclough and Fairclough (2012), who develop the political analysis of discourse. This approach involves describing forms of argumentation as a mode of action used by agents or actors in the production of policies, as a decision-making space for constructing a given policy: "We orient political discourse analysis to the claim that political discourse is fundamentally argumentative and primarily involves practical argumentation; political discourse analysis could focus on the analysis of practical argumentation" (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012, p. 2).

Political discourse analysis is thus proposed from the practical modalities of argumentation, that is, from deliberation as the producer of particular policies. To this end, they propose a theoretical framework constituted by the structure and forms of argumentation, and a methodology based on the analysis of argumentative practices. This would correspond to the analysis of political/argumentative discourse within the genre of policy documents, interviews, and publications across different media involved in the processes of producing a given policy.

For Fairclough and Fairclough, deliberation is the field of policy production. In that field, the authors describe: "Conducting a set of values, objectives, and interests over things or persons" (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012, p. 11). To demonstrate this, they begin from the Aristotelian ethical basis that deliberation is nothing more than the political result produced between decision and action (Aristotle, Book III, 1112a), in which political narratives are constituted through instances, actors, or agents that generate certain types of responses and effects, interpretations, and representations, where deliberation is the result or product of public policies developed through the deliberation of discourses.

The political discourse analysis proposed by the authors—argumentation/deliberation as analysis of the set of practical reasons of politics and deliberations, would be related to classes of argumentative genres of discourse, whether epistemic, political, communicational, among others (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012), which make use of narrative, prescriptive, descriptive, or explanatory strategies. The study argues that a model of political discourse analysis should consider, first, a problematic domain composed of circumstances, objectives, and values, subjected to deliberation and to the argumentative and counter-argumentative practices of subjects—ultimate agents who are themselves the product of discourses and deliberative practices. Second, this deliberative process of discourse provides both the policy process and the set of political analyses and facts traced by the authors through three pathways: political discourses of domination, manipulation, and ideologies. More than a political discourse analysis, the authors propose a rhetorical analysis model.

A methodology for teacher policies is not in line with linguistic analysis or language analysis; it is not limited to lexical analysis, nor is it merely linguistic or rhetorical. Teacher policies seek to exceed these domains in order to describe how the formation of concepts and discourses is linked to an obsession with ordering concepts and objects into forms of discourse; how constructing strategies to privilege certain forms of knowledge over others is related to describing concealments, silences, impositions, and resistances through which particular forms of order are organized, forms we defend or oppose due to their character of uncertainty, difference, multiplicity, or verisimilitude.

In this sense, teacher policies will analyze "discourses as a series of elements operating within a general mechanism of power, as a series of political events through which power is linked and oriented" (Foucault, 2010, p. 254). It is, therefore, about modalities of government that construct forms of teaching and attempt to guide it, and to incite it to guide a particular model of society.

4.2 Educational Policy

Teacher policies differ from educational policies insofar as the latter are understood as "government action programs, structured around values and ideas, directed at school publics, and implemented by the administration and by education professionals" (Van Zanten, 2011, p. 640). From this, it can be inferred that governmental actions upon subjects and contexts represent a determinism of educational actions and their actors, by the mere fact of being constituted as governmental policies, in which the following indeed occurs:

"Recompositions between the local level and political and administrative units, as well as according to establishments, and with a predominance of justification rather than true hybridization […] but it produces numerous perverse effects from the point of view of the effectiveness of the educational system" (Van Zanten, 2011, p. 645).

Teacher policies question the protagonism of the State as a linear and dominant instance of educational policy. They also question the "perverse effects" produced when government policies are not fulfilled within educational systems, and, even more, whether they are fulfilled in school settings. On the contrary, teacher policies will show that, to a large extent, plans, programs, projects, among others, prove to be failures (Grinberg, 2008).

In relation to approaches for analyzing educational policies whose argument is grounded in the elaboration of policy from texts and discourses, from contexts and processes, teacher policies respond that they do not merely comprise the analysis of political events through the determination of the space and time in which policies are produced as an analytic of public policy-making, as proposed by S. Ball (1995; 2006; 2011).

The policy analysis proposed by Ball "policies as text and policies as discourse" (Ball & Bowe, 1998; Ball, 1995, 2006; Ball & Mainardes, 2011), constitutes the performativity of political events, or the production of policy, as the analysis of texts and discourses as singular events. These unfold through cycles of policy production under contexts of influence, text production, practice, and strategy, through scenarios in which they occur and are offered to political analysis (Ball & Mainardes, 2011).

Policies as text would be the set of political practices constituted by actions and political facts expressed in agendas and in the different legislative procedures as they move through different contexts, processes, and political arenas for the formulation of a given policy (Ball, 1995; Ball & Mainardes, 2011). For example, the process that runs from contexts of influence, under which political initiatives are subjected to parliamentary formulation processes in legislative and executive instances, up to the acts developed in the different pathways of policy implementation among certain interest groups: "Text policy comprises the product of compromises in several specific phases: an initial one of influence in the formulation of legislative micro-politics, in parliamentary processes, and in the policies and micro-policies of articulation with interest groups" (Ball, 2006, p. 44). Text policies therefore represent the facts and actions recorded in the processes, contexts, and arenas of educational policy production, what Ball refers to as policy facts and events. Policies as discourse are defined as the production of policy as objectified

and executable; when implemented according to certain strategies of power, they constitute a political practice applicable in the manner of true knowledge: "We need to appreciate the ways in which policies narrate, collect, and assemble exercises of power through the production of 'truth' and 'knowledge' as discourse" (Ball, 2006, p. 48). Such policies as discourse are expressed in the formulation of laws and norms, which would encompass the meaning of discourse, its truth and knowledge, along with strategies of selection, classification, analysis, and description of facts and texts that would express forms of analysis and categorization of a political exteriority upon which interpretation and meaning are conferred.

Ball therefore proposes a political analysis perspective defined by cycles in which facts, texts, discourses, and practices shape processes of policy production as truthful discourse. This means that discursive events and practices move through cycles and contexts of policy production; that is, policy analysis consists of interpreting actions, situations, conditions, means, norms, and ideologies configured through contexts of influence, text, actions and acts, contexts of practice, effects, and strategies, as discourses (Ball, 2006).

Actions, events, and processes correspond, therefore, to policies as text, to facts, according to Ball. Policy analysis of those facts, their formulation, obeys policies as discourse, which would be what grants meaning to policy analysis insofar as they constitute "first-order theorisations" (Ball & Mainardes, 2011, p. 69). This is nothing more than establishing a direct relationship between policy cycles and the expected construction of social orders of justice, equity, legitimacy, participation, etc. In his policy cycle analysis proposal, Ball puts forward a critical social analysis of political facts and texts, and their movement through cycles of policy formation, proposing them as social "discourse" policies.

If approached from space and time understood as texts, contexts, processes, and discourses, Ball does not develop a discourse analytic, but rather proposes a policy analysis based on a critical approach to the formation of knowledge inspired by Kant (2006). This consists of elaborating a reasoned critique of phenomena that occur in a given space and time, which would correspond to "policies as texts", that is, what appears in the fields of perception and sensibility, in a defined and measurable space and time. In Ball's political analysis, these are the facts, phases, and contexts of policy: his analysis of policy as text. Then, "policy as discourse," constituted by the analysis of political phenomena occurring in particular processes, is treated as noumenon, as what is thought and named, as policy discourse.

Inspired by a Kantian critique, Ball seeks to determine the indeterminable: that educational policies would be produced under spaces and times, in texts, scenarios, and cycles that would determine both political facts and their analysis, both the facts called text policies and the political analyses called discourses (Ball, 2006). Ball's political analysis is one of spaces and processes, which corresponds to Kant's thesis that knowledge is produced through the critique of reason about what occurs in the space/time of sensibility. For us, what remains missing is a discourse analytic, and even more, an analysis of educational political practices.

For a teacher policy methodology, political discourse analysis does not correspond to the movement of enunciative events through the binary analysis model between space and time, cycle and context, text and discourse, horizontality and circularity, in which one would move "from phenomenon to noumenon." Nor does a teacher policy methodology

correspond to the establishment of direct relations between texts, contexts, and discourses. Even less does it correspond to the process in which "data as information are elaborated about a reality through a conceptual process" (Flores, 1994, p. 16), as if complex political relations represented the interpretation of a direct relation between signified and signifier; as if the challenge were the deciphering of a positivity resting between "informational content, records on physical supports, expressions in forms of language, and elaborations from reality" (Flores, 1994, p. 26).

Or as if political data and events were the result of processes of organizing and classifying information; or as if textual categorizations could make documents have direct meanings and analyses with documentary contents, with discourses and practices. Or as if the relationship between text, discourse, and events replaced the linguistic relation between signified and signifier; as if, for political discourse analysis, there existed a relation that allowed one to move "from the utterance to the utterable through interpretation" (Aquino & Mutti, 2006, p. 681).

Let us say that taking texts and deducing contexts, spaces, and inferring times, meanings, and concluding signifiers, discourses, and discovering social forms, is part of a type of analysis which, under a certain critical social approach to discourse, establishes relations between facts and the meaning of interpretation between "the linguistic and the social and the historical, in which language is not only a linguistic form but also a material form of ideology. Beyond this, it is in the contact between the historical and the linguistic that the specific materiality of discourse is constituted" (Pêcheux, 2002).

Teacher policies do not deploy their analytic instruments as a direct relationship between texts, contexts, and discursive meanings, as if there were a relation between words and things, between utterances and discursive meanings; as if "in the contact between the historical and the linguistic, the specific materiality of discourse were constituted" (Aquino & Mutti, 2006, p. 680). In this regard, we ask: what is the place of the practices of the knowledges to be transmitted, and of the modalities and behaviors through which they are carried out in school? What strategic struggles are developed to obtain certain domains, and what is the result upon different forms of subjectivation?

Whether as texts or as discourses, political facts and events do not obey a direct relation between materialities and their contexts. The methodology proposed by teacher policy does not refer to the problem of finding a correspondence between space and time, between fact and discourse. It is not a grammatical problem, nor does it seek to carry out policy analysis on a linguistic basis founded on the relation between signified and signifier.

This interpretive strand is also raised by Charaudeau and Maingueneau (2008), from a discourse analysis perspective that assigns meaning to the grammatical unit within the linguistic ordering of sentence composition—that is, by defining discourse analysis through a grammatical relation between the utterance and its place in the sentence.

4.3 Teacher Policy

With regard to the production of educational policies concerning teachers, Vaillant states, in relation to Latin America: "the State is not only the main employer of teachers, but it is also the one that has the authority to set the rules of the game and working conditions" (Vaillant & Rossel, 2006, p. 19). Teacher policies are not interested in engaging in an analysis in which government actions are understood as the superior institution of decisions, executive actions, and administrative actions within a state system; nor do they

grant the State excessive importance in the domain of teaching practices. Governments may attempt to do so, but social results show that they do not dominate with such solvency or horizontality, and in multiple examples it is shown that their reforms are a failure (Grinberg, 2008).

Teacher policies may acknowledge the transition between forms of analysis/action/intervention of public policies regarding the delimitation of social actions, and they may also recognize the concrete contributions of different approaches to public policy analysis, forms of knowledge, in defining their contexts and processes as boundaries for the application of certain systemic, incremental, or rational positivities, in relation to public problems conceived as objective, tangible, and easily identifiable realities in public action (Easton, 1968; Lindblom, 1991; Kingdon, 1984).

However, teacher policies are interested in how these public and educational epistemic currents are constituted; how they obey the construction of different social regimes of truth and particular political technologies of government; and how, in specific spaces and historical periods, specific practices of teaching in Colombia are formed, exist, and disappear. Likewise, they are interested in how these practices shape and are shaped by particular knowledges and powers: formations, disjunctions, dispersions, modifications, or dissolutions of teaching.

Teacher policies do not refer to conceptions of public policy analysis from systemic, functionalist, and/or pragmatic tendencies. They recognize the contributions that policy sciences have made to the history of political analysis, as a mobilization of European and North American social sciences toward the establishment of concrete alternatives for public policies aimed at reorganizing the public and the social in a postwar period.

Teacher policies constitute another interpretive place for teacher-related political events, not necessarily corresponding to approaches of analysis that explain them through analyses of time, space, and events as analyses of texts and discourses (Ball & Mainardes, 2011), nor through diagnosis, formulation, implementation, and evaluation as an analytic of the actions and events of incremental policy (Easton, 1968; Lindblom, 1991; Kingdon, 1984). That is, they do not obey a pragmatics of effectiveness nor a neo-functionalism. They also differ from the analysis of political actions as an inference within space and time of the causality of actions upon the public, as the determination of the set of political events and occurrences in agendas, cycles, or policy processes (Lindblom, 1991; Kingdon, 1984).

Teacher policies are responsible for describing the conditions of existence, dispersion, disjunction, and modification of teaching practices and experiences in societies across specific historical discontinuities. They must analyze the formation of forms of teaching on the basis of the relationship between knowledges, behaviors, instances, and subjects that form them and through which they are formed—those social subjects who attempt to determine and formalize teaching as a political practice. In this sense, "it would be fitting to make the effort to analyze public policies as political practices" (Reis, 2003, p. 13).

Likewise, they recognize the development of critical, social, and economic studies produced in Ibero-America, which define, through the categories of vocation–teaching–occupation; profession–education–educator; professional–learning–manager, some of the main foci for analyzing teaching activities (Tenti, 2006, 2007, 2008; Tardif, 2012; Nóvoa, 2009, 2014; Fernández, 1991, 1998; Peñuela et al., 2008). These appear to be part

of the set of categories through which a particular version of teaching has been constructed in the region.

Teacher policies do not refer to a political administration of teachers that would have to do with technical factors applied to cost–benefit, cost–efficiency, cost–effectiveness analyses, or the elaboration of social indicators, that is, analyses conducted from sovereign positions. Instead, they seek to analyze how these administrative, economic, sociological disciplines, among others, attempt to shape regimes of knowledge and government over teaching, and how modalities and political teaching practices are produced.

Nor do they consider as the ultimate purpose of public policies the social implementation of ideals of justice and equity, typical of certain shared foundations and assumptions, with their respective differences, both in critical theory and among neo-functionalists. Not because teacher policies exclude them, but because among their objectives is to show how these others are part of conditions of existence that contribute to shaping them, through historical and social processes specific to relations of knowledge transmission and modalities of governing conduct through instances, subjects, discourses, experiences, and practices.

If teacher policies are the set of relations between the social knowledges to be transmitted, and if they are the set of behaviors that a society, in a given period and historical situation, privileges in its attempt to form and constitute an ideal type of social subject, the present text is not oriented only toward what is formulated by public policies or educational policies. It therefore refers to the set of experiences and practices of teaching in the everyday unfolding of school life, understanding by practices and experiences those that differ from what is formalized by public and educational policies, curricular guidelines, programs, and projects. These practices may be constituted by the set of rarities manifested in the daily life of classrooms and beyond them, in which transmission and the formation of social subjects, rather than dispersing into social formulations, undergo disjunction and dilution in the school space. That is, teacher policies will have as their task the interpretation and description of the singularities carried out in territories by subjects, collectives, communities, and social actors.

The work of teacher policies will be to investigate teaching as an experience of multiplicity, located at the limits of the outside of formulated policies. It must locate situated practices on the ground of the classroom and beyond it. It will pay attention to the interpretation of those practices that resist the formulations that attempt to dominate school and extra-school everyday life, and in which exercised knowledges resist and create from chaos, insurrections, which, when attempting to implement their exteriorizations, disperse, become disjunctive, or are modified.

Teacher policies will understand that school everyday life unfolds under urgencies, and that it is exercised by each school subject under prior learnings and socio-economic, affective, violent, or even market-driven anxieties that are not properly school-based. In such conditions, each subject makes of teaching, the action of pedagogy and education, a singular medium of subjectivation: sometimes for self-realization, at other times for distancing, for shaping their territory, for expressing a claim, a resistance, or the construction of lines of flight of subjectivities according to the differentiating conditions of place, situation, or social context, and the emergence of subjectivities and/or singularities.

Teacher policies will ask about the conditions of subjects, about the situations of the communities in which they act, about dispersions, disjunctions, and lived experiences of school life, as well as about local, regional, national, and international contexts that condition their situated action in the territory. In this sense, we ask: could the excess of public and educational policies, of formulations, methods, and procedures, upon teaching be an excessive demonstration of what communities themselves produce in their territories? And if so: would an epistemological development of teacher policies not be pertinent?

If teaching approaches the multiple and indeterminate set of experiences and practices, as a set of experiences that obey production carried out by subjects in situations, contexts, and territories that condition them, in modalities of resistance, but also of creation, then would it not be this set of relations that rethinks what is said and formulated in school by public policies, educational policies, instances and their norms, and the entire juridical grid that attempts to define the conducts and behaviors of teaching, and what is socially established about it?

We thus see that a simple bundle of concerns should lead to rethinking any study on the formation, permanence, and historical and social dispersion of teaching, as action and diaspora of the transmission of certain social practices. These would surpass the school instance, subjects, and the knowledges of education and pedagogy, not only because of the crisis of education, nor because of digital education catalyzed by the pandemic, nor because of youth demands claiming the fulfilment of basic educational rights, nor because of the marketing arsenal of educational goods offered by the most diverse social institutions, national and international, private and public, which do not cease to offer formulations, recommendations, and responses that insist on orienting teaching as a market good.

Teaching will therefore be, up to this point, what communities in their territories already exercise; and for those who interrogate it, it will be what has not yet been said about it.

Perhaps what has not been said about it corresponds, among other things, to polysemic and multi-practical categories, since it turns the transmission of knowledges and the modalities of social conduction of subjects into axes and objectives of government. And it is precisely there, in territories, where teaching events constitute, through teaching practice, differentiations, subjectivities, and singularities, what becomes the object of teacher policy.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Analyzing and describing, in policy terms, teaching and territories, as a problematization of public policy, educational policy, or teacher policy, has implied establishing, as a current pivotal point, the territories themselves. This means that public, educational, and teacher policies must be rethought through territorial perspectives such as gender, sexuality, ethnicity, religiosity, vulnerability, violence, poverty, exclusion, inequality, among other forms of territorial conditions that gravitate between the personal and the collective.

Territories, understood as public, educational, and teacher policy that revolves around difference, are approached here without any interest or pretension on the part of policies to appropriate the subject and to constitute plans, programs, and projects through socially determined agendas imposed upon the territory. Rather, it goes beyond not only

a policy, and not only the construction of a social right: teaching and territory go beyond policy as the government of others, particularly in what concerns policies of domination over a given territory.

Second, this approach is not interested in the machinery of public and educational policies that, in the name of inclusion, differential approaches, flexible curricula, rural education, indigenous education, intercultural education, education for persons with disabilities, among others, reproduce certain social plans, programs, and projects in the name of diversity.

Third, a problematizing relationship between teaching and territories must descend into the pores—and why not, into the subsoil—of experience as it is, in order to understand how it functions in thought and action, and to discover what is orthodox and differential, moral and ethical, in the daily production of territorialities. That is, instead of being rooted in the old tensions of "everything for everyone," it should instead produce a territorial teaching for each territory in particular. In sum, by territories we understand a multiple focus of singular domination of differences. Thus, our task—if not the fundamental one—will be to liberate subjects and collectives from their strongest relations: to free themselves from the social wrappings—public policies—that prevent them from being and discovering what the territory truly is, through the unveiling of what it seeks to recognize for itself with passion and febrile mobilization; through the will and capacities it possesses and must enhance; through the construction of a singularity and/or territorial difference in the common world and with the territory itself. Perhaps the contemporary challenge, when it comes to rethinking teaching and territories, education and pedagogy, is that, by inhabiting chaos and multiplicity, one rescues from there the objects of those monstrous experiences, the subjects and ethical and aesthetic subjectivities, in order to bring them closer to the frontiers of education as ways of potentiating the boiling up of differences in subjects, collectives, and territories. At least with respect to life as lived in territories, it is not a matter of the unity of the subject, nor of communities, nor of the construction of our own subjective modeling, nor of common practices. It is no longer a matter of being objects or subjects; it is a matter of becoming multiple events. It is a matter of difference and multiplicity—that is, of understanding territory as the diaspora of differences.

It is not, therefore, about establishing models of transcendent subjects in their religion and morality, nor universal in their social form and function, nor outside the common so that they may affirm themselves. It will not be enough to step outside consumption and the market. Perhaps it is not about public policies, nor educational policies. It is now about life, the living being, creation in the nakedness of its territorial potency (Foucault, 2007; Agamben, 1996). It is about the multitude (Hardt & Negri, 2004), about other logics of meaning and difference (Deleuze, 2012) that go beyond the practices of being a subject, subjectivity, or singularity. It is about the unparalleled set of differences: producing experiences without object or subject. It is about territories of forms and relations with oneself and others based on difference.

The differences of territories are the staging of creative teaching machines that update forms and modes, knowledges, instances, norms, subjects, and subjectivities, around the questioning of relations with the real, as the production of multiplicity and differentiation. That is, creative analytics of territorial experiences as tools for asking, for ceasing to be what we are from identity and place; for inquiring into the network of situations in which they are found: communities, streets, countryside, neighborhoods, and the local and

regional contexts that condition them to create themselves in living, and to make that creation their territorial way of life and teaching practice in exercise.

Referencias

1. Allison, G. (1971). *Essence of decision: explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis.* Harper Collins Publishers.

2. Aquino, R. y Mutti, R. (2006). Pesquisa qualitativa: análise de discurso versus análise de conteúdo. *Rev. Texto Contexto, 4*(15), 679-84. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/26476055_Pesquisa_qualitativa_analise_de_discurso_versus_analise_de_conteudo

3. Aristóteles. (2005). *Ética a Nicómaco.* Alianza.

4. Avalos, B. (2011). *El desarrollo profesional de los docentes: Proyectando desde el presente al futuro.* Ginebra, Suiza: UNESCO. https://www.schwartzman.org.br/simon/delphi/pdf/avalos.pdf

5. Ball, S. J. (2006). Education policy and social class. The selected works of Sthephen J. Ball. Ed. Routledge.

6. Ball, S. y Mainardes, J. (2011). *Políticas educacionais: questões e dilemas.* Ed. Cortez. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272859180_BALL_Stephen_J_MAINARDES_Jefferson_orgs_Politicas_Educacionais_questoes_e_dilemas

7. Ball, S.J. y Bowe, R. (1995). El curriculum nacional y su "puesta en prácticas": el papel de los departamentos de materias o asignaturas. *Revista de Estudios del Currículum, 1*(2), 105-131.

8. Bedoya, M. (2018). *La gestión de sí mismo. Ética y subjetivación en el neoliberalismo.* Universidad de Antioquia. https://www.udea.edu.co/wps/wcm/connect/udea/cc96bd5c-2ff3-40a9-8c2e-1b7c6339a598/La+gesti%C3%B3n+de+s%C3%AD+mismo.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CVID=maNHqA.

9. Blondeau, O., Dyer-Witheford, N., Vercellone, C., Kyrou, A., Corsani, A., Rullani, E., Moulier-Boutang, Y., y Lazzarato, M. (2004). *Capitalismo cognitivo, propiedad intelectual y creación colectiva.* Traficantes de Sueños. https://radioslibres.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/libreteca-varios-capitalismo-cognitivo-propiedad-intelectual-creacion-colectiva.pdf

10. Bocanegra, H. (2010). Las políticas educativas y el magisterio colombiano en la década de los 80. Rev. Diálogos de saberes, Bogotá D.C. Colombia, Universidad Libre, n. 32, p.29-44, enero-junio 2010.

11. Castro, J. (2007). *Maestro: Condición social y profesión docente en Colombia. 1991 – 2002.* Ed. Universidad Pedagógica Nacional. https://www.albertomartinezboom.com/escritos/prologos/2007_Maestro_Condicion_social_y_profesion_docente_en_Colombia.pdf

12. Castro, J. et al. (2005). De la profesión a la función docente: Una mirada a la formación de los maestros desde los estatutos 2277 de 1979 y 1278 de 2002. Cuadernos de Psicopedagogía, Bogotá, n. 5, 2005.

13. Charaudeau, P. y Maingueneau, D. (2008). *Dicionário de análise do discurso.* Ed. Contexto.

14. Coral, L. (1980). *Historia del Movimiento Sindical del Magisterio.* E. Suramericana.

15. Cox, C., Beca, C.E., y Cerri, M. (2011). *Nueva agenda de políticas docentes en América Latina y el Caribe: Nudos críticos y criterios de acción.* Encuentro Preparatorio Regional 2011,

Revisión Ministerial Anual (RMA), Consejo Económico y Social de las Naciones Unidas (ECOSOC), OREALC/UNESCO.
http://www.ub.edu/obipd/docs/nueva_agenda_en_politicas_docentes.pdf

16. Cuenca, R. (2015). *Las carreras docentes en América Latina: La acción meritocrática para el desarrollo profesional* (Proyecto Estratégico Regional sobre Docentes). OREALC/UNESCO y CEPPE, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile.
https://ceppe.uc.cl/images/contenido/publicaciones/proyecto-estrategico-regional/2015/Carreras_docentes.pdf

17. Deleuze, G. (2012). *Diferencia y repetición*. Ed. Amorrortu.

18. Durkheim, É. (1999). *Educación y sociología*. Ediciones Altaya, S.A.

19. Easton, D. (1968). *Política Moderna: un estudio sobre la situación de la ciencia política*. Ed. Letras.

20. Easton, D.. (1992). *Esquema para el análisis político*. Ed. Amorrouto.

21. Fairclough, N. (2001). *Discurso e mudança social*. UNB.

22. Fairclough, I. y Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political Discourse Analysis. London: Ed. Routledge.*

23. Fecode. (1982). *XII Congreso nacional de educadores*. Conclusiones. Bogotá.
https://fecode.edu.co/images/CEID-2025/1_MOVIMIENTOPEDAGOGICO1982_AFXII.pdf

24. Fernández, M. (1991). A ambiguidade da docência: Entre o profissionalismo e a "proletarização". *Teoria e Educação*, (4), 41–61.

25. Fernández, M. (1998). *La cara oculta de la escuela: Educación y trabajo en el capitalismo*. Siglo XXI Editores.

26. Foucault, M. (2006). *Seguridad, territorio, población: curso en el Collège de France (1977-1978)*. Ed. FCE. https://www.uv.mx/tipmal/files/2016/10/M-foucault-seguridad-territorio-poblacion.pdf

27. Foucault, M. (1992). El orden del discurso. Buenos Aires: Ed. Letra E.

28. Foucault, M. (1996). La verdad y las formas jurídicas. Ed. Gedisa.
http://www.hechohistorico.com.ar/archivos/Foucautl%20-%20La%20verdad%20y%20las%20formas%20jur%C3%ADdicas.pdf

29. Foucault, M. (1997). La arqueología del saber. México: Siglo XXI

30. Foucault, M. (2010). *A ordem do discurso*. Ed. Loyola.
https://revistas.pucsp.br/index.php/verbum/article/view/65378

31. Flores, J. (1994). *Análisis de datos cualitativos. Aplicaciones a la investigación educativa*. Ed. PPU.

32. Frigotto, G. (1984). A Produtividade da Escola Improdutiva. Ed. Cortez.
https://konektacommerce.nyc3.cdn.digitaloceanspaces.com/TEXT_SAMPLE_CONTENT/produtividade-da-escola-improdutiva-a-89230-1.pdf

33. Fundación Compartir. (2014). Tras la excelencia docente. Cómo mejorar la calidad de la educación para todos los colombianos. Ed. Punto aparte.
https://rutamaestra.santillana.com.co/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Tras-la-excelencia-docente-%C2%BFc%C3%B3mo-mejorar-la-calidad-de-la-educaci%C3%B3n-para-todos-los-colombianos.pdf

34. Fundación Varkey. (2022). *Global teacher prize*.
https://www.globalteacherprize.org/es

35. González, C. (2024). La La tarea docente de transmitir. Panorama crítico del primer cuarto del siglo XXI. *Cuadernos Universitarios*, *17*(17), 91-102.
https://doi.org/10.53794/cu.v17i17.635

36. Grinberg, G. (2008). *Educación y poder en el siglo XXI. Gubernamentalidad y pedagogía en las sociedades del gerenciamiento*. Ed. Pedro Miño.

37. Hardt, M. y Negri, A. (2004). *Multitud. Guerra y democracia em la era del imperio*. Ed. Debate

38. Ibarra, O. A. (2010). *Ser de maestro en Colombia: de oficio a profesión. Perspectiva histórica, social y pedagógica de las transformaciones de la actividad educadora en nuestro país*. Universidad Pedagógica Nacional de Colombia. https://ulibros.com/ser-de-maestro-en-colombia-de-oficio-a-profesion-perspectiva-historica-social-y-pedagogica-de-las-transformaciones-de-la-actividad-educadora-en-nuestro-pais-mtto9.html

39. Jiménez, E. y Estrada, G. (1993), *Magisterio Antioqueño 1900-1980. Procesos de organización, luchas, pedagogía política vida cotidiana*. Litoarte Ltda

40. Kingdon, J. (1984). *Agendas, alternatives and public policies*. Ed. Library of Congress.

41. Le Bot, I. (1985). *Educación e ideología en Colombia*. La Carreta.

42. Lindblom, Ch. (1991). *El proceso de elaboración de políticas*. Ed. Porrúa.

43. Mahatma Gandhi Institute of Education for Peace and Sustainable Development. (2022). *Reimaginando la educación: La evaluación internacional de educación basada en ciencia y evidencia* (MGIEP/2022/PI/2). UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000380986_spa

44. Marx, K. (2002). *El Capital, Libro I*. Ed. Online-Porrúa. https://www.marxists.org/espanol/m-e/capital/karl-marx-el-capital-tomo-i-editorial-progreso.pdf

45. Marx, K. y Engels, F. (1848). *El Manifiesto Comunista*. Ed. Online-Porrúa. https://sociologia1unpsjb.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2008/03/marx-manifiesto-comunista.pdf

46. Meny, A. y Thoening, J. (1992). *Las políticas públicas*. Editorial Ariel S. A. https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/403/40354944011.pdf

47. Murillo, M. V., (2001). Una aproximación al estudio del sindicalismo magisterial en América Latina. *Estudios Sociológicos, XIX*(1), 129-160. https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/598/59855106.pdf

48. Nóvoa, A. (2009). *Professores: Imagens do futuro presente*. Ed. Educa. https://rosaurasoligo.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/antc3b3nio-nc3b3voa-professores-imagens-do-futuro-presente.pdf

49. OIE. Oficina Internacional de la Educación. (1934). *Recomendación N°. 3. Sobre las economías en materia de instrucción pública*. París.

50. Palamidessi, M. (2003). *Sindicatos docentes y gobiernos: Conflictos y diálogos en torno a la reforma educativa* (Serie Documentos No. 28). Santiago de Chile: Programa de Promoción de la Reforma Educativa en América Latina y el Caribe (PREAL). http://www.ub.edu/obipd/docs/sindicatos_docentes_y_gobiernos.palamidessim.pdf

51. Parra, R. (1997). *Los maestros colombianos*. Ed. Plaza y Janés.

52. Pêcheux, M. (2002). O *Discurso: estrutura ou acontecimento*. Campinas (SP), Pontes. http://muriloaraujo.pbworks.com/w/file/fetch/53730830/Pecheux_O-Discurso.pdf

53. Peñuela, D.. (2008). La cuestión docente: Colombia, los estatutos docentes. Buenos Aires: Ed. Fund. Laboratorio de Políticas Públicas Flape. 1ª Ed, E-Book. https://www.academia.edu/32281409/La_cuesti%C3%B3n_educativa_en_Colombia_Reforma_educativa_funci%C3%B3n_docente_y_salud_laboral_pdf

54. Popkewitz, T.S. (1995). Profissionalização e formação de professores: Algumas notas sobre sua história, ideologia e potencial. En A. Nóvoa (Coord.), *Os professores e sua formação* (pp. 35–50). Lisboa, Portugal: Publicações Dom Quixote.

55. Popkewitz, T.S., y Brennan, M. (Comps.). (2000). *El desafío de Foucault: Discurso, conocimiento y poder en la educación*. Pomares-Corredor.

56. Pulido, O. (2005). Formación de maestros, profesión y trabajo docente. En S. D. Baquero Reyes & Foro Latinoamericano de Políticas Educativas (FLAPE) (Comps.), *Formación de maestros, profesión y trabajo docente*. Universidad Pedagógica Nacional.

57. Reis, E.P. (2003). Reflexões leigas para a formulação de uma agenda de pesquisa em políticas públicas. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, 18(51), 11–24. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-69092003000100002

58. Ríos, R. (2010). *Pedagogía, saber y ciencias*. Bogotá, Colombia: Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Facultad de Ciencias Humanas, Centro de Estudios Sociales (CES).

59. Rodríguez, R. (2009). *El maestro en Colombia. Hitos, avatares y paradojas*. Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas.

60. Souza, C. (2007). Estado da arte da pesquisa em políticas públicas. En G. Hochman, M. Arretche, & E. Marques (Orgs.), *Políticas públicas no Brasil* (pp. 65–86). Rio de Fiocruz. https://es.scribd.com/document/409597224/Estado-Da-Arte-Da-Pesquisa-Em-Politicas-Publicas

61. Tardiff, M. (2012). *El oficio docente en la actualidad. Perspectivas internacionales y desafíos de futuro*. Seminario internacional. Políticas docentes. Formación, regulaciones y desarrollo profesional. Buenos Aires: UNESCO/IIEPI.

62. Tello, C. (2011). Epistemologías de la política educativa y justicia social en América Latina. *Nómadas. Revista Crítica de Ciencias Sociales y Jurídicas*, Número especial: América Latina. https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=5412512

63. Tello, C. (Coord.). (2013). *Las epistemologías de la política educativa: Posicionamientos, perspectivas y enfoques*. Campinas, SP: Mercado de Letras. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Cesar-Tello/publication/357690055_Epistemologias_de_la_politica_educativa_posicionamie ntos_perspectivas_y_enfoques/links/61db6ea3e669ee0f5c98f8e9/Epistemologias-de-la-politica-educativa-posicionamientos-perspectivas-y-enfoques.pdf

64. Tenti, E. (Comp.). (2006). *El oficio de docente: vocación, trabajo y profesión en el siglo XXI*. Ed. Siglo XXI. https://repositorio.minedu.gob.pe/bitstream/handle/20.500.12799/4895/El%20oficio %20docente%20vocaci%C3%B3n%2C%20trabajo%20y%20profesi%C3%B3n%20en %20el%20siglo%20XXI.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

65. Tenti, E. (2007). *La condición docente: análisis comparado de la Argentina, Brasil, Perú y Uruguay*. Ed. Siglo XXI. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000144319

66. Tenti, E. (2008). *Sociología de la profesionalización docente. Seminario Internacional: Profesionalizar a los profesores sin formación inicial: puntos de referencia para actuar*. IIPE/UNESCO.

67. Torres, R.M. (2000). De agentes de la reforma a sujetos del cambio: La encrucijada docente en América Latina. *Perspectivas: Revista Trimestral de Educación Comparada*, 30(2), 255–273. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000123231_spa

68. Unesco. (2011). Primer Estado del Arte sobre Políticas Docentes en América Latina y el Caribe. Colombia. Santiago de Chile.

69. UNESCO. (2013). *Antecedentes y criterios para la elaboración de políticas docentes en América Latina y el Caribe*. UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000223249
70. UNESCO. (2015). *Replantear la educación: ¿Hacia un bien común mundial?* UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000232697
71. Vaillant, D. (2004). *La construcción de la profesión docente en América Latina: Tendencias, temas y debates*. Programa de Promoción de la Reforma Educativa en América Latina y el Caribe (PREAL).
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/289505533_Construccion_de_la_profesion _docente_en_America_Latina_tendencias_temas_y_debates
72. Vaillant, D. y Rossel, C. (2006). Maestros de escuelas básicas en América Latina: hacia una radiografía de la profesión. Santiago de Chile, PREAL.
73. Van Zanten, Á. (2011). *Dicionário de Educação*. Petrópolis Ed. Vozes.
74. Vásquez, L. (2015). *Políticas docentes o de las tecnologías de formación, existencia y desaparición del maestro en Colombia* [Tesis doctoral, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais]. Belo Horizonte, Brasil. https://repositorio.ufmg.br/items/78aaa914-7184-4d01-b8fc-d8baeb3726db
75. Vásquez, (2015b). La docencia como práctica política en Colombia: Más que formación, carrera y remuneración, más que enseñar, educar aprender. *Rev. Olhar de professor, Ponta Grossa, Brasil, 18*(2), 162-183.
https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/684/68459084002.pdf
76. Vásquez, L. (2016). Políticas docentes en Colombia: El maestro de escuela como sujeto de gobierno social. *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, (70).
77. https://revistas.upn.edu.co/index.php/RCE/article/view/3771
78. Vásquez, L. (2018). La docencia: Técnica del decir verdad social para la producción y modificación de los sujetos. *Artes La Revista*, *17*(24) .
https://revistas.udea.edu.co/index.php/artesudea/article/view/340448
79. Vásquez, L., & Ochoa, A. (2022). De la educación religiosa y la educación laica en Colombia: Normatividades y políticas (1930–2020). *Revista Colombiana de Sociología*, *45*(1), 125–146. http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/rcs/v45n1/0120-159X-rcs-45-01-125.pdf
80. Viegas, J., Neves, M., y Serradas, R. (2011). Reseña de "Associativismo e sindicalismo em educação. Organização e lutas." de Dal Rosso, S. (org.). *Revista Lusófona de Educação,* (18), 195-197. https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=34922201013