

## The Subject Educated in Colombia: Governing Secondary School Education And Forming Social Subjects (1956 - 2015)

Dr. Luis F. Vásquez Zora<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Alex Dueñas Peña<sup>2</sup>, Mg. Diana M. Cuellar Sánchez<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universidad Colegio Mayor de Cundinamarca, Bogotá D.C. (Co), Bogotá, Colombia.  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8172-0602>

<sup>2</sup>Universidad Colegio Mayor de Cundinamarca, Bogotá D.C. (Co). Funza, Colombia.  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2940-416X>

<sup>3</sup>Universidad Colegio Mayor de Cundinamarca, Bogotá D.C. (Co), Funza Colombia.  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9500-1799>

### ABSTRACT:

This article problematizes the formation of models of the educated subject in Colombia through an analysis of the curriculum and the governance of secondary education between 1956 and 2015. The methodology employed consists of research and analysis of historical sources concerning the social ordering of the transmission of certain forms of knowledge and the silencing of others, as well as norms and practices of curricular governance aimed at shaping a particular social subject. Among the research findings, three educational series are identified: (1) the curricular plan and the formation of the administrative subject (1956–1970); (2) the systematization of the curriculum through educational technology for the production of the standardized and informatized subject (1978–2000); and (3) curriculum management for the production of the subject of excellence, entrepreneurship, and innovation (2002–2015). The article demonstrates how the secondary education curriculum in Colombia functions as a sophisticated social technology of knowledge and governance: of knowledge, insofar as it privileges and organizes the social transmission of specific forms of knowledge; and of governance, insofar as it shapes, guides, excludes, or resists the constitution of particular social subjects.

**KEYWORDS:** Subject. Middle education. Curriculum. Government. Colombia.

### INTRODUCTION: THE CURRICULUM: SOCIAL ORDERING OF KNOWLEDGE AND GOVERNANCE OF THE SUBJECT.

The formalizations of the secondary education curriculum in Colombia between 1956 and 2015 raise problematizations that go beyond the description of theories, approaches, currents, or curricular paradigms (Giraldo et al., 2019). To interrogate this curriculum implies questioning not only the technical organization of study plans, but also the historical processes through which certain bodies of knowledge are selected, hierarchized, and legitimized as “valid” knowledge to be transmitted in school and society, while others are displaced, silenced, or excluded (Vásquez and Ochoa, 2022). From this perspective, the curriculum can be understood as an educational dispositif that participates in the formation, guidance, and social governance of the subject in Colombia, insofar as it delimits what is considered true, relevant, and formative in each historical moment.

From this approach, the study of the secondary education curriculum is not limited to identifying formalized theoretical regimes, but rather to analyzing how these result from relations of power and disputes among social, economic, and political instances involved in the definition of school knowledge. In this process, diverse actors converge—international agencies, the State, governments, financial entities, private and non-governmental organizations—whose orientations are appropriated, negotiated, resisted, or otherwise practiced by the school and by school subjects. Consequently, the curriculum should not be understood solely as prescription, but also as a field of tensions in which practices, resistances, and shifts of meaning are configured in everyday school life (Vásquez, Dueñas and Cuellar, 2024).

Within this framework, the article seeks to move beyond a technical understanding of the curriculum associated with the rational design of study plans (Bobbitt, 1918; Tyler, 1973), as well as beyond practical approaches that situate education in the relationship between subject and context (Schwab, 1970; Goodson, 1991). It also engages critically with critical and post-critical perspectives that have problematized the curriculum as a site of epistemological, political, and cultural dispute (Apple, 1986; Giroux and McLaren, 1998; Popkewitz, 2010; Sacristán, 1994; De Alba, 1998; Díaz, 2003; Magendzo, 1986; Torres, 2017; Bolívar, 2008; Fernández, 2018). Nevertheless, the emphasis of the analysis is centered on understanding how, in the period 1956–2015, curricular selections operated as historical strategies for the production and transmission of social truth, defining models of knowledge aimed at forming socially valued subjects articulated to ideal projects of society.

Based on the above, it becomes necessary to recognize how regimes of selection and ordering of curricular knowledge were configured in Colombian secondary education between 1956 and 2015, and how these functioned as dispositifs for the formation and governance of the social subject.

In line with the above, the objective of the study is to analyze the historical forms of ordering of the secondary education curriculum in Colombia between 1956 and 2015, identifying the legitimized knowledge, the rationalities that underpin its selection, and the strategies through which the social circulation of certain knowledge is privileged, transmitted, or silenced. In doing so, the aim is to recognize how regimes of curricular truth are imposed and how these are appropriated, implemented, or resisted within the framework of institutional and social disputes.

#### THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: CURRICULUM AS EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND SOCIAL PRODUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE

The curriculum can be understood as an object of educational policy insofar as it organizes and formalizes the knowledge considered legitimate for its school and social transmission. From this perspective, the curriculum is not limited to a technical instrument of pedagogical planning nor to a neutral set of contents; rather, it is configured as a process of public regulation through which it is defined what knowledge should circulate socially, under what criteria of validity, and for what educational and social purposes (Van Zanten, 2011). In this sense, educational policy can be understood as the set of state and social actions oriented toward the public sphere, developed through processes of diagnosis, formulation, implementation, evaluation, and improvement plans for educational programs and projects.

This understanding makes it possible to recognize that the curriculum is produced within a framework of institutional decisions that respond to social needs, conflicts, and disputes. In the tradition of public policy analysis, these decisions are not conceived as mere technical responses to previously defined problems, but as processes of social construction of the educational problem, where priorities are established, interests are negotiated, and agendas are shaped (Bowe et al., 1992; Lindblom, 1991). Thus, curriculum policy can be understood as a functional ordering of actions in the public sphere that seeks to intervene in the school and in society, defining criteria for the selection, hierarchization, and distribution of the social transmission of knowledge.

Consequently, the curriculum is constituted as a social construction traversed by power relations, institutional disputes, and political, economic, and cultural interests that define which knowledge is considered necessary, valuable, or relevant to be taught. This social character of the curriculum becomes visible when analyzing the actors involved in its formulation and orientation. It is not only about state entities, but also about institutions and subjects that intervene directly or indirectly in the configuration of school contents: teachers, students, families, productive sectors, media, civil organizations, social movements, non-profit organizations, and international agencies.

In the contemporary field of policy analysis, it is recognized that educational policy operates as a multiscale process that involves diverse actors at different levels of influence, from the global to the school level. Within this framework, international organizations, national and regional governments, and private sectors influence the definition of priorities, standards, pedagogical approaches, and quality criteria, impacting curriculum organization and the ways in which schooling is oriented (Rizvi & Lingard, 2020; Ball, 2021). In this way, the curriculum becomes a site of meaning production and institutional regulation, rather than a simple administrative prescription: it is a space where not only contents are contested, but also models of society, definitions of citizenship, and ways of understanding the subject that the school is expected to form.

### **Macro, meso, and micro curriculum: levels of production and incidence**

To understand the curriculum as educational policy and as the social production of knowledge, it is essential to recognize that its formulation and circulation do not occur at a single level, but through a multiscale process involving international, state, and school-based instances. In this sense, the curriculum can be analyzed through macro-, meso-, and micro-curricular levels, which make it possible to observe how formalized knowledge is organized and contested, as well as the institutional strategies that guide its transmission.

At the macro-curricular level, international orientations and discourses that influence national educational reforms are situated. At this level, the curriculum is associated with the formulation of educational policy as a public action oriented toward the collective, articulated with processes of diagnosis, planning, formulation, implementation, and evaluation (Van Zanten, 2011). Thus, the macro-curriculum includes the recommendations and guidelines of international agencies that, although they do not directly determine national policy, contribute to shaping agendas, priorities, and models of educational reform. From a policy analysis perspective, this allows recognition that educational policy is not a linear process, but a construction shaped by multiple instances and rationalities, in which social problems and their possible responses are defined (Bowe, 1992; Lindblom, 1991).

At the meso-curricular level, national and regional policies expressed through regulations, guidelines, frameworks, and standards are situated, through which the State produces and regulates the official curriculum. This level corresponds to the set of institutional actions that define contents, pedagogical approaches, quality criteria, and forms of evaluation, configuring an ordering of transmissible knowledge within the education system (Van Zanten, 2011). However, the meso-curriculum is not configured exclusively by the State, but is shaped by the participation and influence of multiple actors and institutions. As approaches in public policy analysis indicate, the formulation of the public sphere involves civil institutions, social organizations, private entities, community actors, and other subjects that influence the orientation and regulation of educational policy (Thoenig, 1997; Lascoumes and Le Galès, 2009). In this sense, the meso-curriculum constitutes a space of contestation over the definition of the national curriculum, where state, social, and economic interests converge, as well as differentiated educational projects.

At the micro-curricular level, situated school practices are found, in which the curriculum is enacted in the daily life of the educational institution. This level includes subject plans, lesson plans, pedagogical decisions, and the concrete dynamics of teaching, evaluation, and knowledge transmission. In the micro-curriculum, it becomes evident that the curriculum is not only a prescribed document, but a school practice in which subjects, institutions, and contexts intervene (Maroy and Dupriez, 2000; Mainardes, 2006). Therefore, the formalized curriculum can be appropriated, adapted, reinterpreted, resisted, or diverted by school actors, showing that curriculum policy is also produced in the realm of practice and not only in that of normative formulation. This understanding aligns with the analysis of educational policy as complex processes, in which public decisions are shaped through interactions, negotiations, and disputes among diverse actors within the school space.

Thus, the macro–meso–micro distinction should not be interpreted as a linear hierarchy, but as a dynamic network of relationships among actors, discourses, and practices. Taken together, these levels make it possible to analyze how the order of schooled knowledge is historically constituted, as well as the institutional and social modalities through which the transmission of knowledge in secondary education is selected, organized, guided, and regulated.

### **Curricular government: regimes of truth and formation of the social subject**

In addition to being an object of educational policy, the curriculum can be analyzed as a device of social government of the social form of knowledge and of the modes of conduct of subjects. From a Foucauldian perspective, government is not limited to the formal authority of the State nor to the juridical exercise of power; it refers to the set of strategies and tactics aimed at guiding conduct, regulating behavior, and producing subjectivities in specific social contexts (Foucault, 2002). In this sense, the curriculum becomes a privileged mechanism for the social production of particular subjects, insofar as it organizes curricula by prioritizing certain forms of knowledge, establishing those that are to be transmissible and teachable, and delimiting them as true, correct, valuable, and transmissible as social and school objects.

In this sense, the government of the curriculum is not reduced to the administration of study plans or to the institutional management of knowledge. Rather, it is related to the social and historical conditions that allow certain forms of knowledge to be selected, formalized, and transmitted as school truths, while others are excluded, silenced, or displaced. This perspective makes it possible to understand the curriculum as a regime of socially regulated transmission

of knowledge, expressed in forms of disciplinary organization, by areas of knowledge, and in procedures of design, implementation, and evaluation supported by manuals, guidelines, plans, and institutional devices (Lundgren, 1992). Consequently, the curriculum can be understood as a historicized ordering of social truths, that is, as a component of the social device of knowledge transmission in which certain forms and structures of school knowledge are institutionalized, establishing hierarchies over what must be taught.

This approach makes it possible to problematize the curriculum of secondary education in Colombia between 1956 and 2015 as a political and historical scenario where models of society, educational projects, and forms of constitution of social subjects are contested. Indeed, the curriculum is configured as a field of tensions among different theoretical and political perspectives: from technical traditions focused on the social and economic aims of schooling (Bobbitt, 1918; Tyler, 1973), to practical approaches that situate education in the relationship between the subject and the transformation of their social contexts (Schwab, 1970; Goodson, 1991), and critical and post-critical perspectives that question the curriculum as a space of cultural, political, and identity disputes (Apple, 1986; Giroux and McLaren, 1998; Sacristán, 1994; Díaz, 1995; De Alba, 1998; Popkewitz, 2010; Torres, 2017; Bolívar, 2008; Fernández, 2018). These disputes show that the curriculum is not a simple mechanism of pedagogical organization, that it is not only a plan, program, or school project, but a social device that defines which knowledge it legitimizes as transmissible and which models of subject and society are privileged.

At the same time, by considering the curriculum as educational policy, it is recognized that its production involves a network of actions and decisions in which diverse instances and actors intervene. Curriculum policy is configured as part of a functional ordering of actions in the public sphere, oriented toward responding to social needs and conflicts through processes of formulation, implementation, and evaluation (Bowe, 1992; Lindblom, 1991). Within this framework of educational policy, the curriculum is linked to macro-, meso-, and micro-curricular dynamics, in which international agencies, governments, private entities, and school actors converge, contesting the orientation, direction, and definition of schooled knowledge (Van Zanten, 2011; Maroy and Dupriez, 2000; Thoenig, 1997; Lascoumes and Le Galès, 2009; Mainardes, 2006).

From this framework, the curriculum participates in the constitution of norms, conduct, and behaviors for the formation of the social subject, as it operates as a set of strategies of truth that seek to produce desirable models of citizenship, subject, culture, and society (Foucault, 2002; Popkewitz, 2010). However, this process does not occur homogeneously. Between the official curriculum and everyday school experiences there is a considerable distance, since the formalized or prescribed curriculum encounters situated practices that may comply with it, resist it, divert it, or create another in its place in the daily life of the school. Consequently, curricular government is understood as a complex relationship between institutional strategies and school tactics: between the formal ordering of transmissible knowledge and the real practices through which the formation of the social subject is produced—or contested (Foucault, 2002; Sacristán, 1994; Popkewitz, 2010).

In sum, understanding the curriculum as policy and curricular government implies analyzing the historical relationship between forms of knowledge transmission and educational policies for the formation of social subjects: in how school truths are constituted, in how they are institutionalized in epistemes (plans, programs, and projects), devices (international,

governmental, and school instances), and curricular practices (teaching experiences, school urgencies, community demands, among others), that is, how particular truths are articulated with modes of social conduct of subjects, aimed at forming a specific model of subject, without overlooking the resistances and deviations that emerge in everyday educational practice.

## METHODOLOGY

This article was developed from a qualitative approach, through a documentary and historical–interpretive research design, aimed at the critical analysis of the relationship between the secondary education curriculum in Colombia, governmentality (Foucault, 2006), and models of social subject formation, from secondary education in Colombia during the period 1956–2015. It is based on the premise that curriculum policies and pedagogical discourses do not operate solely as technical or administrative frameworks, but as devices of government that produce forms of subjectivity, regulate school practices, and shape ways of formalizing the educational sphere, the ideal model of the social subject, and the expected formation of citizenship (Dean, 2020; Ball, 2021; Vásquez and Ochoa, 2022).

In line with the contemporary field of educational policy analysis, policies are understood as situated processes and discourses, shaped by power relations, state rationalities, and disputes over the meaning of education (Rizvi and Lingard, 2020). For this reason, the methodology drew on tools from critical discourse analysis and policy analysis, considering that curricular and normative texts delimit problems, establish priorities, define institutional responsibilities, and legitimize specific forms of educational intervention (Gee, 2021).

Design and documentary corpus:

The corpus was constructed through intentional sampling and historical relevance, including official and academic documents representative of the period 1956–2015. Four types of sources were used:

- a) Colombian educational and curricular regulations, including decrees, laws, guidelines, and ministerial orientations that structure the governance of the curriculum at different stages of the education system.
- b) Technical and institutional documents, such as development plans, sectoral reports, and educational policy texts that define curricular priorities and approaches to citizenship education.
- c) Specialized academic production, focused on curricula, the history of education, educational policies, and subject formation.

### **Analytical strategy:**

The documentary analysis was carried out at three complementary levels:

- a) Descriptive and temporal organization reading: the main moments of transformation of the curriculum and educational policy were identified, locating normative changes, dominant approaches, and institutional priorities by decade.
- b) Analytical and categorical reading: a thematic coding procedure was applied, guided by central categories of the study, such as: curriculum governance, educational policy rationalities, citizenship and social formation, competencies, quality and evaluation, school subject and pedagogical subjectivity, and technologies of institutional regulation.

These categories made it possible to identify continuities, ruptures, and shifts in the way the curriculum produces meanings about the social subject to be formed.

c) Interpretive and critical reading: at this level, the findings were interpreted in light of the governmentality approach, understanding the curriculum as a technology of government that articulates pedagogical knowledge, institutional regulation, and the production of subjectivities (Dean, 2020; Ball, 2021). Likewise, the influence of global discourses on curriculum design was analyzed, especially within the framework of educational reforms associated with quality, standardization, and competencies (Rizvi and Lingard, 2020).

### **Ethical considerations:**

Given that this is a documentary study based on public sources and academic texts, the research did not involve the collection of sensitive data or the direct participation of human subjects. Interpretive fidelity, rigorous citation, and acknowledgment of the institutional origin of the analyzed documents were maintained.

## RESULTS: CURRICULAR SERIES IN SECONDARY EDUCATION IN COLOMBIA

It is important to problematize the historical ordering of curricular contents and the political actions of government that seek to shape, guide, render invisible, or differentiate the production of a particular social truth, based on the knowledge that is to be privileged and transmitted as truth, through the selection of theories, approaches, currents, and curricular perspectives—at times technical, at others critical, and at others post-critical (Sacristán et al., 2010; Pinar, 2014; Tadeu da Silva, 1999). Likewise, it is relevant to problematize curricular government, that is, the strategies and tactics produced among institutions (Tello, 2013), forms of knowledge (Zuluaga, 1999), and disputes over the curriculum (Arroyo, 2011) and the formation of subjects, which, in their operation within the school setting, reveal the configuration of particular curricular experiences in secondary education in Colombia, while also showing the formation, constitution, or formative agonism of specific social subjects in the country.

Beyond delimiting the analysis of curricular knowledge and its governmental actions from the perspectives of administrative planning (Martínez, 2012), technique (Martínez; Noguera and Castro, 2003), and management (Bedoya, 2018), the focus is on analyzing the social relations involved in the formation of specific types of subjects, the knowledge that shapes them, the modes of orientation, guidance, exclusion, or differentiation, and the characteristics and singularities of the processes of subject constitution through the secondary education curriculum in Colombia.

Three series reveal the historical and social duration of curricular knowledge in secondary education in the country: (1) educational administration, which established the curriculum plan and the technical subject (1956–1970); (2) educational technology, which, through the sequencing of educational processes, sought the technification of education, as well as the formation of a transformative and consumer subject (1978–2000); and (3) curriculum management, which, through educational managerialism, proposes excellence and innovation as the model of the entrepreneurial social subject (2002–2015).

**The Curriculum Plan and the Formation of the Development-Oriented Subject**

In the history of curriculum in Colombia, the year 1956 marks the period in which educational planning was formalized in the country. The “First Five-Year Education Plan” (Ministry of National Education, MEN, 1956) represented the emergence of the first educational policy, whose guiding principle and action was the planning of educational curricula. One year later, the “Sectoral Office of Educational Planning” was established (Decree 0206 of September 6, 1957, MEN), followed by the creation of the National Planning Department (DNP) (Law 19 of 1958), establishing educational planning as: “the necessary organization of comprehensive plans for monitoring and evaluating the Five-Year Plan, the coordination of international assistance and technical advisory support in education” (Decree 0206 of September 6, 1957, Art. 4, MEN).

Planning was established as an object, purpose, and function of the Colombian State in pursuit of development. It became the renewed rationality that would organize education through the designation of its new function: the configuration of the school plan understood as that “school practice that carries out the elaborated curricular art of foresight, a technical rationality of organization, measurement, systematization, and evaluation of the school experience” (Coombs and Ruscoe, 1970, p. 17). As the backbone of the curriculum, planning became the foundation of a new positivity of knowledge and school action. It was established as a requirement for the new order of transmission of educational knowledge. From that moment on, the plan had to consider: “School Architecture and Statistics, Documentation and Information Centers, Psychotechnics and Vocational Guidance Centers, and four experts from international organizations or contracted by the Ministry of National Education, responsible for the internal functioning of the Planning Office” (Decree 0206 of September 6, 1957, Arts. 3 and 4, MEN).

The plan became the administrative means of governing the curriculum, shaping truth and subject, knowledge and social governance, all of which were to contribute to development, economic and social growth, and the formation of an effective and efficient education aligned with social objectives derived from planning for progress (Ministry of National Education, MEN, 1956).

Among these initiatives were the “Colombian Educational Planning Guidelines,” developed by the Third German Mission (1965–1968), which defined two curricular administrative modalities: (1) planning as an effective means of educating students, and (2) the urgent development of study plans. In the first case, the curriculum is understood as a social plan, and education depends on the curriculum plan, which consists of defining study plans, objectives, content, methods, resources, evaluation, and timeframes. The plan, as curriculum, establishes direct relationships with the objectives and conditions necessary for the formation of the administered social subject. It prescribes teaching within a technical and administrative curriculum, a form of techno-economic truth subordinated to the achievement of goals through administrative planning processes, grounded in a practical, analytical, and empirical rationality that extends into society the relationship between education, society, and development (Martínez, Noguera, and Castro, 2003).

This represents a renewed positivity of school and social procedures, now observable and measurable through the curriculum enacted as administration of plan, process, method, and goal. The curriculum, understood through planning, becomes both object and purpose of

economic and social growth, and therefore a model for forming the transformative subject of development.

In the second case, the study plan represents the set of disciplines and school knowledge considered valuable for society and for the model of subject to be formed: “learning experiences are all those planned and directed by the school to attain its educational goals” (Tyler, 1986, p. 39). Planning practices become new forms of social truth: the fixation of educational content through the planning of objectives and procedures. The curriculum is defined as the “element composed of goals and objectives, methods for selecting and organizing content, patterns of learning and teaching, and a program of evaluation and outcomes” (Taba, 1974, p. 81). From then on, planning becomes model, conception, strategy, instrument, procedure, and social technique (Bobbit, 1919; Tyler, 1949).

Planning redefines the ordering of knowledge and social truths as the “application of rational and systematic analysis to the process of social development, with the aim of making instruction more effective and efficient in responding to the objectives and needs of students and society” (Coombs and Ruscoe, 1970, p. 17).

From the perspective of curriculum policy, planning embodies the administrative rationality of processes, subjects, and social outcomes. It transforms education into a scenario for the systematization of laws, rules, and norms that, oriented toward subjects, enable the progress and development of the country. It is the administrative and governmental rationality of the curriculum, aimed at fulfilling principles of political, economic, and social efficiency. These are the “forms of planning, organization, and instruments of social efficiency as organizational structures imposed by authorities to regulate behavior” (Hanneson, 1994, p. 5). They constitute forms of order and modalities of social action.

It is within this framework that the curriculum plan acquires historical, political, economic, and social dimensions (Stenhouse, 1991; Sacristán, 1988), by limiting knowledge and experience to the positive order of administrative planning of curricular knowledge, as the emergence of a new truth that establishes planning as a form. This represents a new plausibility of social knowledge: that of foresight for a secure future, without underdevelopment or poverty, aligned with the aspiration to reach the developed world, in dialogue with international agencies, missions, and educational planning offices established in the country. These were national measures aimed at achieving a future social model: social planning as social governance of educational curricula, for the production of subjects of development and social transformation.

Planning as a means of social governance was grounded in functionalist and pragmatic approaches, drawing on psychological, historical, sociological, and anthropological knowledge, which framed planning for development as the systemic engine of social, collective, and individual progress. In this context, three foreign missions arrived in Colombia, positioning planning as the solution to backwardness and underdevelopment: the Currie Mission (1950), the Leuret Mission (1958), and the German Mission (1965). These missions proposed the creation of planning offices for economic, social, and educational development (Aristizábal et al., 2008).

By the late 1960s, the Symposium “Administration, a Fundamental Instrument for the Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Social Development Plans” (Organization of American States, OAS, 1969) established that, based on the structure of administration and educational planning, the scientific, organizational, systematic, and social model would be consolidated.

The curriculum plan thus formed a governing triad: planning, curriculum, and the social subject for development.

### **Curricular Technology and the Formation of the Cyber-Anthropic Subject**

Educational technology enabled the systematization of the curriculum and the establishment of a social model for the production of an informatized and massified subject, through processes and sequencing. Decree 088 of 1976, “by which the educational system is restructured and the Ministry of National Education is reorganized,” reformed the Colombian Educational System by establishing “diversified secondary education with the dual purpose of preparing students for higher education and for employment in technical and auxiliary professions” (Decree 088 of 1976, Art. 10). Curriculum organization thus became not only a matter of planning, but also of systematization and sequencing in secondary education for the construction of a social subject—academic and/or vocationally oriented high school graduates—referred to as “vocational secondary education” (MEN, Decree 1002 of 1984, which establishes the study plan for preschool, primary, secondary, and vocational secondary education). This modified Decree 088 of 1976 by establishing that “education is a systematic and formative process of the individual and society that must respond to scientific and technological advances” (Decree 088 of 1976, Art. 10).

The systematization and technification of education brought about, beyond the study plan, new imperatives for social development: educational technology, whose purpose was “to accompany social and political evolution, as well as technical and economic development” (Faure et al., 1973, p. 28). From this perspective, “the curricular objective is to support the social effort to strengthen democracy, technology, science, and culture” (MEN, Decree 1419 of 1978, which establishes basic norms and guidelines for curriculum administration in preschool and primary education). Supported by agreements with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and UNESCO, a “systematized, technological, and improvement-oriented curriculum model” (1972) was formulated and disseminated through “workshops on curriculum systematization and ongoing teacher training” (MEN, 1975), seeking to expand the techno-educational apparatus in Colombia.

This renewal of educational technology introduced new social delimitations, framed within the idea of “learning to be, for the education of the future” (Faure et al., 1973), as a means of producing a “complete human being; a cyber-anthropos” (Faure et al., 1973, p. 233). Education was no longer merely a resource for planning and curriculum in the service of development; it now involved “observing, experimenting, classifying, expressing, listening, exchanging, and engaging informational data through the training of the scientific method” (Faure et al., 1973, p. 235). The curriculum thus became a social machine of technification, grounded in the shift from “learning over teaching” (Faure et al., 1973, p. 205). The social technology of learning became the guiding systematic principle of needs, motivations, interrelations of practices and content, and the integration of media and technologies as vehicles of knowledge (Faure et al., 1973, p. 28).

The curriculum aligned with information technologies as a systematized set of learning procedures. The curricular model became a social production machine for a cyber-anthropic subject. It was no longer only a plan for economic and political development, but an educational technology for the future—centered on acquiring technological, cybernetic,

communicational, and informational skills for a society that privileges technological knowledge and the formation of a systematized, informatized subject: a cyber-anthropos.

The curriculum of educational technology aimed to totalize and massify learning through informational and communicational dissemination, responding to the “need for specialization to form efficient, practical, technological, and productive social subjects” (Vogliotti, 2004, p. 2). It proposed the integration between human and machine as a systemic function of education and society. Educational technology, previously grounded in curriculum planning and administration, now incorporated computing and communication as key forms of knowledge in shaping the social subject—the cyber-anthropos.

This discontinuity between curriculum planning for development and educational technology for the formation of a cyber-anthropos subject has been described as the “instrumentalization of education in the country” (Martínez, Noguera, and Castro, 2003; Ríos and Sáenz, 2010; Téllez, 2001). Beyond planning and administration, technology, computing, and communication emerged as curricular knowledge based on educational technology, where the subject becomes the result of anthropotechnics. This was materialized through the establishment of the National Institutes of Secondary Education (INEM) (Decree 1962 of 1969, which established diversified secondary education), with a curriculum aimed at forming a socially and technologically oriented subject.

Governing the curriculum to form a social subject through educational technology and cyber-anthropos knowledge implies positioning science and technology at the center, guided by principles of efficiency and social effectiveness. This is achieved through forms of knowledge that draw on systems approaches, learning psychology, computing, communication, and ecology (Martínez, Noguera, and Castro, 2003). These disciplines established new guidelines for shaping the social subject, while learning technology became formalized as the new curricular positivity of seeing, thinking, imitating, and acting through evaluative feedback processes (Aristizábal et al., 2008).

However, other forms of knowledge resisted educational technology and the cyber-anthropos model of the social subject. Teachers’ organizations, social movements, intellectuals, and social science researchers formed the Colombian Pedagogical Movement, a social mobilization that advocated for the construction of “a distinct curriculum, referred to as that of the educated Colombian individual” (Fecode, 1982). This movement emerged both as rejection and recovery: rejection of the technological instrumentalization of curriculum and education, and recovery through the renewal of pedagogy.

This pedagogical renewal proposed curricula based on accumulated knowledge, Colombian cultural heritage, the appropriation of external knowledge, and the development of locally situated knowledge in interaction with cultural contexts. It aimed to form a Colombian social subject as a bearer of knowledge and cultural agent, capable of engaging in the epistemological re-signification of the nation (Rodríguez, 2002; Tamayo, 2006; Zuluaga, 1987), and as a social and collective actor who gives deeper meaning to citizenship and society.

From this perspective, the Colombian Pedagogical Movement can be interpreted as a rupture against mechanisms of power consolidated through scientific and technological institutions and discourses, which tend to centralize the production of truth and the regulation of social practices.

### **Curricular Management and the Formation of the Entrepreneurial Subject**

Educational management reveals a new discontinuity in the contemporary history of the curriculum and its governance. It now involves more capillary forms of knowledge, oriented toward standards of individual performance, referring to quality, innovation, and excellence as expressions of the demands of a competitive society and the aspiration for individual fulfillment in relation to others. This becomes the ideal model that both individuals and social institutions establish as an incentive and benchmark for achieving the highest standards of innovation, quality, and excellence (Republic of Colombia, MEN, Law 115 of 1994).

These are measurable forms of cognitive capital—the econometrics of the curriculum—based on evaluation according to national and international standards of conceptual, cognitive, formative, and social dimensions (Velasco, Gómez, and López, 2018). At the same time, they are reinforced through incentives such as national, regional, and individual educational awards (the National Teaching Award by Fundación Compartir; regional education awards; programs such as *Ser Pilo Paga* or *Generación E*, among others). Through stimulation and personal motivation, these mechanisms promote in individuals the transformation of their modes of subjectivation into valuable capital for a society that models itself on social entrepreneurship and education as a market good or credential, as UNESCO (2015) states in describing education as a “global common good.” Several developments highlight the relationship between curricular management and the production of the innovative and entrepreneurial social subject:

From the domain of knowledge, a financial economy based on education as a service and source of income emerges, which—beyond labor and capital—focuses on analyzing and shaping individuals’ marginal desires and consumption values for intangible goods such as learning and education (Brunner, 2000; Coombs, 1985; Friedman, 2002; Hayek, 1997; Schultz, 1968).

Education and training become matters shaped by multilateral and financial institutions: the World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, International Monetary Fund, Organization of American States, OECD, Organization of Ibero-American States, UNESCO, NGOs, among others. National civil organizations, business sectors, and foundations also participate, promoting cognitive capitalism through the generation of innovative and competitive knowledge for global and national economic growth. In Colombia, examples include *Empresarios por la Educación*, *Todos por la Educación*, and *Fundación Compartir*, which propose curricular management based on collective entrepreneurship and individual competitive initiatives.

A complex network of relationships emerges between management and control of social and educational practices that encourage participation in competitive arenas, fostering individual satisfaction through access to the social privileges associated with achieving a comfortable and successful life.

The management of social entrepreneurship among individuals results from the alignment of the Colombian curriculum with global, national, regional, and local contexts shaped by neoliberal policies over the past two decades of the twentieth century, generating both transformations and forms of resistance.

Technoscientific management of the individual, understood as the active incorporation of information and communication technologies into secondary education (Orjuela, 2010).

In this way, management becomes an instrument for addressing national problems, serving as justification for efficiency and effectiveness in confronting poverty, inequality, and inequity (Torres, 2003). Development plans (2002, “Toward a Community State,” and 2006, “Community State: Development for All”) define national objectives, goals, and social actions through school management as a guarantee of high growth. The Colombian Development Plan “Toward a Community State” (2002–2006), under President Álvaro Uribe Vélez, emphasized education as part of social policy, particularly in the pursuit of equity through the primacy of security. The subsequent plan, “Community State: Development for All” (2006–2010), integrated a community-based vision of society as a pillar of competitive management for national security (MEN, 2010, p. 14).

Likewise, the General Education Law and Law 715 of 2001 strengthened school autonomy, transforming schools into managerial entities through an “Educational Revolution” (MEN, 2002). This approach conceives educational governance as directive management, organization, and structuring of schools at primary and secondary levels, particularly in curricular management processes, aligned with the directives of international and transnational financial institutions such as the World Bank, IMF, WTO, and OECD (Ceid-Fecode, 2013). This new autonomy (MEN, 2015), by introducing school management as a means to “enhance educational processes in order to respond to international, national, regional, and local needs” (MEN, 2015), aligns with the Decennial Education Plan 1996–2005 (OECD, 2016) and sectoral plans that establish school autonomy as a mechanism of self-regulation. This is implemented through management tools such as the Synthetic Index of Educational Quality (ISCE) (MEN, Decree 1075 of 2015), transforming the curriculum into a value or tradable credential subject to measurement and performance categorization (ICFES, 2016), based on efficiency and effectiveness within evaluative markets recognized by MEN as indicators of quality management.

This organizational shift toward management raises critical questions: Is it a guide for institutional improvement, or a device for self-regulation and control of the social subject? To what extent does management (planning, organization, execution, evaluation, and improvement; MEN, 1996) constitute a capillary form of intervention in which individuals govern themselves according to standards of competence and excellence measured by national and international assessments? Management introduces ruptures in subjectivity by extending life into the domain of enterprise and services, fostering self-demand for innovation and continuous improvement (MEN, 2008). The subject is expected to become a leader and manager of their own initiatives, promoting self-management of skills, competencies, and entrepreneurial capacities.

At this point, it can be stated that planning, technology, and management—as orders and modalities of curricular knowledge—correspond to techniques for the formation and governance of the social subject: from administrative planning, to educational technology forming the cyber-anthropos, to curricular management shaping the entrepreneurial subject. In this sense, the curriculum operates as a sophisticated social technology of knowledge transmission, but also as a social machine that stimulates the production and constitution of subjects through themselves, guided by rationalities of governance that incentivize, evaluate, and reward, aiming to achieve “maximum effects at the lowest possible cost” (Foucault, 2002, p. 41).

The objective is not only to organize, but to govern—through planning, through the cyber-anthropos, or through self-management—producing specific forms of the social subject. Governing the curriculum of secondary education thus involves not only guiding through plans or informational systems, but also encouraging self-conduct, expanding the consumption of society and education as goods or forms of social and individual value (Hayek, 1997), offered within a financialized and consumer-oriented society.

Across these series—curriculum as plan, as technology, and as management—it becomes evident that the transmission of curricular content, organized within grids of educational knowledge, is not limited to curricular theory, ideology, or societal self-representation. Rather, it is linked to practical interests, to ways of acting oriented by ends and means, shaped through continuous reflection and implementation of social technologies aimed at forming and governing subjects. These processes unfold through dynamics of obedience, resistance, or creation of political practices, through strategies and tactics of governance that shape specific models of the social subject, as well as their invisibilization or resistance.

### **Considerations**

An analytical review has been conducted of the curricular orders of secondary education in Colombia, revealing the interplay in the organization of knowledge carried out by institutions, bodies of knowledge, and subjects, demonstrating how the discontinuous set of norms, rules, behaviors, and procedures of curricular governance not only impose social rules of truth but also aim to constitute models of the educated Colombian subject.

The established forms of knowledge for the curriculum were brought into discussion, which implied an epistemic intervention that did not focus solely on formalized knowledge, but on the treatment of series and discontinuities—of their emergence, persistence, or social and historical silencing—in order to consider the incision they constitute, their irreducible emergence, and forms of appropriation, as well as how they are updated, arranged, function, dissolve, and transform into orders of knowledge and specific, modified truth through the experiences and practices of society and its subjects.

These modifications refer to three discontinuities in the curricular knowledge of secondary education in Colombia: educational planning, educational technology, and school management. The aim was to show “how they transform and disguise themselves, how they contribute, ultimately, to making our current conditions of existence possible” (González, 2010, p. 107). That is, to demonstrate how curricular governance, across these emergent series, orders knowledge, guides political actions, updates planning in one moment, educational technology in another, and curricular management in yet another. The order of knowledge is therefore also a modality of governance, an attempt to impose a collective truth, and the selection of procedures, behaviors, and norms for the formation of the Colombian social subject, at times the planner, at others the cyber-anthropo, and more recently the entrepreneur. Analyzing and describing the forms of social veracity of the curriculum—its functioning, procedures, ways of doing, techniques, and mechanisms of governance—implies not only attending to the formation and guidance of objects and subjects, but also paying greater attention to the how and the why, rather than the what; it requires focusing more on the pragmatics of actions than on metaphysics or purely theoretical conceptualization.

By drawing on historical, empirical, critical, and political material to propose the interplay of curricular truth formations and the procedures for constructing the model of the social subject

in Colombia, this study advances political analytics of the present. It questions the interaction of curricular objects at international, national, regional, and local levels, presenting knowledge not merely as data or study plans, but as the result of relationships—outcomes of interactions among society, disciplines, and subjects—through which power is articulated with aspirations of domination or resistance.

It is also important to clarify that the description of these three curricular discontinuities, as well as the governance of the social subject in Colombia, although grounded in historical particularities, may not correspond to a linear progression of development. Methodologically, the analysis proceeds in the opposite direction: it starts from the present to trace the historical and political specificities that mark these series, identifying their characteristics, continuities, or dispersions. The intention is to move away from official ways in which the social sciences and education have studied and analyzed the curriculum, and instead to critically locate the historical conditions that produce it and the relationships that shape the agonisms among history, society, politics, and the lived experience of subjects.

The curriculum of secondary education in Colombia has been described as a sophisticated social technology of knowledge and governance: of knowledge, insofar as it privileges and organizes the social transmission of specific forms of knowledge; and of governance, insofar as it shapes, guides, excludes, or resists the constitution of particular social subjects.

Another consideration is that the curriculum is not merely a study plan, a systematized sequencing, institutional management, an area plan, or a lesson plan. This implies that it cannot be reduced to the formalization of curricular practice; rather, it is delineated by the concrete relationship between education and lived experience in schools. It is what seems to conceal the knot of events, what covers long, resounding historical and social silences, what hides omissions and sophisticated formulations, what exists at the limits of the action of curriculum and subjects. It may instead correspond to what does not obey planning, educational technology, or management—what is undefined, what lies enclosed because it exists outside—namely multiplicity, difference, and the simultaneous plurality of events, where knowledge is offered and dispersed.

Here, the urgencies of each school day are pushed to the limits of the everyday: in situated practices where the transmission of knowledge is conditioned by vulnerable socio-economic contexts, territories, conflicts and violence, subjectivities, affective conditions, local narratives that resist, families, traditions, processes of unlearning, the recognition that not everything learned is useful in practice, that little enters the curriculum, the body, and the mind, shaped by caring or indifferent teachers, punishments, uncertainties, divisions rather than unity. In this sense, the curriculum is not merely teaching, educating, or transmitting knowledge, but problematizing knowledge. Perhaps, in this country, what is needed for life is not yet found in school; perhaps the curriculum scarcely enters the classroom—shaped instead by informal, multiple becomings molded by everyday urgencies.

It may also be considered that the regimes of curricular ordering in secondary education in Colombia respond to the relationship between society and school through modalities that limit or associate the integration of knowledge, the separation of disciplines, and the inclusion—or exclusion—of subjects. Reflecting on this, one might question whether knowledge, and in this case curricular order, emerges from rupture: that the curriculum is not merely a concept but a precept of social ordering, a set of political strategies and tactics, and a mechanism for producing specific individuals and subjects. Through the curriculum as plan, technology, or

management, the country has traced a particular jurisdiction of power through which individuals are constituted as subjects insofar as power makes them its object. The curriculum thus becomes the backbone of social knowledge that orders learning to form individuals, producing them through rationalities and systematizations—outcomes of planning, sequencing, and the marketization of learning as self-enterprise.

In simple terms, what is desired is a flexible education that incorporates a reflexive dimension, that promotes self-education—first, in a natural sense, by turning back, breaking with itself, and liberating; giving rise to an education that abandons being the result of an orthodoxy of rules, norms, and habits. Second, that it becomes a means of liberation, autonomy, and individual sovereignty, allowing what is within to be brought outward, to be extracted, rather than imposing forms of order and prescribed modes to be assumed.

#### REFERENCES

1. Apple, M. (1986). *Ideología y currículo*. Akal.  
<https://books.google.cl/books?id=dLV6LkYYhFcC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>
2. Aristizábal, M., Muñoz, M. y Tosse, C. (2008). *El Gigante en el país de los liliputienses: Las ilusiones del desarrollo y el planeamiento para la educación*. En: *Traslapamiento de la pedagogía por el currículo: Colombia 1960-1975. Voces y miradas sobre el paradigma anglosajón en educación*. Primera parte. Universidad del Cauca.
3. Arroyo, M. (2011). *Currículo, Território em disputa*. Vozes.
4. Ball, S.J., & Mainardes, J. (2011). *Políticas educacionais: Questões e dilemas*. Cortez.  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282124341\\_Políticas\\_educacionais\\_questoes\\_e\\_dilemas](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282124341_Políticas_educacionais_questoes_e_dilemas)
5. Ball, S.J. (2021). *The education debate* (4th ed.). Policy Press.  
<https://books.google.com.co/books?id=5PXOY8EsfbYC&printsec=frontcover&hl=es#v=onepage&q&f=false>
6. 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&CVI D=maNHqA>.
7. Bobbit, J. (1918). *The Curriculum*. Houghton Mifflin company.
8. Bolívar, A. (2008) *Didáctica y Currículum: De la modernidad a la posmodernidad*. Ediciones Aljibe.  
<https://archive.org/details/bolivar-a.-didactica-y-curriculum.-de-la-modernidad-a-la-posmodernidad>
9. Bowe, R., Ball, S. J., & Gold, A. (1992). *Reforming education and changing schools: Case studies in policy sociology*. Routledge.
10. Bruner, J.J. (2000). *Nuevos escenarios de la educación. Revolución tecnológica y Sociedad de la Información*. PREAL <http://www.preal.cl/>
11. Congreso de la República de Colombia. (1994). *Ley 115 de 1994, por la cual se expide la Ley General de Educación*. Diario Oficial No. 41.214.  
[https://www.mineducacion.gov.co/1621/articles-85906\\_archivo\\_pdf.pdf](https://www.mineducacion.gov.co/1621/articles-85906_archivo_pdf.pdf)

12. Congreso de la República de Colombia. (2001). *Ley 715 de 2001, por la cual se dictan normas orgánicas en materia de recursos y competencias para la prestación de los servicios de educación y salud*. Diario Oficial No. 44.654.  
<https://www.funcionpublica.gov.co/eva/gestornormativo/norma.php?i=4452>
13. Coombs, P. (1985). *The world crisis in education. The view from the eighties*. Oxford University Press. <https://es.scribd.com/document/535335154/Philip-H-Coombs-The-World-Crisis-in-Education-the-View-From-the-Eighties-Oxford-University-Press-1985>
14. Coombs, P., & Ruscoe, G. (1970). *El planeamiento educacional*. Paidós. [https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000076671\\_spa?posInSet=1&queryId=467b181f-2d06-4b74-a8cf-eaef4cd45395](https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000076671_spa?posInSet=1&queryId=467b181f-2d06-4b74-a8cf-eaef4cd45395)
15. De Alba, A. (1998). *Currículo crisis, mito y perspectivas*. Universidad de Buenos Aires. [https://pepm-sal.inf.d.edu.ar/sitio/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Material-de-lectura-Clase-3\\_ALBA-Alicia-Curriculum-crisis-mito-y-perspectiva-CAp-III.pdf](https://pepm-sal.inf.d.edu.ar/sitio/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Material-de-lectura-Clase-3_ALBA-Alicia-Curriculum-crisis-mito-y-perspectiva-CAp-III.pdf)
16. Dean, M. (2020). *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society* (3rd ed.). SAGE. <https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/governmentality/book232754>
17. Departamento Nacional de Planeación (DNP). (1958). *Ley 19 de 1958*. <https://www.funcionpublica.gov.co/eva/gestornormativo/norma.php?i=8271>
18. Departamento Nacional de Planeación (Colombia). (2002). *Plan Nacional de Desarrollo 2002-2006: Hacia un Estado Comunitario*. Gobierno de Colombia. <https://colaboracion.dnp.gov.co/cdt/pnd/pnd.pdf>
19. Departamento Nacional de Planeación (Colombia). (2006). *Plan Nacional de Desarrollo 2006-2010: Estado Comunitario: desarrollo para todos*. Gobierno de Colombia. [https://colaboracion.dnp.gov.co/cdt/pnd/pnd\\_tomo\\_1.pdf](https://colaboracion.dnp.gov.co/cdt/pnd/pnd_tomo_1.pdf)
20. Díaz, Á. (1995). Currículum. Tensiones conceptuales y prácticas. *Revista Electrónica de Investigación Educativa*, 5(2), p. 81-93. <http://redalyc.org/pdf/155/15550205.pdf>
21. Faure, E., Herrera, F. Kaddoura, A., Lopes, H., Petrovsky, A., Rahnema, M. & Ward, F.. (1973). *Aprender a ser. La educación del futuro*. Alianza-Unesco. [https://www.berrigasteiz.com/monografikoak/inkluisibitate/pub/unesco\\_aprender%20a%20ser.pdf](https://www.berrigasteiz.com/monografikoak/inkluisibitate/pub/unesco_aprender%20a%20ser.pdf)
22. Federación Colombiana de Educadores (FECODE). (1982). *Movimiento pedagógico colombiano*. [https://fecode.edu.co/images/Revista\\_Educacion-100/Revista\\_Educacion\\_y\\_Cultura\\_No.1.pdf](https://fecode.edu.co/images/Revista_Educacion-100/Revista_Educacion_y_Cultura_No.1.pdf)
23. Fernández, A. (2018). *Configuración del campo del currículo en Colombia. Un viaje por la producción escrita de sus autores más representativos*. Samava impresiones.
24. Friedman, M. (2002). *Capitalism and freedom*. The University of Chicago Press. <http://pombo.free.fr/friedman2002.pdf>
25. Foucault, M. (2002) *Vigilar y castigar*. Siglo XXI Editores. <https://www.ivanillich.org.mx/Foucault-Castigar.pdf>
26. \_\_\_\_\_. (2006). Seguridad, territorio y población. Curso en el College de France 1977 – 1978. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (pp. 139 y ss.).
27. Gee, J.P. (2021). *Introducing discourse analysis: From grammar to society* (4th ed.). Routledge. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340780247\\_Introducing\\_Discourse\\_Analysis\\_Fr](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340780247_Introducing_Discourse_Analysis_Fr)

- om\_Grammar\_to\_Society\_by\_James\_Paul\_Gee\_London\_Routledge\_2018\_170\_pp\_165\_Hardcover\_ISBN\_978-1-318-29838-5
28. Giraldo, E. Cadavid, A. y Flóres, S. (2019). Posibilidad de acuerdos sobre las concepciones de currículo para la formación de maestros. *Educación y Educadores* 22(1), 9-22. <https://educacionyeducadores.unisabana.edu.co/index.php/eye/article/view/9224>
  29. Giroux, H.; y McLaren, P. (1998). *Sociedad, Cultura y Educación*. O Pedro Miño. <https://archive.org/details/giroux-h.-y-mc-laren-p.-sociedad-cultura-y-educacion>
  30. González, R. (2010). *El taller de Foucault*. Universidad Pedagógica Nacional. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315028118\\_El\\_taller\\_de\\_Foucault](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315028118_El_taller_de_Foucault)
  31. Goodson, I. (1991). *La construcción social del currículo. Posibilidades y ámbitos de investigación de la historia del currículo*, En: *Revista de Educación*. No. 295. Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia de España. pp. 7-38.
  32. Hanneson, citado por Aristizábal, M., et al., 2005. ZABAL, Aproximación crítica al concepto de currículo. En: *Revista ierRed: Revista Electrónica de la Red de Investigación Educativa* [en línea]. Vol.1, No.2 (Enero-Junio de 2005). Disponible en Internet: <http://revista.iered.org>
  33. Hayek, F. A. (1997). *Los fundamentos de la libertad*. Folio. <https://archive.org/details/hayek-f.-a.-los-fundamentos-de-la-libertad-epl-fs-1960-2022>
  34. III Misión Pedagógica Alemana en Colombia. (1965–1968). *Guías de planeación educativa colombianas*. Ministerio de Educación Nacional. <http://museopedagogico.pedagogica.edu.co/2024/02/13/guias-para-el-maestro-aportes-de-la-tercera-mision-pedagogica-alemana-en-colombia/>
  35. Lascoumes, P. y Legales, P. (2009). *Sociologie de l' action publique*. Armand Colin. [https://www.academia.edu/38065238/Lascoumes\\_La\\_sociologie\\_de\\_l\\_action\\_publique\\_0\\_Armand\\_Collin\\_](https://www.academia.edu/38065238/Lascoumes_La_sociologie_de_l_action_publique_0_Armand_Collin_)
  36. Lindblom, C. (1991). *El proceso de elaboración de políticas públicas*. Porrúa. <https://seminarioestadoyeducacion.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/el-proceso-de-elaboracion-de-politicas-publicas.pdf>
  37. Lundgren, U. (1992). *Teoría del curriculum y escolarización*. Morata. [https://books.google.com.co/books/about/Teor%C3%ADa\\_del\\_curriculum\\_y\\_escolarizaci%C3%B3n.html?id=0Q11O6Z\\_1AMC&redir\\_esc=y](https://books.google.com.co/books/about/Teor%C3%ADa_del_curriculum_y_escolarizaci%C3%B3n.html?id=0Q11O6Z_1AMC&redir_esc=y)
  38. Magendzo, A. (1986). *Currículo y cultura en América Latina*. Editorial PIIE. <https://www.piie.cl/biblioteca/publicaciones/libros/L-1986-044.pdf>
  39. Mainardes, J. (2006). *A abordagem do ciclo de políticas e suas contribuições para a análise da trajetória de políticas educacionais*. *Atos de Pesquisa em Educação*, 1(2), 94–105. <https://doi.org/10.7867/1809-0354.2006v1n2p94-105>
  40. Maroy, C., & Duriez, V. (2000). La regulación en los sistemas escolares: Propuesta teórica y análisis del marco estructural en Bélgica francófona. *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, (130), 73–87.
  41. Martínez, A. (2012). *Verdades y Mentiras sobre la Escuela*. Bogotá D.C. Alcaldía Mayor de Bogotá. Instituto para la Investigación Educativa y el Desarrollo Pedagógico, IDEP.
  42. Martínez, A., Noguera, C. y Castro, J. (2003). *Currículo y Modernización. Cuatro décadas de educación en Colombia*. Magisterio. [https://www.albertomartinezboom.com/escritos/libros/2003\\_Currículo\\_y\\_Modernizacion.pdf](https://www.albertomartinezboom.com/escritos/libros/2003_Currículo_y_Modernizacion.pdf)

43. Ministerio de Educación Nacional. (1957, 6 de septiembre). *Decreto 0206 de 1957*. <https://www.suin-juricol.gov.co/viewDocument.asp?id=1845544>
44. Ministerio de Educación Nacional. (1976, 22 de enero). *Decreto 088 de 1976*. <https://www.mineduacion.gov.co/portal/normativa/Decretos/102584:Decreto-088-de-Enero-22-de-1976>
45. Ministerio de Educación Nacional. (1978). *Decreto 1419 de 1978*. <https://www.mineduacion.gov.co/1621/article-102770.html>
46. Ministerio de Educación Nacional. (1984, 24 de abril). *Decreto 1002 de 1984*. <https://www.mineduacion.gov.co/portal/ejes-tematicos/Normas-sobre-Educacion-Preescolar-Basica-y-Media/103663:Decreto-1002-de-Abril-24-de-1984>
47. Ministerio de Educación Nacional de Colombia. (1996). *Plan Decenal de Educación 1996–2005: La educación, un compromiso de todos*. MEN. [https://www.mineduacion.gov.co/1621/articles-107820\\_archivo\\_pdf.pdf?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.mineduacion.gov.co/1621/articles-107820_archivo_pdf.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
48. Ministerio de Educación Nacional de Colombia. (2008). *Guía No. 34: Guía para el mejoramiento institucional de la autoevaluación al plan de mejoramiento*. MEN.
49. Ministerio de Educación Nacional de Colombia. (2015). *Decreto 1075 de 2015: Decreto Único Reglamentario del Sector Educación*. Presidencia de la República de Colombia. [https://bibliotecadigital.ccb.org.co/bitstream/11520/24712/1/DECRETO%201075%20DE%202015.pdf?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://bibliotecadigital.ccb.org.co/bitstream/11520/24712/1/DECRETO%201075%20DE%202015.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
50. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2016). *Education in Colombia: Reviews of National Policies for Education*. OECD Publishing. [https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2016/04/education-in-colombia\\_g1g63511/9789264250604-en.pdf?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2016/04/education-in-colombia_g1g63511/9789264250604-en.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
51. Orjuela, D. (2010). Integrar las TIC al currículo en la educación media. En: Revista de investigaciones UNAD. Bogotá: Volumen 09. Número 3. diciembre 2010. <https://hemeroteca.unad.edu.co/index.php/revista-de-investigaciones-unad/article/view/722/1540>
52. Pinar, W. (2014). *La teoría del currículum*. Narcea. <https://books.google.com.mx/books?id=5cxuBgAAQBAJ&printsec=copyright#v=onepage&q&f=false>
53. Popkewitz, T. (2010). Estudios curriculares y la historia del presente. *Profesorado, revista de currículum y del profesorado*, 14(1). Universidad de Granada. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/567/56714113020.pdf>
54. OEA. Organización de Estados Americanos. (1969) Simposio: administración, instrumento fundamental para la elaboración, realización y evaluación de los Planes de Desarrollo Educativo. Organización de Estados Americanos, OEA. (1969) Simposio: administración, instrumento fundamental para la elaboración, realización y evaluación de los Planes de Desarrollo Educativo. Washington D.C.
55. Ríos, R. y Sáenz, J. (2012). *Saberes, sujetos y métodos de enseñanza*. Universidad Nacional de Colombia. Centro de Estudios Sociales CES. <https://revistas.upn.edu.co/index.php/PYS/article/download/1946/1895/6728>
56. Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2020). *Globalizing education policy* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/Globalizing-Education-Policy/Rizvi-Lingard/p/book/9780415416276>

57. Sacristán, J. (Comp.), y otros. (2010). Saberes e incertidumbres sobre el currículum. Morata. <https://content.e-bookshelf.de/media/reading/L-3498265-138d73707c.pdf>
58. Rodríguez, R. (2002). *El maestro en Colombia: hitos, avatares y paradojas*. Universidad Distrital. [https://www.fecode.edu.co/images/Revista\\_educacion\\_101-148/Revista\\_Educacion\\_y\\_Cultura\\_No.106.pdf](https://www.fecode.edu.co/images/Revista_educacion_101-148/Revista_Educacion_y_Cultura_No.106.pdf)
59. Schultz, T. (1968). Valor económico de la educación. México, D.F: Ed. UTEHA, Unión tipográfica editorial hispano americana, 1968.
60. Schwab, J. (1970). The practical: a language for curriculum. National Education Association. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1084049>
61. Taba, H. (1974). *Elaboración del Currículum*. Troquel. <https://educativopracticas.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/curriculum-hilda-taba.pdf>
62. Tadeu da Silva, T. (1999). *Documentos de identidad. Una introducción a las teorías del currículo*. Auténtica. <https://www.fceia.unr.edu.ar/geii/maestria/DoraBibliografia/Ut.%201/SILVA%20docs%200ident.pdf>
63. Tamayo, L. (2006). El movimiento pedagógico en Colombia: Un encuentro de los maestros con la pedagogía. *Revista HISTEDBR On-line*, (24), 102–113 [https://www.fe.unicamp.br/pf-fe/publicacao/4953/art09\\_24.pdf](https://www.fe.unicamp.br/pf-fe/publicacao/4953/art09_24.pdf)
64. Téllez, G. (2001). *Proyecto político de nación*. UPN-Colombia.
65. Thoenig, J.C. (1997). Política pública y acción pública. *Gestión y Política Pública*, 6(1), 19–42. Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas (CIDE). [https://www.gestionypoliticapublica.cide.edu/ojs/ide/num\\_anteriores/Vol.VI\\_No.I\\_1sem/TJ\\_Vol.6\\_No.I\\_1sem.pdf](https://www.gestionypoliticapublica.cide.edu/ojs/ide/num_anteriores/Vol.VI_No.I_1sem/TJ_Vol.6_No.I_1sem.pdf)
66. Torres, J. (2017). *Políticas educativas y construcción de personalidades neoliberales y neocolonialistas*. Morata. [https://edmorata.es/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Torres.PoliticasyEducativas.PR\\_.pdf](https://edmorata.es/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Torres.PoliticasyEducativas.PR_.pdf)
67. Torres, R. (2003). *De esta manera, la gestión se torna en el instrumento de solución a los problemas nacionales...* En *Educación en Revista*, 38, e85574. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1984-0411.85574>
68. Tyler, R. (1986). Principios básicos del currículo. Ediciones Troquel. 5ª edición. <https://cmapsconverted.ihmc.us/rid=1TQF25GFJ-1FGJFT5-TP/Tyler%20Principios%20basicos%20del%20currículum.pdf>
69. Van Zanten, A. (2007). *Individualismo y solidaridad en las elecciones educativas de las familias*. En S. Paugam (Ed.), *Repensar la solidaridad: Aportes de las ciencias sociales* (pp. 705–720). Presses Universitaires de France. 10.3917/puf.pauga.2011.01.0705
70. Vásquez, L. Dueñas, A. y Cuellar, D. (2024). Rethinking Teaching from Territories: Approaches from Public Policy, Educational Policy, And Teacher Policy. En: *Rev. Cultura. International Journal of Philosophy of Culture and Axiology*. Vol. 21 N° 8s / 2024. <https://culturajournal.com/article-view/?id=2271>
71. Vásquez, L y Ochoa, A. (2022). De la educación religiosa y la educación laica en Colombia. Normatividades y políticas (1930- 2020). *Revista Colombiana de Sociología* Vol. 45, N° 01 enero – junio de 2022-I. Bogotá D.C. Universidad Nacional de Colombia. <https://revistas.unal.edu.co/index.php/recs/article/view/90221/82537>

72. Velasco, C, Gómez, P y López, C. (2018). Caracterización de los objetivos específicos de la educación media: contribución a los componentes del currículo. Disponible en: <https://hdl.handle.net/1992/39793>
73. Vogliotti, (2004) *Procesos formativos y prácticas de los formadores docentes*. Ediciones Díaz de Santos. <https://reader.digitalbooks.pro/book/preview/38613/00008.html>
74. Zuluaga, O.L. (1999). *Pedagogía e historia: La historicidad de la pedagogía, la enseñanza y un objeto de saber*. Siglo del Hombre Editores; Anthropos; Editorial Universidad de Antioquia. [https://www.academia.edu/17615387/Pedagogia\\_e\\_historia\\_Zuluaga](https://www.academia.edu/17615387/Pedagogia_e_historia_Zuluaga)