



THE PROFESSIONAL TRAINING POLICY IN THE BRAZILIAN FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE BODY: THE PATH OF CORPORATE EDUCATION IN THE MODERNIZATION NARRATIVE OF THE PARLIAMENT

William Maximiliano Carvalho de Melo*

Fernando de Souza Coelho**

Abstract: After the Brazilian redemocratization in 1986, the legislative institutions began a changing process derived from the assimilation of new constitutional competencies and the increasing pressure of interest groups in the development of a broad scope of public policies. The need to prepare a new legislative bureaucracy to deal with a panoply of new themes led to the creation of training centers. They began to be consolidated in broader models of corporate education, such as the Training Center from the Chamber of Deputies (CEFOP) and the Brazilian Legislative Institute (ILB) from the Federal Senate. These initial models influenced the development and diffusion of professional training policies to other legislative organizations. This paper presents an analysis of the corporate education trajectory in the National Congress to explore ‘how have professional training policies been developed in the Federal Legislative Branch?’ Institutional documents, interviews, and political speeches were used as data sources to analyze the two organizations paths. As its outcome, the paper synthesizes some historical elements of the vocational training policy in both legislative organizations. In short, it contributes to encourage a research agenda in the cross area of public administration and corporate education, in the peculiar context of the Legislative Branch.

Keywords: Corporate Education; Professional qualification; Modernization; Legislative Branch.

1. Background

Parliaments are institutions dedicated to the process of correspondence between popular will and political choices (Bobbio, Metteucci, and Pasquino, 2000). They are organizations that have developed together with modern democracies, as alternatives to authoritarian projects (CARVALHO 2003). Brazil, like many Latin American countries, has adopted, with the advent of the Republic, the North American presidential model, so that Parliament is predominantly engaged in legislative and superintended activities, while its counterpart, the executive, personified in the President, is responsible for the State’s actions and Government.

*Doutorando em Administração Pública pela Universidade do Minho/Portugal e Mestre em Gestão de Políticas Públicas pela Universidade de São Paulo. ORCID iD: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2803-0722>. E-mail: wmaximiliano@gmail.com

**Doutor e Mestre em Administração Pública pela FGV-SP. Professor Doutor da EACH-USP. ORCID iD: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2803-0722>. E-mail: fernandocoelho@usp.br

The legislative studies in Brazil present a research agenda based on an examination of the relations between the Executive and Legislative branches, especially the mechanisms of bargaining and agenda-setting control used by the Government to guarantee their interests in the Congress (LIMONGI, 2010). However, there is a lack of attention from academic studies to understand parliaments not only as political arenas but also as political-administrative organizations with relative autonomy to pursue their interests (ARANDA, 2010). The parliament, as an organization, is not only composed by the body of politicians on whom most attention is drawn, but is also made up of administrative staff who, although they may not have the final say on the matters discussed and legislated in the organization, are responsible for policies' and bill's drafts, as well as professional advice on various issues, producing direct effects on the quality of each parliament's outcome (EGEBERG ET AL, 2015).

In the Brazilian case, the bicameral parliament is the National Congress, composed by the Federal Senate and the Chamber of Deputies. The first organization is formed by 81 Senators and more than 6 thousand direct employees, between civil servants and parliamentary secretaries. In the Chamber of Deputies are 513 deputies and a set of 2,894 public servants, 8,949 parliamentary secretaries, and, still, 1,456 occupants of positions of free appointment. Therefore, the National Congress is a set of two organizations with administrative autonomy. These, in turn, each have a set of public servants that form the fixed component of the organizational structure, and a set of professionals appointed in the function of the political representation of the parliamentarians or the administrative competence of each Executive Board.

The plurality of activities and themes in which each parliament is engaged produces an intense demand for specialized expertise (COGHILL et al., 2007). Thus, each parliament must find solutions in education and training so that their administrative staff can respond to the different demands of the organization. This article analyzes the development of corporate education policy in a comparative perspective between the Chamber of Deputies and the Federal Senate. It is intended to answer the question: How have professional training policies been developed in the National Congress? The paper aims to explore the relationship between the concept of administrative modernization and corporate education. In order to do this, the scenario of the modernization movements that have affected Brazilian public administration is contextualized from the academic literature, as well as changes in corporate education concepts that respond to these processes.

This paper adopts the methodology of the case study (YIN, 2015), comparing the paths of two organizations, both grouped under the label of the National Congress. The data were collected during the development of a master's degree thesis in the period 2013-2015.² Documentary data, as official

² For more information, access the full text this master thesis whose title is "*As Escolas do Legislativo no Contexto de Modernização do Parlamento Brasileiro: Um Estudo de Casos Múltiplos: EL-ALMG, CEFOR, ILB-INTERLEGIS*", presented at Escola de Artes, Ciências e Humanidades da Universidade de São Paulo (EACH-USP). It is available on the website of the Brazilian Association of Legislative Schools through the link: <https://www.portalabel.org.br/images/pdfs/as-escolas-do-legislativo-no-contexto-de-modernizacao-do-parlamento-brasileiro.pdf>.

reports, norms, acts, and resolutions were aggregated in order to construct trajectories (THELEN, 1999) of corporate education in these institutions. Also, to identify elements of perception about corporate training in the organizations investigated, an analysis of the data emerged from the parliamentary discourse, following the line proposed by Flores (1994). The speeches were chosen according to their availability on the website of the Chamber of Deputies and the Federal Senate, and selected, based on the contributions generated to understand the topic under study. Finally, the trajectories of both organizations are compared, highlighting the differences and their implications in the process of defining a corporate education policy in the Federal Brazilian parliament.³

2. Administrative modernization: From bureaucracy to governance

The beginning of public administration in Brazil is marked by a predominance of patrimonialism and clientelist narratives (NUNES, 1997). Legal courses were the right paths to prepare a new generation of elites who would occupy prominent positions in government, obtained through political and personal relations (SCHWARTZMAN, 1996). Only with the Revolution of 1930 began the search for the professional administration model seeking mechanisms to equate public and private administration, considering the ideas of efficiency and control, as disseminated by classical authors such as Frederick Taylor and Luther Gulick during the first half of the twentieth century.

The specialized model of the professional administration fits well in the bureaucratic context, which for Weber (1922) is the organization *par excellence*, in which the tasks of the government are distributed in official duties, with methodological prediction for their performance and whose execution may be conducted only by persons qualified and determined by the bureaucratic authority.

Bureaucratic authority is given according to a monocratically organized hierarchy that establishes exhaustive rules that must be studied and fulfilled. In this context, the public administration is a subfunction of the legalist tradition (KICKERT, 2005). All management is based on written documents and the official character of the State. Employees of the state must act by impersonality and the persecution of the common good. Their wages are associated with their functions and must develop on a career principle, in which working time, coupled with the evaluations of hierarchical superiors, must be the determinant factor for their promotion. Thus, the first movement of modernization comes with the administrative reform of the *Estado Novo*, aimed at countering the personal culture of the origins of the Republic with an impersonal bureaucratic model capable of rationalizing public organizations through normative systems and formative practices based on processes and efficiency (FARAH, 2011).

³ A previous version of this paper was presented at the IASIA Conference 2019, organized by the International Association of Schools and Institutes of Administration and took place at Instituto Universitário de Lisboa in Portugal. The working paper was part of a session of Working Group on Education and Training in Public Administration.

In this context, the idea of professionalization is linked to procedures, so that training focused on the daily workers' activities and processes, attributing great importance, according to Saraiva (2002), to their systematic compliance with norms and regulations.

After the *Estado Novo's* implementation, the writings of Woodrow Wilson (1887) gained popularity among political elites. They had two essential dimensions: the split of the government between administrative activities and the political sphere; and the legitimacy of the executive mandate, attributed by the people, to make decisions independently. In this period, the bureaucratic insulation, corporatism, and universalism of procedures gained strength in the executive's organizations with different strategies of armaments against clientelism and politicians, especially the parliamentarians (NUNES, 1997).

The duality between administration and politics (DENHARDT; BAKER, 2007) ultimately centered Parliament around itself, and away from the gubernatorial debate in the country. According to Faria (2005, p. 373): "the process of modernization of legislative organs took shape throughout the authoritarian regime of 1964-1984, precisely when these organs were greatly diminished in their political influence and practically deprived of autonomy". Thus, as the modernization of the model of professional administration could not reach parliament, considered the very embodiment of politics, the *Estado Novo* managed to isolate it.

During this period of relative emptying of their political power, parliaments received significant investments to modernize their technological structures, developing an increasingly robust information system (FARIA, 2005). From this period comes the creation of the Data Processing and Information Center of the Federal Senate - PRODASEN, the first training structure that starts the team's training in computer systems (VENTURELLI; MARQUES, 2004).

To account for the growing demands of society and to enforce the bureaucratic system, governments grew, in size and cost, without showing the corresponding gain in productivity or effectiveness (POLLITT, 1990). Organizations' tendency to increase their staffing and budget structures led to endless bureaucracy, to the point where large organizations could not be coordinated or controlled (DIXON; KOUZMIN; KAKABADSE, 1998).

Criticism of the Professional model, according to Silvestre (2010), was since these were unproductive, based on weak decision-making processes, without incentives to rationalize resources, with low accountability of public employees, without incentives for new forms of work, irresponsible, elitist, opposition to democracy, among others.

In this context, the managerialism corresponds to an injection of a foreign body, coming from the private sector, in the bureaucratic regime (POLLITT, 1990). So that this new concept was the private-sector solution to the problems of the public sector (DIXON; KOUZMIN; KAKABADSE, 1998); it was done by introducing tools such as strategic planning, reengineering, consumer services, quality assurance, performance management, risk management, accountability, to public sector problems. According to Hood (1995), to ensure efficient performance, the public sector should borrow

the tools, values, and terms used in the private sector. Thus, public administrators became managers (ASHBURNER; FERLIE; FITZGERALD, 1996). In this transition, the figure of the manager gains the status of a hero, as opposed to the villains, who congregate politicians, unions, and bureaucrats (Pollitt, 1990).

The essential framework of managerialism, which illustrates the process of solutions coming from the private sector, is the "In Search of Excellence" by Peters and Waterman (1982), in which the authors develop a study in order to identify, among the American organizations, the characteristics which led them to a clique of excellence. Aucoin (1990) considered that it would be possible to convert organizations with swollen bureaucracies into organizational systems that use their resources economically and improve their efficiency by giving priority to the organization's objectives and practices of de-bureaucratization.

In post-redemocratization in Brazil, the managerialism ideas about introducing business logic into public sector activities echoed by the managerial reform model defined by Bresser-Pereira (2001) and instrumented in the "Master Plan for Reforming the State Apparatus", which, among other predictions, attributes to the state public administration schools the responsibility for training and qualifying civil servants to advance public management in order to produce and deliver agile and efficient public services (BRASIL, 1995).

For legislative organizations, the process of redemocratization represented a turning point. On the one hand, the National Congress had a modern computer system. On the other hand, it faced three new challenges arising from the redemocratization process: The first one was the preoccupation of the politicians with their political survival, once that the average renewal rate for parliamentarians during the democratic primary elections, exceeded 60% (ANASTASIA, 1998). Second, the process of creating a new constitution with society direct participation has put the National Congress as a target for a series of new social movements, unions, coalitions and pressure groups that somehow tried to influence the original constitutional text, fostering a culture of participation that would remain beyond the constituent process (VERSIANI, 2010). Finally, after the passage of the new constitution in 1988, the National Congress has acquired new constitutional competencies, for which the composition of a permanent administrative body composed of public servants was imperative.

After the Constituent of 1988, new ideas for modernization began to emerge. In this period, according to Lenardão (2008), these ideals are tied to legal and institutional reforms based on free-market agendas and neoliberal theses. José Sarney, after had been in charge of Brazilian's executive presidency from 1985 to 1990, was elected for a Senate's mandate in 1991 and became its President in 1995, which introduced the neoliberal modernization agenda-setting to the Federal Senate.

The mechanism for administrative modernization adopted in 1995 was the establishment of a working group of three senators. The result of the working group's work was a document entitled "Reengineering of the Legislative: The Experience of the Working Group on the Reform and

Modernization of the Federal Senate" (CALHEIROS, 1995), which was forwarded to the Senate Steering Committee for its consideration about the administrative reform's plan.

Although the plans for the modernization of the administrative apparatus reform of the state and the reengineering of the Legislative Power were under discussion in the same period, some ideas presented in both reform programs were developed in opposite directions. The first one tried to reduce public spending and optimize State's services (ABRUCIO, 2007), while the second plan sought to create a national network of legislative organizations to transmit technologies and training while seeking new forms of connection between the organization and the denizens (CALHEIROS, 1995).

The context of the reform of the Legislative resembles the advent of ideas proposed in the advancement of public administration discussions around the theme of Governance. This concept emerges, according to Löffler (2009), by overcoming the separation between politics and administration, and by the participatory involvement of citizens and institutional actors in the various stages of elaboration and implementation of public policies and laws. The reform of the Legislature opened a double pedagogical agenda. On the one hand, an increasing number of new civil servants should be trained on subjects as diverse as Parliament's scope of action. On the other hand, contact with society should permeate a more open education model, capable of serving not only the administrative body of the houses but also of enabling those who wish to participate in different political arenas.

3. The development of Corporate Universities in the Brazilian Public Sector

Education is a theme that seems always to remain relevant to the agenda of modern societies. According to Éboli (2004, p. 32), "education refers to the intentional and systematic influence on the human being, to form it and develop it in society, to preserve and transmit the collective existence". Thus, the educational process is directly related to the survival of society and its institutions.

However, as the society and its achievements become more complex, the scope of the educational process is broadened, as Schwartzman (1996) points out: "economic, social, cultural and other human activities have become dependent on a considerable volume of knowledge and information "(p.4). Therefore, the acquisition and management of knowledge and information have become critical points in the educational process.

Rodriguez and Dahlman (2008), in a World Bank report on competitiveness in Brazil, indicated education as a critical factor for innovation as a competitive strategy. Under this line, instruction ceases to be just an obligation of the state to become a strategic tool, not only for the government but for any institutions that establish innovation as part of its organizational survival strategy. However, according to Brunner (2001), the school, a traditional reference of educational processes, with the development of society, leaves the strict monopoly of knowledge and teaching

practices, living with complementary forms of production and dissemination of knowledge information.

The private organizations have offered different programs of complementary education under the name of Corporate Education. These programs have evolved from training centers geared to specific activities in the Taylorist model (Bianchi, 2008) for management-oriented and competency-based training courses required for career development through Corporate Universities (CASTRO; ÉBOLI, 2013).

The Public Sector based itself on management reforms and business experiences about Corporate Universities to develop their Government Schools as institutional structures for the professionalization of public servants through the dissemination of knowledge in public administration (PACHECO, 2000).

Through article 4 of Presidential Decree 5,707/2006, Government Schools have been defined as "institutions aimed, in particular, at the formation and development of public servants, included in the structure of the federal public administration, autarchic and foundational" (BRASIL, 2006). From this moment, according to Fernandes (2013, p. 53): "Schools of government become a figure expressly provided for in the constitutional text, maintained within the Union and the states, as a component of the professionalization of the civil service".

In this context, the Schools of Government are restricted to the servers and aim to give them technical training compatible with their areas of activity. Pacheco (2002, p. 76) points out: "This is the focus for the performance of government schools in the current context: helping to produce the desired changes in the public sector, preparing managers and servants for the new management". Government Schools have only an indirect impact on the population, since their results, such as the professionalization of the public sector and the modernization of the state bureaucracy, will only be felt in the long term.

However, as Farah (2011) points out, the increase in the complexity of government activities ends up expanding the public administration public and, therefore, broadens the set of people who need to develop this type of skill. This redefinition of the public highlights the need for an opening of the Government Schools, serving not only public servants but also offering training courses for citizenship to the public. Garcia and Sales (1999) point to the need for training programs that foster vigilance and participation in public administration issues. In a complementary way, Fleury (1999, p. 7) indicates that "the demand for government schools is not just to think in terms executive or legislative, but to think of society itself in its dimension of self-government and its governance dimension of public affairs". Some Government Schools have begun to offer agendas for training programs open to society, in conjunction with their internal training programs.

In this sense, the Legislative Branch finds in its schools both the traditional model of qualification of the legislative houses and an open model for society. Cosson (2008, p. 71) states that:

[...] The "awakening" of the Legislative to the need to have their schools of government is not only a legal gap opened by the Constitution. It is also a response to Parliament's modernization pressures, understood as part of the improvement of public service in general and the professionalism and agility required by contemporary processes of integration and political decision-making. (COSSON, 2008, p. 71).

In this way, it is possible to understand that the Schools of the Legislative are, firstly, Schools of Government, designed for the professionalization of the servants and parliamentarians who work in the legislative houses. However, the very democratic nature of the parliament has made the pedagogical proposal of these schools extrapolate the internal dimensions of parliaments and establish new relations of formation and dialogue with society. Next will be analyzed the trajectories of two of the first Schools of the Legislative: The CEFOR of the Chamber of Deputies and the ILB of the Federal Senate.

4. Administrative Professionalization: The CEFOR case

The origin of the school of the government of the Chamber of Deputies dated 1971 when a new internal structure was created to select and develop the human resources necessary for the exercise of the organization's competences. This structure was called the Coordination of Selection and Training (CST) (ROCHA; MARTINS; PRADO JÚNIOR, 2005). The redemocratization process pressured, as evidenced by resolution 30/1990, for the institutionalization of public tenders as the right way to form the administrative body, as well as, compel the new employers to take part in CST training programs that aimed to increase efficiency and organizational effectiveness by training each employee in their specialty areas.

However, the demand for training intensified in the first years after the introduction of the public tender as a system for the selection of new civil servants and was proposed by the administrative workers to the board by indication number 190/1995 that intended to create a training school for the public servers from legislative (COSSON, 2008).

In 1997, under the chairmanship of Michel Temer, CEFOR was established: Act of the Board 69/1997: Art. 1 - The Center for Training, Training and Improvement of the Servants of the Chamber of Deputies, under the General Board of Directors, is hereby established with the purpose of planning, promoting, executing and evaluating programs and activities for recruitment, selection, updating, perfecting, specializing and developing human resources.

According to Articles 12 and 14 of the Act, CEFOR begins its activities with specific endowment and own staff of the legislative branch. It should be noted that this act of the Bureau regulated Article 58 of Resolution 21/1992, which reads:

Resolution nº 21/1992: Art.58 - The Chamber of Deputies will maintain, in the area of human resources, Center for Training, Training, and Improvement of Servers, in a suitable format to serve as an essential support for the consolidation and development of the career plan.

The original formulation of CEFOR directly links the development of a career plan in the Chamber of Deputies; something new brought directly by the Constitution of 88. The Center was thus formulated to act mainly in the human resources area. Its main activity in origin was of selection, so the structure dealt with more selection than training.

The Center initially reported to the general board, responsible for approving the activities that would be executed. The development of the school in this period runs parallel to the functioning of the Chamber's political arena. At this point, CEFOR was constituted as a training center, but it still had a large part in activities of recruitment and selection.

A breakthrough in CEFOR's institutional development was given in 2000, when the agency expanded its autonomy of action through the approval of its internal regulations, through the Act of the board 41/2000, which provides it with the educational function of training in the areas of technical, managerial and behavioral competencies.

In 2003, through Act 27, CEFOR became part of the Board of Human Resources that was created in the House. In this sense, all the decisions of the training policies are conditioned to the sector of human resources of the organization and begin to distance themselves from the directive board.

With a body of teachers from the organization itself, CEFOR starts to offer specialization courses to the legislative staff. The Center could do this because of a window of opportunity envisioned by the Center with the opening of the Educational Ministry for the special accreditation of Government Schools to offer of *lato sensu* graduate courses. With the certification, the first *lato sensu* graduate courses emerge.

In 2013, CEFOR increased its model of an educational institution, adding its first master's program in Legislative Branch developed entirely by legislative civil servants, with their classes taught by legislative staff. It is the only academic program in Brazil entirely directed to the Legislative Power in Political Science.

According to the report of CEFOR's own Evaluation Committee, in 2017, the Center had three classes of the master program already completed, with 42 graduates, and another three programs in progress. Also, the Center conducted postgraduate specialization programs in eight specialized courses in areas such as law, public policy, and legislative process, as well as programs developed in partnership, such as the Specialization in Social Justice course, developed in collaboration with other organizations in the arrival area.

Until December 2017, the Center offered 33 specialization courses or master's degrees for a group of 852 students, 80% of which were occupied by students of the Chamber of Deputies, and 20% of the vacancies occupied by students from outside the organization. Of the seats held by the members of the organization, 76% of the positions were filled by public servants, 14% by parliamentary secretaries, and 10% by those appointed by the free-appointment posts.

The courses are interconnected with research groups for the development of investigations. The master's program has a journal called E-Legis ranks in Political Science and International Relations. To complete the teaching-research-extension triangle, workshops and other events have been offered to present what is happening in the Chamber of Deputies to different segments of society, with particular emphasis on programs that bring young people closer to the parliament.

The analysis of the parliamentary discourses¹ on CEFOR generated seven categories that depict a slope of the perceptions about the Center that arrived at the tribune of the Chamber of Deputies.

The first of these categories is the "Interaction with society", and it includes the performance of CEFOR with extension arms that allow the participation of society in the activities of the Center. Opening to attend groups outside the professional framework of the Legislative, both with specialization courses and more basic offers, such as the case of literacy. It is this context of interaction that has promoted the processes of opening and welcoming society in CEFOR's plans, bringing it closer to a more open model with greater Public Governance.

Two categories that should be observed together are "Parliamentary Participation" and "Membership of Servers". The references in the speeches of both categories lead to the questioning: Who is CEFOR for? On the one hand, it is possible to follow the Pozer's (2012) line and consider the formation of the teams that keep the institutional memory of the Legislative Houses as an essential purpose, but, on the other hand, it is essential to assume the professionalism as a strong narrative, as pointed by Manning (2011). In this sense, CEFOR has a mission that is broader than the formation of parliamentary advisory services, and it is up to the Center to train parliamentarians and civil servants for the very identity of the legislative function and the knowledge that binds it.

The remaining four categories are deeply interrelated. The idea of "Professionalization" is conceived as an institutional project of the Chamber of Deputies, linked to a human resources development policy. In this sense, "Training" presents the differential of offering postgraduate courses at the level of specialization, both to the employees and to society in general. In this sense, the idea of professionalization transcends the logical structure, based only on the daily process of the server, and reaches a level of search for the excellence of the House's professionals, an idea that follows the managerial model. It is reflected in the "Objectives", in which, in addition to the concern with legislative activities, it is perceived that CEFOR is responsible for disseminating congressional knowledge. The product of this professionalization model is presented as "Result", a system for reflection, systematization, and dissemination of knowledge in Parliament, about Parliament, and for Parliament.

5. Modernization Agenda-setting: The ILB case

In the 1970s, the Federal Senate created the PRODASEN with the function of serving as an instrument for the modernization of the Legislative Power (SIMÕES, 2005). One aspect of the result of substantial investment in technology over time, according to Buarque (2010), is that, from the technological perspective, the Congress is exceptionally modern, serving as a reference for other parliaments around the globe. To be able to assimilate the new technologies, according to Venturelli; Marques (2004), the first Sector of Training and Development of the Federal Senate was created inside Prodasen to teach how to use the new systems.

The mechanism for organizational modernization adopted in 1995 was the establishment of a working group of three senators. The result of the working group's work was a document entitled "Reengineering of the Legislative: The Experience of the Working Group on the Reform and Modernization of the Federal Senate" (CALHEIROS, 1995), which was forwarded to the Senate Steering Committee for its consideration administrative reforms.

The document deals with Legislative Education in different approaches, and in perspective broader than the limits of the organization, as the report proposed to create a corporative school to develop and diffuse to other parliaments the new knowledge derived from technology and managerialism. Based on this conception, the structures of Legislative Education emerged, two in 1997 and one in 2000.

The Brazilian Legislative Institute (ILB) was created from the manifestation of the Presiding Board 09/1997. The resolution clarifies ILB's role in the Senate's training and qualification policy and maintains the possibility of establishing an agreement with other parliaments. However, even in 1997, according to Simões (2005), Prodasen's technicians would come up with a proposal, with international financial support, to interconnect the parliaments and the Audit Courts of the country, thus creating the Interlegis project. This project had as one of its pillars, according to Venturelli and Marques (2004), to reach society by strengthening the structures of the Municipal Councils; taking as one of the paths to this, the offer of face-to-face training and, later, distance education for the technical-administrative staff of the legislative in the municipalities.

Thus, ILB was the first structure to be created. His skills encompassed the performance of the organization's former training areas. In this way, their educational challenges were based on the specific demand presented by the workplaces, however, three requests were essential to their development: First, the universalization of specific knowledge to a universe of approximately 9 thousand people, which led to the employment of online teaching models for essential knowledge such as legislative process and writing. Secondly, the need to train managers for leadership positions led the organization to adopt training programs in the managerial field, to prepare the high administrative rank of the organization. Thirdly, ILB began to use its online platform to teach tutored or not, open to the

population, about subjects of the Legislative Power, and utilizing the knowledge of the staff from inside.

While the ILB was being developed, resources were also directed towards the implementation of the Interlegis Program, which was also created in 1997, and fulfills one of the premises of the Modernization Agenda proposed by the Senate to bring a modernization program to other parliaments. In this sense, the Program is designed with international funding with the aim of share, in the first instance, the technological knowledge accumulated by the Senate, primarily through Prodasen, for other parliaments. As a result, the first network of technology sharing between Parliaments was created, not only allowing the Chambers of remote sites to receive computer equipment, and, secondly, technical knowledge added later to the Legislative Branch, creating the first knowledge network among parliaments.

In 2000, the Federal Senate had two training and training structures: the ILB, with courses designed to train the House's staff, and the Interlegis program, which in addition to providing technology and communication solutions to other Legislative Houses, also offered face-to-face and distance courses for the members of these Houses. A new structure would be added to this context, to specialize in the Federal Senate's servers: Resolution 77/2000 then approved the creation of the University of the Brazilian Legislative - Unilegis.

UNILEGIS sought to fill a gap in the field of academic training: The lack of postgraduate courses aimed at the scopes of the Legislative Branch. Much of the administrative structure in the organization was derived from experiences and training in the private sector, or, when public, it was mainly the Executive's experiences to predominate. In this sense, Parliament could not train its specialists with the specifications and peculiarities of the Legislature. At its inception, UNILEGIS managed graduate programs that were acquired from other academic institutions. Only in 2013, the organization achieved the legal authorization from the Education Ministry and started to offer its graduate courses without the need of external entities, with a staff of teachers from the organization itself.

In the year 2013, by a decision of the Board of Directors, to reduce costs and avoid duplicity of activities, the three structures were wiped out in only one that was renamed ILB / Interlegis. This unified structure has four main axes for its operation. Two axes are derived from the previous experience of ILB and consist of the open courses, with and without tutoring, in the online platform of the Senate called Knowledge Portal, in which more than 30 courses are offered. The other axis refers to technical and managerial training programs aimed at attending to the organization's own employees, whether in day-to-day operations or in the preparation of a career for managerial posts.

From the experience of UNILEGIS, there are four specialization courses taught exclusively by ILB / Interlegis with its own certification, as well as a depository in which the monographs produced in the classes are registered and made available. Finally, the Interlegis Program network continues to be active on the fourth axis, not only as a provider of technology and knowledge to other Legislative

Houses but also as an essential data and informational center for legislative houses, its parliamentarians and its activities.

According to the Institutional Self-Assessment Report of the ILB's Higher Education Coordination for 2017, ILB has 66 teachers who are part of the organization's technical-administrative staff and attended 118 students in four specialization courses offered in the areas of law and constitutionality, public policies, project management, and public budget. A relevant point is the use of the e-learning model to offer more than 30 free-courses with and without the presence of tutors, for partner organizations and society in general, stands out, allowing subjects to be studied in the areas of law, budgetary management, and public policy.

The category that emerges from the Senators' discourses¹ around the ILB theme is Modernization. ILB is understood not only as an educational structure to increase the level of schooling in the organization's technical-administrative area, but also as a tool for political relations with other parliamentary organizations and, in some cases, even with organizations of the Executive Branch. The ILB is mainly mentioned by members of the Board of Directors, who use the courses and events held by the institute as a way of approaching other organizations. In this sense, the ILB not only constitutes a School of Government in conceptual terms, but it is also a tool in the implementation of a narrative of modernization that originates in the '70s and is still developing in the organization.

6. Final Discussion

The Brazilian Parliament has been experiencing a process of administrative modernization that began in the 1970s with the development of technologies and systems to support the parliamentary process. With the Constitution of 88, new challenges are brought by the environment to the organization. The problem is to welcome and respond to a more demanding society; at the same time, it is necessary to respond to the new configurations and attributions that the Constitution grants to the parliamentary organization.

This context requires new knowledge, skills, and competencies that need to be assimilated and disseminated quickly, while legislative organization becomes increasingly complex. This scenario of change coincides with the context of modernization expressed by Giddens (1991) and Huntington (1998). However, within the legislative organizations, the concept of modernization is not always linked to an idea of positive change in the organization.

Often, the narrative of modernization is considered as a soft reform. According to Wahrlich's (1974) thought, modernization is a process that takes place through the adoption of the admittedly modernizing elements. However, throughout the recent history of Brazilian's National Congress, there has not always been convergence on what such elements should be. These soft reforms were adopted by the Executive Boards that followed in both Houses so that the administrative staff was driven by political will. Considering the mismatch between management's vision and political vision, and how

rare are the times in which this marriage occurs, the idea of modernization has in many cases become a synonym for conflict between the interests of the administrative area and the political arena.

Each legislative House solved this conflict of modernization differently. In CEFOR, there is a bureaucratic insulation strategy. It is because CEFOR is out of the focus of most parliamentarians, and many parliamentarians are unaware of its existence. According to Nunes (1997, p. 34): "Bureaucratic insulation means reducing the scope of the arena in which popular interests and demands may play a role". The insulation of CEFOR implies a very small involvement of the political area in the functioning and decisions of the Center so that the technical and administrative staff assumes the conduct and development of the activities in their own interests.

Already in the ILB, the proximity of the structure of the School with the political arena is higher than CEFOR's case. At the same time, it is necessary to highlight one element of differentiation among the Federal Senate and other Legislative Houses: it is the only Parliament in which the mandate of its members takes along eight years, while in other Houses, this time is only of four years. Nevertheless, the Senate framework is always renewed in one or two-thirds proportion. At the beginning of the conception of the Federal Senate in Brazil Empire, the mandates were permanent. It portrays a more institutionalized legislative organization than the others. Possibly this higher degree of institutionalization allows the Parliament to have more time and attention to the issues of the legislative organization. By being more institutionalized, the Federal Senate conceived the idea of a modernization of the legislature that went beyond the institutional limits of the organization. At the same time, however, much was attached to the development of the structures that today converge for ILB to the policy decisions of the Executive Boards.

The administrative modernization of these two organizations is related to the bureaucratic reforms developed by the Executive Branch from the *Estado Novo*. However, they are only manifested in Parliament after the re-democratization and the new Constitution of 1988, at which time Parliament has a permanent administrative body. After 1995, the Executive Branch began adopting new conceptions from the management field, as the New Public Management, resulting in the State Management Reform. With the opening of competitions in the Legislative Houses and the interlocutions with the other branches and society, the management culture approached the administrative body of the Parliaments, leading to a new conception of modernization as an adoption of some managerial elements and the development of training programs in this area.

The Legislative Schools were born under a conception of the administrative modernization to the Parliament, to increase the professionalization of the legislature, and to strengthen the Parliament's activities. However, with the advancement of managerial ideas and their assimilation within the Legislative Houses, the Schools have become centers of legitimization and dissemination of concepts, techniques, and tools, especially management, a process that sometimes places administrative and political interests on opposite sides.

The study has limitations inherent to its exploratory research model, as well as the limited number of cases analyzed. It is not intended here to exhaust the examination of the relationship between Parliament's proposals for modernization and the process of setting up legislative schools. Contrariwise, it is meant to instigate a research agenda in the field of Public Administration so that other legislative experiences at different levels, from states and municipalities, could be investigated, allowing a better understanding of the directions that the narratives of modernization and professionalization have taken in various organizations from Legislative Power in Brazil.

References

- ABRUCIO, F. L. Trajetória recente da gestão pública brasileira: um balanço crítico e a renovação da agenda de reformas. **Revista de Administração Pública**, v. 41, p. 67-86, edição especial, 2007.
- ANASTASIA, F. Mudanças Institucionais e Renovação na Assembleia. **Revista do Legislativo**, v. 7, n. 24, p. 29-34, 1998.
- ARANDA, J. T. La Administración parlamentaria en la encrucijada de la renovación. **Corts: Anuario de Derecho Parlamentario**, v. 23, p. 157-191, 2010.
- ASHBURNER, L., FERLIE, E., FITZGERALD, L. Organizational transformation and top-down change: the case of the NHS. **British Journal of Management**, v. 7, n. 1, p. 1-16, 1996.
- BIANCHI, E. M. P. G. Didática e educação corporativa: o desafio empresarial da educação continuada. **Revista Gerenciais**, v. 7, n. 1, p. 73-82, 2008.
- BOBBIO, N.; METTEUCCI, N.; PASQUINO, G. Dicionário de Política. 5ª ed., vol. 2. Brasília: Ed. UnB; São Paulo: Imprensa Oficial do Estado de São Paulo, 2000.
- BRASIL, Presidência da República. Leis. **Decreto n. 5.707**. Diário Oficial da União, Seção 1, Brasília, 24 fev., p. 3, 2006.
- BRASIL, Presidência da República. **Plano Diretor da Reforma do Aparelho do Estado**. Brasília: Ministério da Administração Federal e Reforma do Estado, 1995.
- BRESSER-PEREIRA, L. C. Do Estado Patrimonial ao Gerencial. In: PINHEIRO, W.; SACHS, I.; WILHEIM, J. (orgs.). **Brasil: Um Século de Transformações**. São Paulo: Cia. das Letras, 2001.
- BRUNNER, J. J. Globalización y el futuro de la educación: precisiones, desafíos, estrategias. In: UNESCO/OREALC. **Análisis de perspectivas de la educación en América Latina y el Caribe**. Santiago: Oficina Regional de Educación de la UNESCO para América Latina y el Caribe.
- BUARQUE, C. A Modernização do Senado Federal. In: VELLOSO, J. P. R. (Coord.). **Construindo Sociedade Ativa e Moderna e Consolidando o Crescimento com Inclusão Social**. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. José Olympio, 2010.
- CALHEIROS, R. (Coord.). **Reengenharia do Legislativo: A experiência do Grupo de Trabalho de Reforma e Modernização do Senado Federal**. Brasília, Senado Federal, 1995.
- CARVALHO, M. A. A influência de Hobbes, Locke e Rousseau na formação do Parlamento moderno. **Revista de Informação Legislativa**, v. 40, n. 160, p. 261-268, 2003.

- CASTRO, C. M.; EBOLI, M. Universidade Corporativa: Gênese e Questões Críticas Rumo à Maturidade. **Revista de Administração de Empresas**, v. 59, n. 4, p. 408-414, 2019.
- COGHILL, K.; HOLLAND, P.; DONOHUE, R.; ROZZOLI, K.; GRANT, G. Professional development programmes for members of parliament. **Parliamentary Affairs**, v. 61, n. 1, p. 73-98, 2007.
- COSSON, R. J. Entre dois modelos: o Cefor como escola de governo. **E-legis**, n. 1, p. 44-51, 2008.
- DENHARDT, R. B.; BAKER, D. L. Five Great Issues in Organization Theory. In: RABIN, J. et al (Org.). **Handbook of Public Administration**. 3ª ed. New York: Taylor & Francis Group, 2007.
- DIXON, J.; KOUZMIN, A.; KORAC-KAKABADSE, N. Managerialism-something old, something borrowed, little new: Economic prescription versus effective organizational change in public agencies. **International Journal of Public Sector Management**, v. 11, n. 2, p. 164-187, 1998.
- EGERBERG, M.; GORNITZKA, Å.; TRONDAL, J.; JOHANNESSEN, M. The European Parliament Administration: Organizational Structure and Behavioral Implications. In: BAUER, M. W.; TRONDAL, J. (Ed.) **The Palgrave Handbook of the European Administrative System**. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- FARAH, M. F. S. Administração pública e políticas públicas. **Revista de Administração Pública**, v. 45, n. 3, p. 813-836, 2011.
- FARIA, M. A. **Diálogo com o tempo: 170 anos do Legislativo Mineiro**. Belo Horizonte: Assembléia Legislativa do Estado de Minas Gerais, 2005.
- FERNANDES, C. C. O tema das escolas de governo na emenda da reforma administrativa. **Res Pública - Revista de Políticas Públicas e Gestão Governamental**, v. 12, n. 2, p. 45-56, 2013.
- FLEURY, S. [Apresentação em Seminário]. In: **Estado e Sociedade: Novas Relações**. Recife: Fundação Joaquim Nabuco/Escola de Governo e Políticas Públicas, 1998.
- FLORES, J. G. **Análisis de datos cualitativos: aplicaciones a la investigación educativa**. Tesis de Doctorado, Universidad de Sevilla, Sevilla-España.
- GARCIA, M. V.; SALES, R. O papel da escola de governo na construção de uma nova relação entre Estado e terceiro setor: da desconfiança à parceria. **Revista Paranaense de Desenvolvimento**, n. 96, p. 77-89, 1999.
- GIDDENS, A. **As conseqüências da modernidade**. São Paulo: Ed. UNESP, 1991.
- HOOD, C. The “new public management” in the 1980s: Variations on a theme. **Accounting, Organizations and Society**, v. 20, n. 2, p. 93-109, 1995.
- HUNTINGTON, S. P. **El choque de las civilizaciones y la reconfiguración del orden mundial**. Cuadernos de estrategia, v. 99, p. 239-248, 1998.
- LENARDÃO, E. A relação entre “modernização” neoliberal e práticas políticas “atrasadas” no Brasil dos anos 1990. **Revista de sociologia e política**, v. 16, n. 31, p. 197-214, 2008.
- LIMONGI, F. Estudos Legislativos. In: LESSA, R.; MARTINS, C. B. (Org.). **Horizontes das Ciências Sociais no Brasil: Ciência Política**. São Paulo: ANPOCS, 2010.
- LÖFFLER, E. **Why co-production is an important topic for local government**. London: LARCI, 2009.

MANNING, P. A Model Parliament for Canada. **Canadian Parliamentary Review**, v. 34, n. 4, p. 10-16, 2011.

NUNES, E. **A gramática política do Brasil: clientelismo e insulamento burocrático**. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Jorge Zahar; Brasília: ENAP, 1997.

PACHECO, R. S. Escolas de governo como centros de excelência em gestão pública: a perspectiva da ENAP. **Revista do Serviço Público**, v. 53, n. 1, p. 75-88, 2002.

PACHECO, R. S. Escolas de governo: tendências e desafios – ENAP-Brasil em perspectiva comparada. **Revista do Serviço Público**, v. 51, n. 2, p. 35-53, 2000.

PETERS, T. J., WATERMAN, R. H., JONES, I. **In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies**. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.

POLLITT, C. **Managerialism and the public services: The Anglo-American experience**. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.

POZER, V. **An Innovation in Parliamentary Staff Training**. **Canadian Parliamentary Review**, v. 35, n. 4, p. 32-35, 2012.

ROCHA, H. S. N.; MARTINS, M.; PRADO JÚNIOR, T. X. **Projeto político-pedagógico para o Centro de Formação, Treinamento e Aperfeiçoamento da Câmara dos Deputados**. Monografia do Curso de Especialização em Gestão Estratégica de Pessoas da Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais. Belo Horizonte: UFMG, 2005.

RODRIGUEZ, A. C.; DAHLMAN, J. S. **Knowledge and Innovation for Competitiveness in Brazil**. Washington, DC: The World Bank, 2008.

SARAIVA, L. A. S. Cultura organizacional em ambiente burocrático. **Revista de Administração Contemporânea**, v. 6, n. 1, p. 187-207, 2002.

SCHWARTZMAN, S. **América Latina: universidades en transición**. Washington, DC: Organización de los Estados Americanos, 1996.

SILVESTRE, H. C. **Gestão Pública: Modelos de Prestação no Serviço Público**. Lisboa: Escolar Editora, 2010.

SIMÕES, M. Prodasen - 33 anos de história. **Senatus**, v. 4, n. 1, p. 70-76, 2005.

THELEN, K. Historical institutionalism in comparative politics. **Annual Review of Political Science**, v. 2, n. 1, p. 369-404, 1999.

VENTURELLI, T. A.; MARQUES, J. R. Da evolução da educação na Sociedade para a educação no Legislativo. **Senatus**, v. 3, n. 1, p. 48-52, 2004.

VERSIANI, M. H. Uma República na Constituinte (1985-1988). **Revista Brasileira de História**, v. 30, n. 60, p. 233-252, 2010.

WAHRLICH, B. M. S. Reforma administrativa federal brasileira: passado e presente. **Revista de Administração Pública**, v. 8, n. 2, p. 27-75, 1974.

WEBER, M. **Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft**. Abteilung III of Grundriss der Sozialökonomik (S. Altmann, Ed.). Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1922.

WOODROW, W. The study of administration. **Political Science Quarterly**, v. 2, n. 2, p. 197-222, 1887.

YIN, R. K. **Estudo de Caso - Planejamento e Métodos**. 5. ed. Porto Alegre: Bookman, 2015.