The promise of certainty: a critique of educational innovation

José Alfonso Jiménez Moreno*
Andrea Romero Mojica**

Translation to English by Moisés Silva

Abstract

The article focuses on an analysis of the foundations of the concept of educational innovation, and particularly on its relationship with the use of technology, as a result of the needs derived from the recent SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. Through a review of the origins of the concept of innovation and an analysis from the philosophical perspective of the performance society, the text contributes to the discussion on the foundations and orientations of pedagogical practices based on the concept of educational innovation in the times of a pandemic. For this purpose, the essay feeds on the philosophical postulates of freedom and modernity, offering the possibility of contributing to a reflection on the scope and risks of the use of educational innovation as an unquestionable guide to educational work in the midst of a pandemic.

Keywords: educational innovation – educational technology – performance – modernity – education in pandemic.

Introduction

2020 will be remembered as a watershed year for education worldwide. Due to the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, formal educational systems all over the world were faced with the challenge of upholding the right to education of their population in a sanitary scenario that required distance between people. This challenge, unheard of in all nations, implied meeting important health, social and educational demands never encountered before. In such a demanding environment, characterized by uncertainty in most realms of human activity, educational systems resorted to an abrupt implementation of digital media (Ramírez-Montoya, 2020), which became an emergency source of tools for the actors of education to continue their work and keep in touch with

* Ph.D. in Pedagogy. Research Professor at the Educational Research and Development Institute, Autonomous University of Baja California, Mexico. jose.alfonso.jimenez.moreno@uabc.edu.mx
** M. A. in Pedagogy. Professor at the Autonomous University of Baja California, Mexico. andrea.romero.mojica@uabc.edu.mx

their students, providing them with the opportunity to continue their studies. These actions sought to safeguard the right to education despite the sanitary measures taken to maintain physical distance.

Regardless of this context, it is important to keep in mind the fact that the aim to implement and use digital technology and media in education was not brought about by the pandemic, since a number of ways to use technology to promote learning have been sought for decades. According to Rodríguez (1998), the intention of taking advantage of technological capabilities in education is broadly related to the incorporation of the idea of a society of knowledge, in which technology becomes a key element. The period of the pandemic witnessed the use of developments in technology to ensure education even in the uncertain conditions in which societies sought to function daily. The trend to use digital media in education has been part of the educational realm for decades now, since it is closely linked to the innovation of educational processes (Cruz, Roda, 2017). Innovation in education originates in the idea of adapting education to the changes in a society of knowledge (UNESCO, 2016), and although it is not exclusively related to the use of technology, it does have a close link. In the context of a pandemic the innovative view on education, along with technological strategies, took on a primary role, adding not only to the demands that arose but also to the intention of adapting and modifying processes already suggested by UNESCO.

The Latin American approach to educational innovation has been characterized by the intention of modifying pedagogical and technical elements in different realms of education (management, teaching, evaluation) with a strong external influence – such as the UNESCO 's views mentioned above – in order to achieve what was regarded as *quality education* (Ezpeleta, 2004). This way of thinking about education, mediated and driven by innovation in its methodology and operation, as well as closely related to technology, became more apparent during the pandemic, since the presence of coronavirus led Latin American educational institutions to confront demands of technological innovation in didactic and even educational management issues (Ramírez-Montoya, 2020). Although for many years educational institutions had taken on the challenge of incorporating the ideas of innovation and quality in their daily work, the pandemic strengthened this process.

With this in mind, universities made significant efforts to move their teaching processes toward technological environments and media (Moreno-Correa, 2020). This was particularly complex, not only due to the technological infrastructure inequalities and precariousness that characterizes Latin American communities, but also because teachers, administrative staff and students were not necessarily familiar with this kind of model (Moreno-Correa, 2020). Faced with this complexity there are several scenarios that invite reflection, from didactic analyses and proposals with digital mechanisms to analyses of the inequalities in the students' conditions of life for online learning, models for work in educational management, and even reflection on

the technological devices themselves. However, in all of these possibilities the idea of innovation appears as the hinge that makes changes possible in the realm of action on education. In the words of UNESCO (2016: 14), "innovation is not mere improvement but transformation, breaking away with current schemes and culture." Thus, innovation became a very important concept, not only because the sanitary conditions required rethinking educational models but also because it is a common issue in education (Gracia, 2017). In this context, characterized by a palpable uncertainty and the need to make decisions abruptly, innovation – and in particular, its relationship with the technological mediation of educational processes – seemed to be the driving concept that enabled thinking about media, tools, and processes to favor the continuity and assurance of the right to education in the context of a pandemic.

Indeed, innovation works as an axis that offers relative certainty in times of daily uncertainty, thanks to its nature as a drive towards constant modification. However, it is also important to analyze the concept of innovation itself, its philosophical foundations, its scope and limitations, to avoid taking it for granted. The aim of this kind of reflection is to contribute to the discussion on the foundations of pedagogical practices in the middle of a pandemic and a post-pandemic, as well as on the limits and possibilities of use of technology for educational purposes.

To achieve this aim, this paper offers through theoretical and conceptual analysis a critical look upon innovation – particularly when related to the use of technologies as an operational mechanism of quality education – based on the philosophical assumptions of the achievement society analyzed by Han (2012; 2014), based in turn on Foucault's and Heidegger's ideas. Although innovation in education may be approached from different angles, some of them not necessarily related with the use of technologies, our analysis is focused only on that relationship, seeking to reflect on the ways of working promoted as a result of the coronavirus pandemic. To accomplish this goal, we will now provide a brief review of the concept of innovation in education, a reflection on the basis of this concept, and an analysis though the orientations of the achievement society. This will include reflections on the scope and risks of the use of educational innovation as the unquestionable guide of educational work.

Innovation in education: idea and concept

Innovation as a concept did not have its origin in education but in the realm of business. The move from this realm into education stems from the search for modernization processes in schools (UNESCO, 2016). The history of the concept of innovation dates back to the 1960s and reached its heyday in the 1990s, when it helped to justify de-centralizing policies (UNESCO, 2016) according to the educational modernization processes of the decade throughout Latin America (López, Flores, 2006).

In 2005 the Organization for Cooperation and Economic Development (OCDE) published the Oslo Manual (Collado, 2020), a document that has worked as an important guide to the im-

plementation of an innovation ideology in several countries. Among its orientations it remarks that innovation is founded on a number of ideas that, esentially, provide a sense of a continuous need of improvement within schools. The uncertainty that characterizes globalized contexts, the different needs of investment and diversification, a constant technological overflow, the generation and utilization of new knowledge in different areas, as well as the need to take advantage of competitive edges, are the basic elements that demand implementing innovative processes. Thus, the idea of innovation is grounded in the intention of creating, managing, and disseminating new knowledge to generate competitiveness within changing and globalized contexts. From this standpoint, innovation is understood as the development or adjustment of mechanisms or artifacts that can be commercialized and that bring about an economic benefit for those who promote it (Ortiz, 2020).

Despite its clear foundations in the administrative and corporate realm, the use of the term *innovation* in education is grounded particularly in the pragmatic notion of the usefulness of education (Cruz, Croda, 2017), which gives it a key role in the intentions of global economic competitiveness as outlined by the World Economic Forum (Higuera, 2020). This grounding of the use of the concept as the pragmatic basis for the development of educational oriented towards change stems from political intentions that go beyond its origin in the corporate world. In education, innovation promotes an ideology that strengthens the mercantilization of everything related to knowledge (Heredia, Torres, Vega, 2020). Thus, the concept of innovation is positioned as an ideal of what is expected in education, under a strong mercantile and corporate influence (Cruz, Croda, 2017). Based on this ideology, it has been entrenched in education as inextricably linked to the need of change, which requires that anyone immersed in it become aware of how pressing its modification is in order to maintain a certain level of competitiveness in a globalized context (García, 2001). However, under this constant ideal of change the use of innovation as a guideline for educational praxis has become a disproportionate endeavour, without any further reflection on or about it (Gracia, 2017).

The intention of constant change, supported by the modernization ideas of the previous century, has become a hinge for the implementation of competitiveness mechanisms in different nations, corresponding to a globalized context to which education cannot remain indifferent. Thus, innovation strengthens the idea that education is subservient to the economic competitiveness intentions of globalized states. As UNESCO (2016) itself remarks, the demands established by economic processes based in competitiveness become entrenched with the aim of fostering in society a culture of change.

With the goal of implementing processes that enable educational systems to meet the demands of competitiveness – as well as adapting to remote modes of work, as happened in the context of the pandemic – new ways to improve pedagogical activities were sought (UNESCO, 2016). Thus, there were criteria that intended to orientate innovative actions in education. In

that respect, Ortega *et al.* (2007) share some criteria: Novelty, regarding an established situation, Intentions of improvement, Interiorization or acceptance by those involved (that is, at the pleasure of educational communities), Creativity; Sistematization; Depth, generating changes in the perceptions of the agents of education, Pertinence of the actions in their socio-educational context, Orientation towards results, Permanence, seeking its consolidation in their context, Anticipation of possible future problems, Changes in the culture or ways to conceive education, and Articulation of efforts.

All of these criteria revolve around the axis of novelty aimed at change but in a systematized and coordinated way, as well as acceptance in the communities and a strong orientation towards results. Thus, innovation is grounded on disposition (Ortiz, 2020), and therefore freedom of action. In this way, innovation is a process that is always necessarily unfinished (UNESCO, 2014), with the aim of offering solutions to a concrete requirement o need of a given context in education (Aguilar, 2020). Thus, it is assumed that processes can be constantly improved indefinitely, but always oriented to a dynamism that allows for educational adaptations to the demands of the context (Cruz, Croda, 2017).

In this respect, innovation is an ideal concept based on the need of change, driven by the implementation of economic policies of competitiveness and freedom of action, and strongly oriented towards results and competitiveness. In the task of consolidating the innovative intention in education UNESCO has been a key player, with arguments such as:

> Innovation in education is a deliberate and planned act to solve problems that aims to achieve better quality in the students' learning, going beyond the traditional paradigm. It involves overcoming academicist knowledge and going from the passive learning of the student to a conception in which learning is interaction and is constructed by everyone (UNESCO, 2014, in UNESCO, 2016: 1).

The aim of the intentions of innovation expressed by UNESCO is to orientate education towards action and what they call *educational quality*, leaving behind academicist views and aiming them strongly towards action. However, these intentions are not very precise in their philosophical and pedagogical foundations. As Reyes (2019: 67) argues:

> The field of innovation in education and the application of new technologies to the teaching and learning processes are generally more under the pressure of developing modernizing educational practices than well grounded on theoretical and pedagogical principles.

The idea of innovation is not very clear about its foundations in the realm of education. However, it has been taken up as a banner of the need of change, of something new, and of the positive trend towards improvement. This leads to an important paradox, since although

constant and unfinished improvement is sought for the sake of maintaining competitiveness, those educational practices that yield better results are often the longer-lasting ones. Therefore, constant and undiscriminate updating threatens the effectiveness that innovation seeks (Gracia, 2017).

In an uncertain, open, technologized and globalized educational context, as was the case during the coronavirus pandemic, it is perfectly understandable that people search for ideals to orient actions geared towards assuring the right to education through transformations of outdated practices. The constant search for innovative practices offered the possibility of adaptation to an uncertain context, taking advantage of decades of research on the use of technologies to ensure the students' learning. With this dynamics, the intention of innovation as something new and positive represents a possible way to construct certainties in complex and uncertain contexts, even in spite of the vagueness of its theoretical-pedagogical foundations.

In its reforming sense, educational innovation is often linked to technology. This has been done historically (Collado, 2020). Although the use of technology in the educational realm might represent a reduction of the idea of change to a single element (Cruz, Croda, 2017), it gives it a strong instrumental and pragmatic sense (Higuera, 2020), which consolidates the idea of "going beyond the traditional" (Reyes, 2019: 67). Considering that the purpose of innovation resides or lies mainly in change intended towards improvement, it becomes necessary to have an impact on the processes of formation and evaluation of teachers for this intention to be articulated pragmatically through technological resources (Michavila, 2009). The use of technology based on the innovative intention in the context of a pandemic has been a characteristic intention to ensure management, teaching and learning processes (Moreno-Correa, 2020; Ramírez-Montoya, 2020). This nuance is relevant, since technology in the educational realm no longer represents just the modification of didactic paradigms but, under the condition of social distancing, universities sought to adapt to this form of working. Thus, a new educational paradigm has appeared (Moreno-Correa, 2020), albeit in a somewhat forced way due to mankind's sanitary conditions.

This situation entails a number of criticisms. For instance, from the standpoint of infrastructure, it is clear that in unequal societies – as is the case in Latin America – this kind of conditions are significantly different among their members (Bautista, 2020), so the unification of innovative ways of working based on technology becomes a difficult possibility to achieve. From another viewpoint, it is worth mentioning that, even before the pandemic, the curricular structures that support teaching did not experience an innovative updating (Díaz-Barriga, 2020) but maintained a traditional didactic structure.

With at least these two examples in the panorama, the educational innovation supported by technologies derived from the pandemic period is not easy to address. Not only does it cease to be an option for transformation, but it also becomes consolidated as the hegemonic value

through which the fulfillment of the right to education is established, although paradoxically it opened gaps in the exercise of that right due to problems of infrastructure and social inequality. Furthermore, since it was only viewed from a pragmatic perspective, there was no structural modification of the curricula that supported the intentions of learning. As Collado (2020) argues, the incorporation of technologies should not be an end but a means that should be taken advantage of to engage in a critical and creative practice fostered by teachers and schools according to issues in their context.

Thus, the concept of innovation should not be reduced to the intention of improvement itself: it entails a consideration of its foundations in different realms of human activity. A first element is the political intentions that support its action, such as the implementation of innovative ideology as a means of reproduction of educational systems focused on competitiveness, and therefore economic (Higuera, 2020). A second moment is modernization in education, seeking decentralization, as well as the pragmatic and comercial usefulness of education (López, Flores, 2006), without forgetting the impact on curricular and didactic issues that orient the practice of education towards utilitarian goals (Gracia, 2017). Among these interweavings, the role of technology and innovation in education within a context of uncertainty opens up different possibilities worth reflecting on.

Freedom and innovation

The pragmatic value that characterizes innovation derives from the continual intention of change in the forms of work in education. Of course, in the context of a pandemic that forced a modification of educational systems for the sake of reducing the risk of contagion in the best possible way, the use of the idea of innovation as the guide of educational activities was something organic, even perceived as necessary. Regardless of the origin of the term, its scopes and limitations, as well as the political ideas it propagates, it reflects a philosophical outlook characterized by the unfinished, positivity, and constant productivity.

The intention of constant productivity that gives meaning to innovation is strongly influenced by the idea of freedom, which is one of the main characteristics of contemporary individuals. We must also remember that innovation in education is only meaningful when it is founded on the disposition and willingness of improvement (Ortiz, 2020). We live in the midst of freedom of thought, of expression, of work, and of action. This freedom in which we live is founded, in the ideology of modernity, as one of the motivational guidelines of human endeavours. At this point it might be useful to highlight some of the guidelines of modern ideology. As Serrano (2005) explains, modernity, characterized by social changes experienced since the age of Enlightenment, can be identified – among other things – by the transition from a contemplative life to an active one. An active life makes it possible for mankind not to be subjected to a natural order of things or of the cosmos (Serrano, 2005): the normative relativity of the order of things

has established different perspectives to understand reality, thus giving rise to individuality and freedom. The impossibility of accepting that life has a pre-established order, but that it may be analyzed instead from different angles – particularly the rational and scientific one – established individual and libertarian thought. After modernity, humans are able to exercise their freedom as the means of a possibility of self-confirmation.

Freedom and modern individualism are two concepts that go hand in hand. They are a social behavior that implies that "the atom of human reality is the single individual" (Echeverría, 2009: 11). Freedom of thought and action are manifested in individuality and viceversa. The freedom that gives meaning to the individual is potentiated in action and freedom itself is exercised through work: "Turning work into the quintessential model of active life propitiated the limitless value given to technique, as a means to produce instruments that alleviate the fatigue linked to it" (Serrano, 2005: 23).

Work and technique are thus two key concepts that foster the freedom of modern human beings. It is through these concepts that people attain the means for their survival and incorporation to society, but mostly through which they achieve their individuality. The appropriation of nature through technique led to the condition of man's possibility of work as characteristic – what Arendt called *animal laborans* (Heredia, Torres, Vega, 2020). These modern subjects, influenced by the idea of freedom and technique, as well as the mastery of nature as a means of individual emancipation, and in turn focused on work and technique as a necessary means of exercising their freedom, act towards their individuality, living nevertheless as captives of themselves. According to Han (2012), a life centered in freedom represents, paradoxically, being chained to oneself.

In the exercise of freedom, technique and continual work establish what Byung Chul-Han (2012) would call an excess of positivity and a diminution of otherness, both concepts belonging to the society of achievement. That is, the idea of freedom that permeates contemporary life favors continuous and perpetual work in which the possibility of individual development is necessarily manifested. It is this intention that fosters: *a)* an overflowing of optimistic life, *b)* the nullification of the existence of the dialectic barriers that the other represents, and even *c)* the impossibility of moments of rest and contemplation.

In the first moment, the excess de positivity that characterizes contemporary life is a much more effcient means of control of human action than the disciplinary society pointed to by Foucault (1980). For Foucault, a society implied a network of devices oriented towards control through negativity, a *no*, rejection, repression, and punishment. Through repression and limitation societies establish dialectic dynamics between the actor and the oppressor in which individual and social development is made possible and maintained. It is through dialectic relationships between opponents and limitations of action that societies of repression make social conformity possible. From this philosophical perspective, negation or the possibility of not

doing is necessary, since it is through limitation that freedom of action has a possibility of manifesting itself.

However, in modern life the overflowing of optimistic life, positivity and continual growth knows no limits, which paradoxically is much more efficient than repression to foster disproportionate productity, thus feeding a system focused on production. Byung Chul-Han (2012) calls this the *achievement society*. This society, not characterized by coertion but by the infinite possibility of the exercise of freedom (and with it leading human beings to find their individuality), generates a maximization of the *can do*. In this potentialization of infinite freedom and a continual *can do*, the value of the negative is dissipated. As such, in this intention of limitless development of freedom and a constant exercise of unfinished, there is no punishment but oversaturation.

Agreeing with Arendt, Han (2012) reasserts the idea that human beings today reduce our condition to that of *animal laborans*, which means that we value ourselves as agents focused on productivity; that is, through technique as a means to master nature. Active life, wholly focused on productivity and positivity – where everything is possible and achivement prevails – is accompanied by a sense of freedom, but at the same time a feeling of fatigue and depression. This depression through burnout is caused by the pressure towards achievement that supports our condition as *animal laborans*. However, the promise of freedom offered by overproductivity is set as an unquestionable aim.

Even before the pandemic, the achievement society in which the messages of productivity and excessive positivity permeated the world of education. Exercises discussed in other spaces (Jiménez, 2019) reflect on how freedom and the achievement society break with the dialectic vision that permeated Foucault's disciplinary society. In the order of discipline a dialectics of master and slave was established in which the worker maintained ruptures and opposing positions with the employer, thus maintaining a necessary tension that generated symbolisms, meanings, and power structures. In the achievement society that dialectic relationship becomes non-existent. Now, with the idea of freedom, the human being becomes a slave of himself (Han, 2012), since no coertion is required to establish a dynamics of over-exploitation and ceaseless productivity. This manifests itself in the idea of educational innovation, which as can be seen may be regarded as an ideological mechanism of the achievement society, focused on productivity and ceaseless change.

Under the innovative mechanism in education, the constant need of improvement and the non-existent opportunity of rest found fertile soil for development during the pandemic caused by Covid-19. Now educational agencies and agents are in constant freedom of conducting their classes online, answering e-mails and doing work in real time, associating with agents at great distances that are shortened by a single click, or carrying out constant innovations. Thus, the barriers to productivity become non-existant. Freedom of action as such is potentialized in

a literally boundless way. Paradoxically, as Han (2012) argues, the hiperactivity offered by this perspective becomes the most passive thing, since there is no way to refuse its imposition.

Innovation and digital life

As it has been argued above, the process of innovation in education has traditionally been linked to digital life or to the use of technologies in education, and although these are tools used by the ideological mechanism of innovation (Michavila, 2009), their relationship is not exclusive. Technological tools and digital media in education, traditionally associated as a support mechanism to innovation, were used in an almost absolute way in the work plans during the pandemic crisis brought on by the coronavirus (Escudero-Nahón, Ramírez-Montoya, 2021). Some criticisms to this were usually limited to the way populations with little access to infraestructura, technology, and connectivity, were excluded from educational processes (Loyd, 2020). However, added to the criticism about issues of equality and inclusion – which is not only valid but also necessary – it is also worthwhile to reflect on how the digital life that characterized innovation throughout the pandemic had some implications for the conformation of individuals. Digital life has taken on an important role in the practice of education since the late 1990s (Area, 2018), providing the opportunity to communicate and link the different agents of education despite physical distances. In this intention of union, digital life offers a significant paradox: it also brings with it the need of isolation (Han, 2014).

According to Byung Chul-Han (2014) digital media, in their intention of union and destruction of spatial distances between individuals, bring with them a deterioration of social relationships. Even though these media favor the immediate transmission of information, they do not necessarily permit the conformation of an *us*. In digital life the union of the agents is oversimplified and becomes linear relationships. Just like the achievement society fosters an excess of positivity, also digital life, through the oversimplification and linearity of complex processes, erases any possible negativity (Han, 2014). Only productivity is feasible in digital life.

Life in the digital realm favors productivity and continual innovation, diluting again the dialectic processes that characterize the individual's identity construction. As for virtual activity, digital media managed to erase not only physical but also temporal distances. Classes, e-mails, readings, are now present in our digital devices all the time. This, although apparently favorable during the pandemic, has prevented people from separating their leisure time from the tireless possibility of constant work (Han, 2014). Thus, digital life reasserted the intentions of continual productivity and positivity as well as the burnout society created through the implementation of the idea of innovation in the realm of education.

Not only did the idea of limitless productivity take root in digital life during the pandemic, but also that of freedom. Now it is possible to have access to open educational resources, virtual classrooms, editing software, didactic tools, videos, and readings, all of them available with no physical or temporal limits. It is possible to exercise freedom of action and work without any

limitation whatsoever (Han, 2012). This, added to the factors mentioned above, strengthens individualism (Han, 2014).

Working immersed in digital life and using innovation as a banner have become two ideological mechanisms for productivity (strongly influenced by economic interests). As argued above, the apparent freedom exercised by people in their participation as innovative agents limits the freedom that actually exists. The agents of education – educational systems, institutions, managers, teachers, and students themselves – no longer have the opportunity to reject digital work or innovation. As Moreno-Correa (2020) argues, the permanence of teachers online is essential to guarantee that the learning objectives are met. Rejecting that would imply denying the possibility of participating in educational life. Moreover, it would symbolically represent renouncing innovation; that is, renouncing the positive. However, it is worth pondering if that continual digital positivity without dialectic barriers, which supports innovation and digital life, really represents the possibility of freedom it promises.

By way of conclusion

The aim of this text was to offer, through a conceptual discussion, a critique of the concept of innovation in education based on the theoretical guidelines established by philosopher Byung Chul-Han, particularly through his approach to what he calls the *achievement society*. This method helped to elucidate the following elements: *a)* the origin and intentions that support innovation in the realm of education, *b)* the role of the idea of freedom in shaping the concept of innovation, and *c)* the way in which digital life reasserts the ideological domination intentions of productivity and positivity.

In order to approach critically the idea of innovation in education we must acknowledge it as a concept that seeks to offer certainty in times of ambiguity for educational planning by offering, through the aim of continual improvement, a degree of certainty that our actions and plans will tend towards improvement. Likewise, besides this ideological intention, it is a political mechanism focused on limitless productivity. By accepting that economic competitiveness is inevitable, the idea of innovation becomes the guide through which the different agents of education pursue ideological, curricular, didactic, and operational modifications.

If innovation is founded on the acceptance of uncertainty, it found in the pandemic generated by the SARS-CoV-2 virus a breeding ground for its consolidation. This was not inconsequential, since the possibility of losing school terms, making pauses in education and, namely, not contributing to the students' educational achievement, did not seem to sit well with the aims of ceaseless productivity established by the current economic dynamics. After modernity, freedom has been a relevant ideological banner in every human endeavor. In the realm that concerns this text, freedom is a factor of great importance, since it offers a limitless opportunity in our human practice.

Innovation is founded on freedom, on the possibility of limitless action. The achievement society takes advantage of our thirst for freedom to establish an ideological domination without a need for repression; the dissemination of the idea of innovation will suffice to increase limitless productivity. In this respect, digital tools and media reassert this intention by offering a life without limits to work and oversimplifying human relationships. This process has gained such force that it is now impossible to refuse to join the aim of innovation in education. Moreover, it is believed that digital work in education is a pillar for the fulfillment of this right. Assuming *prima facie* that educational innovation and digital media are that *sine qua non* element for contemporary education to be carried out, or holding it as a banner without questioning its ideological foundations is without a doubt a risk in epistemological, conceptual, and didactic terms. A possibility of reflection is to think about certainty in education, as well as its role subjected to ideologies and economic competitiveness interests.

Do we really want to orient education towards continual innovation and productivity – with all the risks already mentioned – over an education that helps us understand our realities as individuals? Education, in all its paradigms, may imply an ideological reproduction and implementation. Not only must we seek to assure educational actividaties (for which innovative digital media were very useful), but this also represents an opportunity to ponder over the philosophical and ideological foundations that underlie our actions, which have an impact on the ideological reproduction that supports education through curricular structures and practices.

References

Aguilar, G. (2020). Filosofía de la innovación e innovación en la filosofía. In Aguilar, F. (coord.). *Filosofía de la innovación y de la tecnología educativa.* Quito: Universidad Politécnica Salesiana, 21-62.

Area, M. (2018). De la enseñanza presencial a la docencia digital. Autobiografía de una historia de vida docente. *Revista de Educación a Distancia, 56.* http://dx.doi.org/10.6018/red/56/1

Bautista, A. (2020). Reflexión respecto a la equidad educativa en México, durante el Periodo Covid-19. *Revista Internacional de Educación para la Justicia Social, 9*(3e).

Becker, A.; C. Eube (2018). Open Innovation Concept: Integrating Universities and Business in Digital Age. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market and Complexity, 4*(12).

Collado, J. (2020). Filosofía de la innovación educativa y desarrollo de competencias digitales con las TIC. In Aguilar, F. (coord.). *Filosofía de la innovación y de la tecnología educativa. Tomo II. Innovación educativa.* Quito: Universidad Politécnica Salesiana, 15-48.

Cruz, R.; G. Croda (2017). Concepciones sobre innovación educativa: elementos para su teorización. Paper presented at the *XIV Congreso Nacional de Investigación Educativa.*

Díaz-Barriga, A. (2020). De la integración curricular a las políticas de innovación en la educación superior mexicana. *Perfiles Educativos, 42*(169).

Echeverría, B. (2009). ¿Qué es la modernidad? Mexico: UNAM.

Escudero-Nahón, A.; M. Ramírez-Montoya (2021). El modelo y sus marcos. In: Vicario-Solórzano, C. (coord.). *Modelo de continuidad de servicios educativos ante un contexto de emergencia y sus etapas de crisis*. Mexico: ANUIES, 20-29.

Ezpeleta, J. (2004). Innovaciones educativas. Reflexiones sobre los contextos en su implementación. *Revista Mexicana de Investigación Educativa, 9*(21). 403-424.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Microfísica del poder*. Madrid: La Piqueta.

García, J. (2001). Supuestos epistemológicos que subyacen a la innovación educativa. *Actualidades Investigativas en Educación, 1*(1).

Gracia, J. (2017). Repensando la innovación educativa en y desde la filosofía. Estudio introductorio. *Quaderns de filosofía, 4*(1). 10.7203/qfia.4.1.10208

Han, B. (2012). *La sociedad del cansancio*. Barcelona: Herder.

Han, B. (2014). *En el enjambre.* Barcelona: Herder.

Heredia, P.; C. Torres; E. Vega (2020). Familia e innovación educativa en el marco de la posmodernidad. *Filosofía de la Innovación y de la Tecnología Educativa. Tomo II. Innovación educativa.* Quito: Universidad Politécnica Salesiana, 233-269.

Higuera, E. (2020). El componente antropológico y pedagógico de la innovación. In: Aguilar, F. (coord.). *Filosofía de la innovación y de la tecnología educativa.* Quito: Universidad Politécnica Salesiana, 161-191.

Jiménez, J. (2019). El Sistema Nacional de Investigadores en México como mecanismo meritocrático de un Estado Evaluador. *Reflexión Política*, *21*(41), 81-90. https://doi.org/10.29375/01240781.2850

Lloyd, M. (2020). Desigualdades educativas y la brecha digital en tiempos de COVID-19. En Casanova, H. (coord.). *Educación y pandemia: una visión académica*. Mexico: UNAM, 115-121.

López, S.; M. Flores (2006). Las reformas educativas neoliberales en Latinoamérica. *Revista Electrónica de Investigación Educativa, 8*(1).

Michavila, F. (2009). La innovación educativa. Oportunidades y barreras. *Arbor. Ciencia, pensamiento y cultura, 185*(Extra), 3-8.

Moreno-Correa, S. (2020). La innovación educativa en los tiempos del Coronavirus. *Salutem Scientia Spiritus, 6*(1), 14-26.

Ortega, P.; M. Ramírez; J. Torres; A. López; C. Servín; L. Suárez; B. Ruiz (2007). Modelo de innovación educativa. Un marco para la formación y el desarrollo de una cultura de la evaluación. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación a Distancia, 10*(1), 145-173.

Ortíz, D. (2020). Aproximación a la innovación educativa: hacia una transformación positiva de la identidad del sujeto, en el contexto educativo. *Filosofía de la Innovación y de la Tecnología Educativa. Tomo II. Innovación educativa.* Quito: Universidad Politécnica Salesiana, 49-86.

Ramírez-Montoya, M. (2020). Transformación digital e innovación educativa en Latinoamérica en el marco del COVID-19. *Campus virtuales, 9*(2). 123-139.

Reyes, S. (2019). La educación dialógica como modelo para la innovación educativa en México. In Fernández, K., J. Organista, M. Ornelas (coords.). *Experiencias innovadoras educativas. Colección Coordenadas Digitales en Educación*. Mexicali: UABC.

Rodríguez, G. (1998). Ciencia, tecnología y sociedad: una mirada desde la Educación en Tecnología. Organización de Estados Iberoamericanos para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación, 18*.

UNESCO (2016). *Texto 1. Innovación educativa. Serie Herramientas de apoyo para el trabajo docente*. Lima: UNESCO.