Brother Jardelino Menegat’s doctoral work attempts to bring light to the complex intersection between Lasallian educational aspirations and higher education regulatory framework. It is an ambitious enterprise that proved to be of great contribution both to the area of Lasallian studies as well as the broader area of higher education management.

Structured in eight different chapters, the thesis’ hypothesis is that the Lasallian educational principles already contemplate what is prescribed by existing higher education regulatory frameworks (both internationally and nationally) as to the necessary elements for delivering high quality education.

The first two chapters present the reader with the framework regarding the thesis, its theoretical underpinnings and analytical premises. Specifically, in the first chapter, a brief contextualization of the concepts regarding the researched topic is offered, as well as hypothesis and questions that will guide the work at hand. The second chapter delves into the why(s) and how(s). A particular strength of the work is the documented research that combines analysis of historical Lasallian documents with documents from the Brazilian government. Its most important contribution, however, is undoubtedly the mapping of empirical studies conducted in Brazil regarding Lasallian education. As a consequence, Menegat’s doctoral work, brings what from now on could be considered the starting point for any work dedicated to Lasallian studies in the country (36-41). Though it is not the goal of the thesis, one can’t help thinking of the advantages that similar literature reviews could bring to Lasallian studies on both a regional and international level.

In the third chapter, a brief historical overview of the Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools is presented, as contextualization is given both to the origin of the Institute and its foundational principles. In addition, a brief outline of the network of Lasallian institutions is delivered, with an emphasis in the regional perspective of Latin America and the Caribbean as well as the country of Brazil. The chapter works as a bridge between the methodological and research ambitions presented in the first two chapters and the analytical content that is delivered in chapters four through seven.

Lasallian educational ideals are the topic of Menegat’s fourth chapter. In order to explore such an extensive topic, Menegat’s choice of use of content analysis techniques as a way of exploring Lasallian documents is an appealing one, at the country level (Educational Proposal of the La
Salle Province of Brazil-Chile), at the regional level (Latin American Lasallian Regional Educational Project) and at the international level, through the contributions put forward by the MEL Bulletins.

One point of discussion when referring to the international aspect of the Lasallian network is that of common identities and the benefits that derive from such a trait. After empirical analysis of the aforementioned documents, Menegat identifies an alignment of the principles that are set forth at the international level with those prescribed at the national level. This brings to light what the author labels “unity of action,” a specific trait of the Lasallian identity in practice.

When analyzing if the Brazilian document reflected those principles shown on the regional and international documents, the work at hand emphasizes another distinct advantage of the Lasallian network, as Menegat shows examples of topics that were of international concern before they were of national concern. Here, the lesson is clear: by sharing experiences, Lasallian institutions would be well suited to keep up with the fast-changing dynamics of current educational structures and values.

Whereas the fourth chapter analyzed Lasallian official documents at the national, regional, and international dimension, the fifth chapter is concerned with regulatory frameworks of education. At the international level attention is given to UNESCO’s Education for All: Meeting our Collective Commitments, whereas at the regional level it is the Organizations of Ibero-American States’ The Education We Want for the Generation of Bicentennials that is more thoroughly analyzed. Finally, at the country level, the National Education Plan receives most of the scrutiny.

It is by joint and crosscutting documental analysis of the aforementioned texts that allows Menegat to come up with commonalities in regards to what would be generally accepted principles that would lead to improving the quality of an educational system or structure. They involve respect to human rights, promotion of citizenship, diversity, environmental sustainability, systematic evaluation of educational structures as well as improvements in management of educational institutions, among others (82).

After analysis conducted on both Lasallian documents as well as major regulatory frameworks, the sixth chapter is where the findings of chapter four are confronted with the findings of chapter five. In this regard, the illustrative chart (185) provided is highly beneficial to the reader, as it begins to demonstrate how the Lasallian educational principles relate to those which are present in different regulatory frameworks. It is quite surprising to note that Lasallian educational principles are integrally aligned with those.

From this point forward, the work at hand attempts to group Lasallian educational principles for quality education in five different topics, which Menegat identifies as pillars: identity and mission; human rights and non-discrimination; an education that prepares for life transformation; consolidation of cooperation networks; managing, monitoring and evaluation of processes and administration.

The proposed pillar’s structure is the culmination of the work by Brother Jardelino Menegat during his doctoral dissertation, a combination of solid research and methodological techniques.
with traditional Lasallian studies, paving the way forward for Lasallian studies in the twenty-first century.