REVISTA TÓPICOS
ISSN 2965-6672 | Qualis A2

COLLABORATIVE PLANNING AS A SCHOOL MANAGEMENT STRATEGY: TEACHER COLLABORATION AND INCLUSIVE PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES

PLANEJAMENTO COLABORATIVO COMO ESTRATÉGIA DE GESTÃO ESCOLAR: ARTICULAÇÃO DOCENTE E PRÁTICAS PEDAGÓGICAS INCLUSIVAS

Ciências Humanas • 26/11/2026

REGISTRO DOI: 10.70773/revistatopicos/795579276

Albetiza Rodrigues Noronha[1]

Aline Soares Campos[2]

Antonia Silvana Andrade Nogueira de Sousa[3]

Filipe Eugênio Rodrigues Silvestre[4]

Irene Mendes Fontes[5]

João Paulo Pereira de Sousa[6]

Mara de Melo Vieira Moura[7]

Meirilane Santos da Silva[8]

Onete Raulino da Costa[9]

Rickardo Léo Ramos Gomes[10]

Silvia Roberta Ribeiro da Silva Sousa[11]

Temis Jeanne Filizola Brandão dos Santos[12]

Vandenberg Barroso Monteiro Junior[13]

ABSTRACT

Collaborative planning is a school management strategy that promotes the coordination of teaching activities and the organization of inclusive pedagogical practices in Basic Education. This study aimed to analyze the contributions of collaborative planning as a school management strategy for coordinating teaching activities and developing inclusive pedagogical practices in Basic Education. Methodologically, it is characterized as qualitative research of a bibliographic and documentary nature, conducted through a narrative literature review. Publications were selected based on their thematic relevance and contribution to the proposed objectives, while the analysis was structured around three areas: the foundations of collaborative planning and its relationship with school management; coordination between mainstream classroom teachers, Specialized Educational Assistance (AEE) professionals, and the school community; and the contributions and challenges of this strategy to the development of inclusive pedagogical practices. The findings showed that collaborative planning, when integrated into school management, constitutes a strategy for organizing pedagogical work that promotes cooperation among teachers, AEE professionals, and the school community in developing inclusive practices. Contributions were identified in areas such as differentiated instruction, curricular accessibility, co-teaching, and the organization of individualized support, as well as challenges related to professional development, time availability, communication, and institutional conditions. It is concluded that the effectiveness of this strategy depends on the shared responsibility of the professionals involved and on organizational conditions that ensure the continuity of joint work. Empirical studies investigating its implementation in different Basic Education contexts are also recommended.

Keywords: Collaborative planning; School management; Inclusive education; Teaching activities.

RESUMO

O planejamento colaborativo constitui uma estratégia de gestão escolar que favorece a articulação do trabalho docente e a organização de práticas pedagógicas inclusivas na Educação Básica. Este estudo teve como objetivo analisar as contribuições do planejamento colaborativo como estratégia de gestão escolar para a articulação do trabalho docente e o desenvolvimento de práticas pedagógicas inclusivas na Educação Básica. Metodologicamente, caracteriza-se como uma pesquisa qualitativa, de natureza bibliográfica e documental, conduzida por meio de revisão narrativa da literatura. A seleção das publicações fundamentou-se em sua pertinência temática e contribuição para os objetivos propostos, enquanto a análise foi estruturada em três eixos: fundamentos do planejamento colaborativo e sua relação com a gestão escolar; articulação entre professores do ensino regular, profissionais do Atendimento Educacional Especializado (AEE) e comunidade escolar; e contribuições e desafios dessa estratégia para o desenvolvimento de práticas pedagógicas inclusivas. A pesquisa evidenciou que o planejamento colaborativo, associado à gestão escolar, constitui uma estratégia de organização do trabalho pedagógico que favorece a integração entre docentes, profissionais do AEE e comunidade escolar na construção de práticas inclusivas. Foram identificadas contribuições relacionadas à diferenciação pedagógica, à acessibilidade curricular, ao coensino e à organização de apoios individualizados, assim como desafios referentes à formação profissional, à disponibilidade de tempo, à comunicação e às condições institucionais. Conclui-se que a efetividade dessa estratégia depende da corresponsabilidade dos profissionais

envolvidos e de condições organizacionais que assegurem a continuidade do trabalho conjunto. Recomenda-se, ainda, a realização de estudos empíricos que investiguem sua implementação em diferentes contextos da Educação Básica.
Palavras-chave: Planejamento colaborativo; Gestão escolar; Educação inclusiva; Trabalho docente.

1. INTRODUCTION

Contemporary school management faces the challenge of organizing pedagogical work in a participatory and coordinated manner, while remaining committed to every student's right to learn. Collaborative planning is relevant in this context because it brings education professionals together through dialogue, the sharing of knowledge, and the joint development of teaching strategies, rather than leaving each teacher to determine classroom activities independently. Unlike approaches to organizing teaching activities that rely on individual initiatives, this perspective involves integrating professional experiences, responsibilities, and knowledge so that pedagogical decisions can be collectively discussed and refined. When this approach is integrated into school management, different stakeholders become more actively involved in organizing educational activities and defining shared objectives.

In Basic Education, this issue becomes particularly significant in view of the demands of inclusive education, which require pedagogical practices capable of recognizing student diversity and ensuring participation in teaching and learning processes. Developing such practices is not the responsibility of a single teacher. It requires mainstream classroom teachers, the Specialized Educational Assistance (AEE) team, school management, and other

members of the school community to work together. However, this joint effort often encounters practical obstacles, such as the organization of time and spaces for planning, communication among professionals, the distribution of responsibilities, and the institutional conditions that schools can actually provide. Understanding collaborative planning as a school management strategy is therefore relevant because it makes it possible to discuss its contributions to teacher coordination and the development of pedagogical responses consistent with the principles of inclusion.

In light of this problem, the study is guided by the following research question: **How can collaborative planning, when integrated into school management, promote the coordination of teaching activities and the development of inclusive pedagogical practices in Basic Education?**

Based on this question, the **general objective** was established as analyzing the contributions of collaborative planning as a school management strategy for coordinating teaching activities and developing inclusive pedagogical practices in Basic Education. To achieve this purpose, three **specific objectives** were defined: (i) to investigate the foundations of collaborative planning and its relationship with school management, considering the organization of pedagogical work and coordination among education professionals; (ii) to examine opportunities for collaboration among mainstream classroom teachers, Specialized Educational Assistance (AEE) professionals, and other members of the school community in developing inclusive pedagogical strategies; and (iii) to identify the contributions and challenges of collaborative planning to the development of pedagogical practices that promote the

participation, learning, and development of students who are the target audience of Special Education.

To address the research question and achieve the proposed objectives, a qualitative study was conducted based on bibliographic and documentary research, in the form of a narrative literature review. Publications were selected according to their relevance to the topic and, above all, their contribution to understanding the research subject. The analysis was organized around three interconnected areas: the foundations of collaborative planning and its relationship with school management; coordination among mainstream classroom teachers, AEE professionals, and the school community; and the contributions and challenges that this form of planning presents for the development of inclusive pedagogical practices.

In terms of organization, in addition to this introduction, the article is divided into three sections. The second presents the theoretical framework, structured around the same three areas that guided the analysis: the foundations of collaborative planning, coordination among education professionals, and the contributions and challenges involved in developing inclusive practices. The third describes the methodological procedures adopted in the research. Finally, the fourth presents the concluding remarks, revisiting the main points discussed and indicating the study's contributions in relation to the research question and the proposed objectives.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Collaborative Planning And School Management: Foundations And Organization Of Pedagogical Work

Collaborative planning refers to an approach to organizing pedagogical work in which decisions about teaching do not originate solely from an individual teacher but are developed through the participation, dialogue, and shared responsibility of school professionals. This distinction is important: it is not simply a matter of each teacher preparing an individual teaching plan. Rather, this perspective requires institutional objectives, students' needs, and instructional choices to be considered collectively, as part of an integrated process rather than in separate compartments. Oliveira, Carvalho, and Carrasqueira (2020) examine this relationship by linking teacher collaboration to school leadership and educational outcomes, suggesting that management is not merely a background condition. It directly influences the institutional circumstances that make collective work either possible or unfeasible.

For this organizational approach to be sustained, permanent opportunities for dialogue must be established, allowing teachers to genuinely share experiences, discuss difficulties, and develop strategies for improving teaching, rather than relying on occasional meetings that undermine the proposal. In this regard, Freire, Cunha, and Pucci (2023) examine the relationship between conversations among teachers and the organization of pedagogical work, emphasizing the importance of collective engagement in developing teaching and learning processes. When this occurs, planning becomes more closely connected to students' actual experiences, as the development of strategies incorporates different professional perspectives and the specific characteristics of the school context.

From this perspective, the practice goes beyond distributing content or defining activities. Planning becomes a collective process of making the decisions that guide educational action.

Freire, Cunha, and Pucci (2023, p. 09) explain that:

> *Involving students in the construction of their own knowledge is a concern for teachers. For formal content to become meaningful and be perceived as knowledge that helps students understand life and the world, their participation and the connection with their own experiences are necessary. In the teaching and learning process, drawing on students' knowledge and aspirations, and thereby enhancing the construction of knowledge about the content teachers are expected to teach, is a complex task that becomes possible through everyone's involvement in collective and collaborative work.*

The participation of professionals in school decision-making is also connected to democratic management, since organizing pedagogical work requires institutional mechanisms for listening, negotiation, and decision-making. Without these mechanisms, the concept loses its substance. In this regard, Silva, Pires, and Gomes (2023) discuss the role of pedagogical coordination, highlighting the importance of encouraging participation among members of the school community.

> *From a collective perspective, the responsibility to encourage participation mechanisms within the school environment also becomes evident, as this contributes to establishing a democratic environment. Decisions at school must necessarily be made collectively. To this end, it is important to understand that opportunities for participation must be made available to everyone who occupies and is part of the school's daily activities. (Silva; Pires; Gomes, 2023, p. 08).*

In this context, pedagogical coordination can contribute to organizing planning sessions, facilitating the flow of information, and monitoring the implementation of collective decisions. This contribution, however, does not occur automatically. Its effectiveness depends on institutional conditions and the relationships established among professionals. Brenner and Ferreira (2020), in examining the effects of school management and conflicts on pedagogical work, provide insights into how disagreements and interpersonal difficulties can affect the organization of teaching activities. Collaboration, therefore, cannot be understood as a mere agreement of individual intentions. It requires dialogue and negotiation procedures that make it possible to address conflicts without compromising shared objectives, and such conditions are not always in place.

Joint planning also supports professional learning by creating opportunities for teachers to exchange knowledge, examine their classroom practices, and jointly develop solutions to the problems they encounter. Eshchar-Netz and Vedder-Weiss (2021) specifically explore the learning opportunities that shared planning creates within communities of practice, considering both novice and experienced teachers. Similarly, Hudson (2024) proposes a

framework for understanding how professional learning communities operate in schools, while the literature review by Olmo-Extremera, Fernández-Terol, and Domingo-Segovia (2024) focuses on the leadership of these communities in Basic Education. Taken together, these studies make it possible to relate collaboration to the development of an institutional culture of reflection and professional development, although none explains how such a culture can be sustained when the necessary institutional conditions are absent.

Collaborative planning, however, does not depend solely on teachers' individual willingness to participate. The continuity of collective initiatives is influenced by what the school provides or fails to provide: working conditions, the time available to teachers, and the existence of institutional spaces in which participation can actually take place. These factors often matter more than the goodwill of those involved in teaching. In this regard, Cunha (2015), by examining how working conditions affect collective organization and the development of the Political-Pedagogical Project (PPP), helps situate planning within the concrete operating conditions of the school rather than within an abstract framework of intentions. To systematize these relationships, Table 1 summarizes the contributions of the selected studies regarding the foundations, organizational mechanisms, and institutional conditions of collaborative planning.

Table 1. Theoretical contributions to understanding collaborative planning and school management

Discussion area	Summary of the contribution to the topic	Author and abbreviated title of the work
Teacher collaboration and	Relationship between teacher collaboration,	Oliveira, Carvalho, and Carrasqueira (2020),

school management	school leadership, and educational outcomes.	*Teacher Collaboration and Educational Outcomes*.
Dialogue and collective work	Dialogue among teachers and the shared development of pedagogical work organization.	Freire, Cunha, and Pucci (2023), *Teacher Dialogue and the Organization of Pedagogical Work*.
Democratic management and pedagogical coordination	Professional participation in decision-making and the role of pedagogical coordination in fostering collective work.	Silva, Pires, and Gomes (2023), *Pedagogical Coordination and Democratic Management*.
Interpersonal relationships and conflicts	The influence of relationships and conflicts on management and the organization of pedagogical work.	Brenner and Ferreira (2020), *School Management and Conflicts*.
Joint planning and professional learning	Shared planning as a learning opportunity for novice and experienced teachers.	Eshchar-Netz and Vedder-Weiss (2021), *Teacher Learning in Communities of Practice*.
Professional learning communities	A framework for understanding the organization and functioning of learning communities in schools.	Hudson (2024), *A Conceptual Framework for Understanding Effective PLC Operation*.
Leadership and professional collaboration	Leadership characteristics associated with sustaining professional learning communities.	Olmo-Extremera, Fernández-Terol, and Domingo-Segovia (2024), *Leading a Professional Learning Community*.
Working conditions and collective organization	Institutional conditions that influence teacher participation and the collective development of the PPP.	Cunha (2015), *The Effects of Working Conditions on the Organization of Collective Work*.

Source: Prepared based on the references of Oliveira, Carvalho, and Carrasqueira (2020); Freire, Cunha, and Pucci (2023); Silva, Pires, and Gomes (2023); Brenner and Ferreira (2020); Eshchar-Netz and Vedder-Weiss (2021); Hudson (2024); Olmo-Extremera, Fernández-Terol, and Domingo-Segovia (2024); and Cunha (2015).

These contributions converge on the same point: collaborative planning encompasses the pedagogical, relational, and institutional dimensions of school management simultaneously, and it cannot be sustained independently. It requires leadership willing to create genuine opportunities for participation, coordination of collective processes, working conditions that make such interaction possible, and recognition of the knowledge that professionals themselves develop through their daily work at school. When these conditions come together, shared planning tends to bring coherence to educational activities and ensure continuity in pedagogical decisions. It thus provides an organizational foundation both for coordination among teachers and for the development of inclusive practices, a discussion that the next section examines in greater depth.

2.2. Coordination Among Mainstream Classroom Teachers, AEE Professionals, And The School Community In Developing Inclusive Strategies

Dantas and Gomes (2020) examined the daily routine of a public school to understand how relationships between mainstream classroom teachers and Specialized Educational Assistance (AEE) teachers are established in practice. Their findings revealed genuine opportunities for collaboration, alongside practical difficulties related to time, space, and the availability of professionals to engage in joint

work. Coordination among these professionals is a condition for inclusive pedagogical practices, but it does not occur spontaneously. It requires overcoming a still-fragmented model in which specialized assistance operates separately from what takes place in mainstream classrooms, with each professional working independently according to their own schedules and priorities.

In other words, integration between AEE and mainstream classrooms cannot be achieved through formal mandates or isolated goodwill. When collaborative practice takes place, it involves the sharing of professional knowledge among these teachers, with a focus on the learning of students who are the target audience of Special Education (PAEE). Dantas and Gomes (2020, p. 50) state that:

> *In view of the obstacles to developing collaborative work between mainstream classroom teachers and AEE teachers, particularly the coordination of their work to promote the inclusion of students with disabilities, we highlight collaborative practice as a possible catalyst for promoting it. It should be emphasized that we consider collaborative practice a specific form of collaboration, since we understand the latter as the sharing of knowledge between mainstream classroom teachers and AEE teachers for the purpose of supporting the learning of students who are the target audience of Special Education (PAEE).*

Mainstream education and Special Education can also be integrated through collaborative teaching, or co-teaching, in which both teachers plan and teach together, sharing responsibility for conducting the class's pedagogical activities. Silva and Vilaronga (2021) analyzed this type of professional development experience

and identified that the decisive factor was not the course itself, but the support provided within the school, where theoretical knowledge can be brought into dialogue with reflection on actual classroom practices. Inclusion cannot remain the sole responsibility of the specialized teacher. It requires changes to teaching strategies and to the organization of instruction provided to the entire class.

This understanding is reinforced by the approach presented by Mendes, Vilaronga, and Zerbato (2014 *apud* Silva and Vilaronga, 2021, p. 03), according to which:

> *The proposal for collaborative teaching is based on the social approach to disability, as it recognizes that the school itself must change, including the activities developed in mainstream classrooms, since this is the space where students spend more time interacting with their peers. Therefore, if the mainstream classroom is not modified in terms of its strategies and operating procedures regarding content and attitudes, the schooling of all students is unlikely to take place. The teachers involved must develop characteristics such as commitment, mutual support, respect, flexibility, and knowledge sharing, since "no professional should consider themselves better than the others.*

Collaboration between general education and Special Education teachers cannot be sustained solely by the willingness of the professionals involved. It depends on concrete organizational and professional conditions, as international literature has consistently demonstrated. Jurkowski, Ulrich, and Müller (2023) understand co-teaching as a partnership-based practice that requires school structures, institutional resources, and investment in professional

development. In their review of studies on cooperation between mainstream teachers and specialists, Paulsrud and Nilholm (2023) identify different forms of collaboration and emphasize factors such as balanced distribution of responsibilities, communication quality, management support, and, a point frequently highlighted in the studies, the time available for joint planning.

This planning, in turn, requires teachers to establish expected learning outcomes, select teaching strategies, distribute tasks, and agree on how students' progress will be monitored. Ruberto and Boily (2026) propose an instrument to support co-planning between general education and Special Education teachers, organized around instructional and assessment dimensions, teaching strategies and learning support, as well as organizational aspects. This proposal helps demonstrate that planning is neither a fixed document nor an isolated activity. Rather, it is an articulated and dynamic process in which student diversity is considered from the selection of activities to the assessment of learning outcomes, rather than being addressed through adjustments made afterward.

Collaboration also requires professional relationships built on recognition of each participant's specific expertise. Friend and Cook (2017), in their discussion of collaboration skills among school professionals, provide the conceptual vocabulary underpinning this debate: communication, shared decision-making, and joint problem-solving. Eshchar-Netz and Vedder-Weiss (2021), in turn, examine shared planning as a context for professional learning in its own right, in which novice and experienced teachers engage in reflection and knowledge exchange. Taken together, these contributions indicate that coordination among mainstream classroom teachers, AEE professionals, school administrators, and

other members of the school community requires continuous dialogue and shared responsibility for developing pedagogical strategies, rather than merely a formal division of tasks.

There is also a dimension that often receives less attention in discussions of collaboration: the institutional organization of the school. In their investigation of teacher collaboration in Brazil, Oliveira, Carvalho, and Carrasqueira (2020) identified an association between collective work, school leadership, and educational outcomes. The limitations of their study should be acknowledged: it was not designed to examine coordination between mainstream education and AEE, which restricts its direct applicability to the issue discussed here. Nevertheless, its findings help explain the importance of management conditions in sustaining collaborative practices. At this same level, the participation of families and support professionals in inclusive planning can also be considered, particularly when their contributions help schools understand students' needs and organize pedagogical responses consistent with their schooling process.

To systematize the contributions of these studies, Table 2 brings together the main dimensions of coordination among school professionals, addressing forms of collaboration, institutional conditions, and implications for developing inclusive pedagogical strategies.

Table 2. Dimensions of Professional Coordination in the Development of Inclusive Pedagogical Practices

Dimension of collaboration	Contributions to the development of inclusive strategies	Author and abbreviated title of the work

Coordination between mainstream education and AEE	Knowledge sharing and closer integration between specialized assistance and activities in mainstream classrooms.	Dantas and Gomes (2020), *Collaborative Practice between Mainstream Education and Special Education*.
Collaborative teaching and pedagogical support	Reflection on practice, support within the school environment, and joint work by mainstream and Special Education teachers.	Silva and Vilaronga (2021), *Collaboration between Mainstream and Special Education Teachers*.
Co-teaching and institutional conditions	Organization of shared work, availability of resources, and professional development for collaboration.	Jurkowski, Ulrich, and Müller (2023), *Co-Teaching as a Resource for Inclusive Classes*.
Cooperation between teachers and specialists	Different forms of cooperation, distribution of responsibilities, communication, and school management support.	Paulsrud and Nilholm (2023), *Teaching for Inclusion*.
Joint planning and pedagogical strategies	Coordination of learning objectives, assessment, teaching strategies, learning support, and school organization.	Ruberto and Boily (2026), *Supporting Co-Planning between General and Special Education Teachers*.
Teacher collaboration and school management	Relationship between collective work, school leadership, and educational outcomes.	Oliveira, Carvalho, and Carrasqueira (2020), *Teacher Collaboration and Educational Outcomes in Brazil*.
Professional learning and development	Exchange of experiences and joint reflection among novice and experienced teachers.	Eshchar-Netz and Vedder-Weiss (2021), *Teacher Learning in Communities of Practice*.

Professional collaboration skills	Communication, shared decision-making, and joint problem-solving in the school context.	Friend and Cook (2017), *Interactions: Collaboration Skills for School Professionals*.

Source: Prepared based on the references of Dantas and Gomes (2020); Silva and Vilaronga (2021); Jurkowski, Ulrich, and Müller (2023); Paulsrud and Nilholm (2023); Ruberto and Boily (2026); Oliveira, Carvalho, and Carrasqueira (2020); Eshchar-Netz and Vedder-Weiss (2021); and Friend and Cook (2017).

2.3. Contributions And Challenges Of Collaborative Planning To The Development Of Inclusive Pedagogical Practices

The development of inclusive pedagogical practices depends, above all, on a school organization capable of recognizing student diversity and identifying the barriers that restrict students' participation and learning. Booth and Ainscow (2011) understand inclusion through the relationship among institutional cultures, policies, and practices. This perspective leads to an important point underlying the argument presented here: responsibility for learning cannot be restricted to the teacher who works directly with a student who is part of the target audience of Special Education. It is in this context that collaborative planning becomes meaningful: shared decisions regarding objectives, teaching strategies, accessibility resources, and monitoring procedures, made in consideration of the characteristics and needs of different students.

However, collaboration among teachers requires much more than occasionally exchanging materials or passing along information. It involves different levels of professional interaction and, above all, shared responsibility for teaching. Pozas and Letzel-Alt (2023, p. 25)

demonstrate that there is a distinction between more superficial practices of exchange and practices such as synchronization and joint construction, the latter being associated with the adoption of differentiated instructional strategies. The authors also discuss the influence of teachers' beliefs on the implementation of inclusive practices, as expressed in the following statement:

> *Teachers' self-efficacy for inclusion and their attitudes toward teaching in inclusive settings are considered two key factors for Differentiated Instruction (DI). Teacher self-efficacy is described or defined as beliefs related to teachers' goals, persistence, and resilience within their profession.*

In co-teaching, the joint work of mainstream education teachers and Special Education professionals tends to create opportunities for more varied teaching strategies and for support to be provided during the activities conducted in the regular classroom. The systematized review by Iacono *et al.* (2023), which brought together studies on the outcomes of different co-teaching models for students with disabilities, points in this direction, but with an important qualification: it is not enough to examine how the two teachers organize their work in the classroom. It is also necessary to consider how this arrangement changes students' educational experiences. This is the point that is often overlooked in more enthusiastic proposals. The simultaneous presence of two professionals does not, in itself, guarantee inclusion. Without shared planning, common pedagogical objectives, coordinated interventions, and jointly designed assessment, the result is simply two people in the same classroom, which falls well short of what co-teaching promises.

Strogilos *et al.* (2023), in a qualitative synthesis, further argue that co-teaching can provide a learning environment for both students and teachers, insofar as it facilitates the exchange of knowledge and supports the development of teaching strategies. The authors do not overlook the difficulties that hinder the consistent implementation of this model, which leads them to emphasize specialized training, clearly defined responsibilities, and institutional organization as necessary conditions rather than supplementary elements. In this sense, collaboration does not emerge fully formed. It is built over time, and its quality depends on the extent to which each professional actually participates and on how one professional's skills are coordinated with those of the other. When this process fails, joint work tends to become a merely operational division of tasks, with each person taking care of their own share.

Planning is another relevant issue, and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) provides an organizational framework in this regard. Sebastian-Heredero, Góes, and Góes (2025) identify the following components of planning designed to address diversity: identifying barriers, defining objectives, selecting flexible resources, and diversifying assessment methods. Thompson *et al.* (2025), in turn, closely examined how individualized supports for students with intellectual and developmental disabilities are planned and monitored. They observed that teachers felt more confident in applying UDL principles, although the qualitative findings regarding their implementation were heterogeneous. This suggests that feeling capable of applying these principles and effectively incorporating them into practice are not the same thing. Taken together, these studies indicate that the joint organization of support measures can contribute to teachers' work. However, this contribution depends on continuous reflection on the extent to

which these principles are actually incorporated into pedagogical practices, rather than merely included in lesson plans.

Institutional conditions also directly affect the effectiveness of collaborative planning. Jurkowski, Ulrich, and Müller (2023, p. 01) demonstrate that co-teaching depends on organizational structures, resources, and professional relationships that sustain shared responsibility for inclusive education. This understanding is reflected in the statements made by the research participants:

> *Teachers working in co-teaching arrangements considered it essential for school principals, school professionals, and external specialists to develop shared responsibility for inclusive education. The teachers' statements reflect the idea of a collaborative relationship and the need for mainstream and special education teachers to negotiate the self-organization and division of tasks within the teaching pair. In short, the successful implementation of collaborative teaching appears to be a process of school and professional development based on organizational structures and resources that support collaboration.*

Ruberto and Boily (2026) revisit these same difficulties, including the lack of common planning time, fragmented activities, and uncertainty regarding the allocation of responsibilities. They propose an organization of joint planning between mainstream education teachers and Special Education professionals structured around three dimensions: planning instruction and assessment, defining teaching strategies and learning support, and organizing pedagogical work. Within this framework, collaborative planning ceases to be merely a matter of instructional decisions and also

encompasses the organizational aspects required to sustain it. These include deciding how responsibilities are to be distributed among those involved in planning, which co-teaching model should be adopted, and how available resources should be managed to ensure that the plan is actually put into practice.

Table 3 summarizes these contributions by relating each dimension discussed above to the scientific publications from which it derives. It also provides a clearer understanding of the opportunities and challenges involved in collaborative planning for the organization of inclusive pedagogical practices.

Table 3. Contributions and Challenges of Collaborative Planning to the Development of Inclusive Pedagogical Practices

Analytical dimension	**Contributions to inclusive practices**	**Implementation challenges**	**Author and abbreviated title of the work**
Inclusive cultures, policies, and practices	Identifying barriers and promoting participation and learning for all students.	Overcoming institutional barriers and incorporating inclusion into school organization.	Booth and Ainscow (2011), *Index for Inclusion*.
Collaboration and differentiated instruction	Joint development of strategies and diversification of teaching practices.	Moving beyond superficial interactions and expanding collaboration toward synchronization and joint construction.	Pozas and Letzel-Alt (2023), *Teacher collaboration, inclusive education and differentiated instruction*.

Co-teaching and educational outcomes	Coordination between teachers to expand participation and learning opportunities for students with disabilities.	Assessing the outcomes of co-teaching models and ensuring the conditions required for their implementation.	Iacono *et al.* (2023), *A systematized review of co-teaching efficacy*.
Teacher and student learning	Sharing knowledge and developing pedagogical strategies through joint work.	Providing specialized training, organizing responsibilities, and addressing implementation difficulties.	Strogilos *et al.* (2023), *A meta-synthesis of co-teaching*.
UDL-based planning	Identifying barriers, promoting curricular flexibility, and diversifying resources and assessment methods.	Developing teachers' skills to incorporate UDL principles into planning and practice.	Sebastian-Heredero, Góes, and Góes (2025), *Planejamento docente no contexto do DUA*.
Planning and monitoring individualized supports	Organizing specific support measures and increasing teachers' confidence in applying UDL.	Monitoring the effectiveness of support measures and their application in actual learning situations.	Thompson *et al.* (2025), *Planning and arranging individualized supports*.
Institutional conditions for co-teaching	Shared responsibility, negotiation of tasks, and coordination	Ensuring the availability of resources, organizational structures, and time for	Jurkowski, Ulrich, and Müller (2023), *Co-teaching as a resource for inclusive classes*.

	among professionals.	collaborative work.	
Organization of joint planning	Integrating instruction, assessment, teaching strategies, and learning support.	Avoiding fragmented planning and establishing shared responsibilities and procedures.	Ruberto and Boily (2026), *Supporting co-planning between general and special education teachers*.

Source: Prepared based on Booth and Ainscow (2011), Pozas and Letzel-Alt (2023), Iacono *et al.* (2023), Strogilos *et al.* (2023), Sebastian-Heredero, Góes, and Góes (2025), Thompson *et al.* (2025), Jurkowski, Ulrich, and Müller (2023), and Ruberto and Boily (2026).

Table 3 brings together contributions of collaborative planning that encompass both pedagogical and organizational aspects, with each dimension supporting the other. Diversifying strategies, making the curriculum accessible, and providing individualized support cannot be sustained without joint decisions or institutional conditions that ensure continuity. Professional development, time for meetings, communication among those involved, access to resources, and clearly defined responsibilities must be incorporated into school management arrangements rather than treated as occasional additions. When these elements are lacking, collaboration tends to occur only sporadically, limiting the joint work of professionals and the participation of students receiving Special Education services in learning experiences.

3. METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a qualitative approach and was conducted through a literature review and documentary research because the research problem required an examination of concepts, interpretations, and theoretical contributions concerning collaborative planning, school management, and the development of inclusive pedagogical practices. Risenberg, Wakin, and Shitsuka (2026) point out that scientific methodology organizes the procedures required for knowledge production, while Sousa, Oliveira, and Alves (2021) describe bibliographic research as a procedure for identifying, selecting, and analyzing scientific publications relevant to the research topic. The review was narrative in nature, as its purpose was to integrate and discuss theoretical contributions without applying a systematic, integrative, or scoping review protocol.

The selection of references was based on the direct relationship between the content of the publications and the three main areas of the investigation: the foundations of collaborative planning and school management; coordination among mainstream classroom teachers, professionals from Specialized Educational Assistance (AEE), and the school community; and the contributions and challenges of inclusive pedagogical practices. The search covered publications in Portuguese and English, prioritizing scientific articles published between 2018 and 2026, while also including earlier works that have become established conceptual references, such as Booth and Ainscow (2011) and Friend and Cook (2017). Articles published in scientific journals and academic books with verifiable bibliographic information were included. Materials without identified authorship, sufficient thematic relevance, or the minimum identification details were excluded.

The search used descriptors in Portuguese and English: “planejamento colaborativo” (collaborative planning), “gestão escolar” (school management), “trabalho coletivo docente” (collective teacher work), “educação inclusiva” (inclusive education), “práticas pedagógicas inclusivas” (inclusive pedagogical practices), “Atendimento Educacional Especializado” (Specialized Educational Assistance), “coensino” (co-teaching), and “Desenho Universal para a Aprendizagem” (Universal Design for Learning), along with their English equivalents: collaborative planning, school management, teacher collaboration, inclusive education, inclusive teaching practices, special education, and co-teaching. These terms were combined using the Boolean operators AND and OR, as in “planejamento colaborativo” AND “gestão escolar,” “educação inclusiva” AND “coensino,” and “teacher collaboration” AND “inclusive education.” Searches were conducted in title, abstract, and keyword fields. However, there is insufficient documentation to establish which databases were actually consulted, which search combinations were used in each database, or which fields were employed in each query. Therefore, the search is not attributed to databases such as SciELO, ERIC, Scopus, or Web of Science, since there is no verifiable evidence that these procedures were followed.

The final selection of each publication considered its thematic relevance, author identification, availability of bibliographic information, and actual contribution to understanding the research areas. Priority was given to studies addressing teacher collaboration, democratic management, co-teaching, joint planning, professional development, curricular accessibility, and inclusive strategies. Any publication appearing more than once in the bibliographic records was counted as a single work. However, there are no consolidated records of the total number of results initially retrieved, the

exclusions made at each stage, or the final number of documents examined. Consequently, this account does not provide screening or inclusion figures that are not supported by verifiable records. This delimitation is consistent with the narrative nature of the review, which does not constitute a systematic review based on a formal selection protocol.

The bibliographic material was examined to identify concepts, arguments, and contributions related to the research problem. These were organized into the same three categories that guided the selection of references: the foundations of collaborative planning and its relationship with school management; coordination among mainstream classroom teachers, AEE professionals, and the school community; and the contributions and challenges of collaborative planning to inclusive pedagogical practices. These categories made it possible to relate the publications to one another and identify convergences, specific features, and complementary perspectives. The interpretation was qualitative throughout, without the use of statistical frequencies or generalization of the findings to schools that were not included in the investigation.

Documentary research was conducted alongside the literature review, focusing on the textual records and documentary information contained in the selected publications. These publications were chosen based on their identification details, authorship, publication date, dissemination medium, and relevance to the research topic. The analysis focused on conceptions of collaboration, approaches to organizing pedagogical work, responsibilities assigned to professionals, inclusion strategies, and the institutional conditions identified in the studies. Arantes (2025) distinguishes documentary research from bibliographic research but

acknowledges that the two can be combined within the same investigation, provided that the materials examined and the procedures employed are clearly specified. This approach was adopted in the present study: the documentary dimension complemented the analysis of the publications without becoming an independent survey of administrative or regulatory documents issued by education systems.

The results of the analysis were organized into an interpretive account that connects the theoretical foundations with the possibilities and limitations identified in the literature. The categories developed made it possible to examine collaborative planning as a dimension of school management that brings together institutional decisions, professional practices, and the organization of inclusive pedagogical strategies. Thus, the methodology addressed the research question through a critical analysis of the selected bibliographic and documentary contributions, within the limits of a study that did not involve observations, interviews, or interventions in school settings.

4. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Collaborative planning, understood here as a school management strategy, organizes pedagogical work on the basis of shared responsibility, professional participation, and the coordination of different areas of knowledge. Ensuring an education system that recognizes student diversity and provides genuine opportunities for participation, learning, and development depends, to a considerable extent, on whether mainstream classroom teachers, professionals from Specialized Educational Assistance (AEE), and other members of the school community are able to coordinate their efforts. This is

because the development of inclusive practices requires coordinated pedagogical decisions and institutional conditions capable of sustaining such coordination over time.

The research question guiding this study can be answered affirmatively based on the bibliographic and documentary analysis conducted: when integrated into school management, collaborative planning promotes the coordination of teaching activities and supports the development of inclusive pedagogical practices in Basic Education. The general objective, which was to examine the contributions of this strategy to the organization of pedagogical work, the collaborative practices of education professionals, and the development of educational responses attentive to diversity, was achieved. The three specific objectives were also addressed through an investigation of the foundations of collaborative planning and its relationship with school management, an examination of opportunities for coordination among teachers, AEE professionals, and the school community, and an identification of the contributions and difficulties associated with the development of inclusive practices.

The first part of the theoretical framework moved beyond the view of collaborative planning as merely a series of meetings or a distribution of tasks among professionals. Its effectiveness depends on dialogue, negotiation, joint reflection, and shared responsibilities, always in coordination with a form of school management that encourages participation in pedagogical decision-making. Collaboration is thus understood as a dimension of institutional organization rather than as an individual initiative undertaken by one teacher or another. Planning becomes collective when decisions regarding objectives, strategies, monitoring, and assessment

emerge from the integration of the knowledge and responsibilities of those involved.

The second part addressed coordination between mainstream classroom teachers and AEE professionals, recognizing the need to acknowledge their distinct areas of expertise and establish complementary responsibilities. The literature presents co-teaching and joint planning as ways of organizing shared pedagogical interventions, bringing specialized support closer to the activities carried out in the regular classroom, and broadening discussions about students' educational needs. Inclusion, however, cannot be achieved simply by placing two teachers together. The participation of school management and other members of the educational community is also part of this organizational process, since it depends on institutional decisions concerning resources, time, spaces, and conditions for pedagogical monitoring.

The examination of the contributions and difficulties associated with developing inclusive practices revealed an interdependent relationship between what collaborative planning can offer pedagogically and the conditions required for its implementation. Identifying barriers to learning, promoting curricular flexibility, diversifying teaching strategies, organizing individualized support, and adopting the principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) are practical possibilities for structuring inclusive practices. However, none of these measures becomes part of everyday school life on its own. Their implementation depends on professional development, time available for joint planning, communication among those involved, infrastructure, resources, and clearly defined responsibilities. This represents a limitation of the present study: because it is based on bibliographic and documentary research,

these relationships were examined through the findings presented in the literature and the documents analyzed. Therefore, it is not possible to assert that these conditions, in themselves, produce specific outcomes in particular schools. This delimitation does not undermine the scope of the investigation. Rather, it establishes the boundaries within which its conclusions can be supported and highlights the need for complementary empirical studies.

The contribution of this article lies in bringing together three dimensions that are often addressed separately: the organization of school management, coordination among education professionals, and the development of inclusive pedagogical responses. From this perspective, collaboration serves as a means of connecting institutional decisions with classroom practice, rather than functioning merely as a work procedure among colleagues. Future research should include field studies in schools from different educational stages and education systems, observing planning meetings, interviewing mainstream classroom teachers, AEE professionals, school administrators, and other staff members, and analyzing actual experiences of co-teaching and UDL-based strategies. Longitudinal studies could also investigate how working time, continuing professional development, and management support relate to the continuity of these collaborative practices and to the participation and learning of students who are the target audience of Special Education.

REFERENCES

ARANTES, T. R. de R. Documentary research, bibliographic research, and systematic review: defining aspects and brief considerations.

Interdisciplinary Studies Notebooks, v. 7, n. 2, e722501, 2025. ISSN 2764-394X. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15799019.

BOOTH, T.; AINSCOW, M. *Index for inclusion:* developing learning and participation in schools. 3. ed. Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education, 2011.

BRENNER, C. E. B.; FERREIRA, L. S. Gestão escolar e conflitos: impactos no trabalho pedagógico dos professores. *Educação*, v. 8, n. 3, p. 11-26, 2020. https://doi.org/10.17564/2316-3828.2020v8n3p11-26.

CUNHA, R. C. O. B. As repercussões das condições de trabalho na organização do trabalho coletivo e (re)elaboração do projeto político-pedagógico na escola básica. *Horizontes*, v. 33, n. 1, 2015. https://doi.org/10.24933/horizontes.v33i1.118.

DANTAS, L. M.; GOMES, A. L. L. A prática colaborativa entre ensino regular e Educação Especial: trajetórias possíveis no cotidiano de uma escola pública. *Educação, Ciência e Cultura*, v. 25, n. 1, p. 47-59, 2020. https://doi.org/10.18316/recc.v25i1.6288.

ESHCHAR-NETZ, L.; VEDDER-WEISS, D. Teacher learning in communities of practice: the affordances of co-planning for novice and veteran teachers' learning. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, v. 58, n. 3, p. 366-391, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21663.

FREIRE, F.; CUNHA, R. C. O. B.; PUCCI, R. H. P. Interlocuções de professores e organização do trabalho pedagógico no contexto do trabalho coletivo. *Acta Scientiarum. Education*, v. 45, n. 1, e54746, 2023. https://doi.org/10.4025/actascieduc.v45i1.54746.

FRIEND, M.; COOK, L. Interactions: collaboration skills for school professionals. 8. ed. Boston: Pearson, 2017.

HUDSON, C. A conceptual framework for understanding effective professional learning community (PLC) operation in schools. *Journal of Education*, v. 204, n. 3, p. 649-659, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1177/00220574231197364.

IACONO, T. *et al.* A systematized review of co-teaching efficacy in enhancing inclusive education for students with disability. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, v. 27, n. 13, p. 1454-1468, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2021.1900423.

JURKOWSKI, S.; ULRICH, M.; MÜLLER, B. Co-teaching as a resource for inclusive classes: teachers' perspectives on conditions for successful collaboration. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, v. 27, n. 1, p. 54-71, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1821449.

OLIVEIRA, A. C. P. de; CARVALHO, C. P de; CARRASQUEIRA, K. Colaboração docente e resultados educacionais no Brasil. *Educar em Revista*, v. 36, e70499, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1590/0104-4060.70499.

OLMO-EXTREMERA, M.; FERNÁNDEZ-TEROL, L.; DOMINGO-SEGOVIA, J. Leading a professional learning community in elementary education: a systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, v. 19, n. 1, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1177/19427751221145207.

PAULSRUD, D.; NILHOLM, C. Teaching for inclusion: a review of research on the cooperation between regular teachers and special educators in the work with students in need of special support.

International Journal of Inclusive Education, v. 27, n. 4, p. 541-555, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1846799.

POZAS, M.; LETZEL-ALT, V. Teacher collaboration, inclusive education and differentiated instruction: a matter of exchange, co-construction, or synchronization? *Cogent Education*, v. 10, n. 2, art. 2240941, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2240941.

RISEMBERG, R. I. C.; WAKIN, M.; SHITSUKA, R. A importância da metodologia científica no desenvolvimento de artigos científicos. *E-Acadêmica,* 7(1), e0171675. 2026. https://doi.org/10.52076/eacad-v7i1.675.

RUBERTO, N.; BOILY, É.. Supporting co-planning between general and special education teachers in secondary schools. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, v. 62, n. 1, p. 67-76, 2026. https://doi.org/10.1177/10534512261450147.

SEBASTIAN-HEREDERO, E.; GÓES, A. R. T.; GÓES, H. C. Planejamento docente no contexto do Desenho Universal para Aprendizagem: fundamentos e estratégias. *Revista Educação Especial,* Santa Maria, v. 38, n. 1, e84/01-24, 2025. https://doi.org/10.5902/1984686X93528.

SILVA, R. S. da; VILARONGA, C. A. R. Colaboração entre professores do ensino comum e especial em um município paraense. *Revista Eletrônica de Educação*, v. 15, e4147009, 2021. https://doi.org/10.14244/198271994147.

SILVA, S. S.; PIRES, E. D. P. B.; GOMES, M. do A. A. Coordenação pedagógica: percepções dos coordenadores escolares na perspectiva da gestão democrática. *Acta Scientiarum. Education*, v. 45, n. 1, e55295, 2023. https://doi.org/10.4025/actascieduc.v45i1.55295.

SOUSA, A. S. de; OLIVEIRA, G. S. de; ALVES, L. H. A pesquisa bibliográfica: princípios e fundamentos. *Cadernos da FUCAMP*, v. 20, n. 43, 2021.

STROGILOS, V. *et al.* A meta-synthesis of co-teaching students with and without disabilities. *Educational Research Review*, v. 38, art. 100504, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2022.100504.

THOMPSON, J. R. *et al.* Does planning and arranging individualized supports for students with intellectual and developmental disabilities influence educator confidence and competence in universal design for learning? International *Journal of Developmental Disabilities*, v. 71, n. 5, p. 733-745, 2025. https://doi.org/10.1080/20473869.2023.2286407.

---

[1] Doctoral Student in Education Sciences at the American University.

[2] Master's Degree in Education (Federal University of Ceará – UFC).

[3] Master's Degree in Educational Sciences. Universidad del Sol.

[4] Master's Degree in Climatology from the State University of Ceará (UECE).

[5] Postgraduate Degree in Criminal Law from UniAteneu University Center.

[6] Master's Degree in Educational Sciences from UNIGRAN.

[7] Master's Degree in Educational Sciences. Universidad del Sol.

[8] Master's Degree in Educational Sciences. Universidad del Sol.

[9] Doctoral Student in Educational Sciences (UNADES).

[10] Dr. in Biological Sciences (Cultural Title) (FICL). Master's degree in Crop Science (UFC). E-mail: acesse o artigo original para visualizar o e-mail.

[11] Master's Degree in Educational Sciences. Universidad del Sol.

[12] Postgraduate Studies in History Education (University Center Farias Brito) and Institutional Psychopedagogy (State University of Vale do Acaraú).

[13] Postgraduate Specialization in School Management and Coordination (Faculdade Prominas).