

**INCLUSIVE PEDAGOGICAL PLANNING IN BASIC EDUCATION: CURRICULUM
FLEXIBILITY AND ENSURING THE RIGHT TO LEARN**

 <https://doi.org/10.63330/aurumpub.073-011>

André Felipe Gomes do Nascimento¹, Tiago Augusto de Figueiredo², Leidiane Maria Magalhães Nascimento³, Cristiane Vieira da Silva Sousa⁴, Luciano João da Silva⁵, Diego Mairins Pereira⁶, Iara Maria Dias Mesquita⁷, Jairo Aldemar Bastidas Gustin⁸, Rafael dos Santos Nardotto⁹ and Isaque Pinho dos Santos¹⁰

¹ Master's Degree in Science and Mathematics Education - UFPE
Carpina - PE

E-mail: andre.fgnascimento@professor.educacao.pe.gov.br
Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/1553435182692707>

² Master's Degree in Teaching Management and Planning from Unincor, Três Corações, MG
FADIVA - Faculdade de Direito de Varginha, docente

E-mail: professor.tiagoaugusto@yahoo.com.br

³ Master's Degree in Language Studies/Linguistics
Universidade Federal do Piauí - UFPI
Teresina - PI

E-mail: leydymagna@hotmail.com
Lattes: <https://lattes.cnpq.br/4451979234217493>
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0964-2416>

⁴ Postgraduate Specialization in Educational Supervision
FAP/UESPI
Teresina - Piauí

E-mail: Crisobreira@outlook.com

⁵ Master's Degree
Universidade Federal de Pernambuco - UFPE
Recife - PE

E-mail: luciano.joao@ufpe.br
Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/7521338210112105>

⁶ Postgraduate Specialization in Chemistry Teaching and Related Technologies
Universidade Federal do Piauí, campus Picos
Ouricuri - Pernambuco

E-mail: ifdiegomairinspereira@gmail.com
Lattes: <https://lattes.cnpq.br/7893129521213506>

⁷ Teaching Degree in Humanities – History
Universidade Federal do Maranhão - UFMA
Codó Maranhão

E-mail: iaramesquita1921@gmail.com
Lattes: <https://lattes.cnpq.br/8090156256542876>

⁸ PhD in Geography
Universidade São Francisco - USF
Bragança Paulista - São Paulo - SP

E-mail: jairobg@gmail.com
Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/4072883527114864>

⁹ Master's Degree in Teaching, PPGEN
Universidade Estadual do Norte do Paraná - UENP
E-mail: rafaelsantosquimica2012@gmail.com

Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/2720118155933737>
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7106-3231>

¹⁰ Postgraduate Specialist in Science and Mathematics Teaching
IFMA
Codó - MA
E-mail: prof.isaque@hotmail.com

Abstract

This article analyzes inclusive pedagogical planning in Basic Education, with particular attention to curriculum flexibility and the conditions required to realize the right to learn. It presents a qualitative bibliographic and documentary study that brings together research on school inclusion, curriculum organization, didactics, assessment, and Universal Design for Learning, together with Brazilian regulatory frameworks. It discusses the difference between enrollment and effective participation, the importance of pedagogical diagnosis, the distinction between curriculum flexibility and curriculum impoverishment, and the limitations of individualized responses disconnected from institutional conditions. It argues that inclusion requires intentional planning, accessibility, methodological diversification, continuous monitoring, and shared responsibility among teachers, school administrators, and support services. By way of synthesis, it presents a framework of operational dimensions to guide planning and assessment decisions. It concludes that ensuring the right to learn requires transforming teaching practices and conditions while maintaining high educational expectations that are nevertheless responsive to students' different trajectories.

Keywords: Basic education, Curriculum flexibility, Inclusive education, Pedagogical planning, Right to learning.

INTRODUCTION

There is something apparently simple yet profoundly challenging about the assertion that schools must teach everyone. Students with different backgrounds, learning paces, conditions for participation, and ways of learning are part of everyday life in Basic Education. This diversity, however, is not always reflected in curriculum proposals, the materials used, or assessment practices. Many educational experiences are still organized around an idealized student for whom uniform timelines and trajectories are established. The problem does not lie in the existence of common objectives, which are indispensable

to ensuring the right to education, but in the assumption that a single pathway is sufficient for achieving them.

Pedagogical planning occupies a decisive place in this debate. Although it is sometimes treated as an administrative requirement, planning means making choices about the knowledge worth teaching, how to create learning situations, the necessary forms of mediation, and the evidence that will make it possible to recognize students' progress. These decisions are also ethical and political: they can expand participation or reinforce silent processes of exclusion. Inclusive education requires teachers to ask not only which students are unable to keep up with a lesson, but also what barriers the lesson itself may be creating.

In the Brazilian context, regulatory achievements related to access to school and specialized educational services (*atendimento educacional especializado – AEE*) coexist with implementation challenges. The 1988 Federal Constitution recognizes education as a right of all; the National Education Guidelines and Framework Law establishes the responsibilities of education systems; and the Brazilian Inclusion Law reinforces the need to provide conditions for access, participation, and learning. However, the formal recognition of rights does not, in itself, ensure that they are reflected in classroom activities. Oliveira and Leite (2007) had already discussed the gap between the political intention to build inclusive education systems and the resources actually made available to schools.

It is also necessary to prevent the idea of curriculum flexibility from being reduced to the preparation of easier tasks for certain students. This interpretation, which is still present in everyday practices, can turn an action described as inclusive into a mechanism that distances students from school knowledge. Flexibility requires viewing the curriculum as a pathway with common purposes but different conditions of access, timeframes, languages, forms of mediation, and means of expression. The challenge is to recognize specific needs without predetermining the limits of what each student will be able to learn.

In their analysis of the practices and documents of a public school, Santos and Cruz (2022) demonstrate that inclusion depends on pedagogical decisions and organizational conditions. Their study

helps show that a political-pedagogical project formally committed to diversity may coexist with poorly planned teaching practices. This contradiction is significant: inclusive discourse may remain confined to institutional documents when it does not extend to the selection of resources, student monitoring, and the concrete organization of lessons.

Assessment is another dimension of this debate. If planning sets out inclusive objectives but the school uses only standardized instruments administered under identical conditions and interpreted without considering barriers to access, the assessment process may contradict its stated intentions. Diversifying assessment instruments does not mean assigning arbitrary results or abandoning the knowledge established in the curriculum. Rather, it requires producing valid evidence of what has been learned and understanding the conditions under which that learning becomes observable. From this perspective, planning, teacher intervention, and assessment should be understood as interdependent components.

This article aims to analyze how inclusive pedagogical planning and curriculum flexibility can contribute to ensuring the right to learn in Basic Education. Through bibliographic and documentary research, it presents the foundations of inclusive education, discusses the curriculum and its potential for flexibility, examines teachers' decisions concerning strategies and assessment, and proposes a concise framework of planning dimensions. The discussion seeks to connect the academic literature with the tensions present in educational work without assigning teachers sole responsibility for problems that are also institutional and social.

INCLUSIVE EDUCATION AND THE RIGHT TO LEARN: BETWEEN PRINCIPLE AND SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

Inclusive education must be situated within the broader field of social rights. Recognition of access to schooling was a historic achievement, but it is insufficient unless accompanied by genuine opportunities for participation, development, and learning. A school may admit all students while simultaneously organizing practices that leave some of them on the margins of the most cognitively

meaningful activities. In such cases, exclusion is no longer expressed solely through physical absence but becomes embedded in everyday interactions, expectations, and curriculum decisions.

The 1988 Constitution establishes education as a right of all and a duty of the State and the family. The National Education Guidelines and Framework Law (Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional – LDB), Law No. 9,394/1996, provides for resources, methods, and forms of organization suited to students' needs and assigns teachers responsibility for planning and learning. Law No. 13,146/2015, in turn, recognizes the right of persons with disabilities to an inclusive education system at all levels, linking it to conditions of access, retention, participation, and learning. These texts do not replace didactic reflection; rather, they require it to be undertaken as a public commitment.

Mantoan's (2003) discussion is relevant because it distinguishes inclusion from initiatives that merely place students within unchanged structures. From an inclusive perspective, individuals should not be required to prove beforehand that they are capable of adapting to a rigid organization; schools must question their own modes of operation. This does not mean denying individual characteristics or disregarding specialized support. It means recognizing that the standard organization of schooling must be transformed to embrace diversity as a constitutive feature of every class.

Oliveira and Leite (2007) situate school transformation within a field of shared responsibilities and argue that inclusion cannot be understood as a spontaneous initiative or a scattered set of good intentions. In addressing the complexity of the process, the authors state:

As we can see, realizing the idea of an inclusive education system requires highly complex planning, ranging from actions to be implemented at the macrosystem level, through the development of a differentiated education policy, to specific actions in the everyday classroom, through pedagogical planning that addresses the diversity of students at the school, including students with disabilities (Oliveira; Leite, 2007, p. 514).

This passage makes explicit that inclusive planning operates on different scales. At the education-system level, it involves resource allocation, professional development policies, the provision of

specialized support, and curriculum guidance. At the institutional level, it depends on the political-pedagogical project, forms of collaboration, and time allocated for study. In the classroom, it takes shape through questions more closely connected to teaching practice: Which objective is at stake? What barriers may arise? What forms of mediation will be offered? How will learning be monitored? Connecting these different scales prevents inclusion from being treated as an isolated individual effort.

Booth and Ainscow (2011) contribute to this understanding by organizing reflection around inclusive cultures, policies, and practices. Inclusion ceases to be regarded as an action aimed only at previously identified students and instead becomes an organizing principle for the school community. Culture concerns the beliefs and relationships that make belonging possible; policies express institutional commitments; and practices embody those commitments in everyday life. When these dimensions develop separately, a school may proclaim inclusive values while maintaining exclusionary procedures.

The UNESCO report (2020) broadens the scope of the discussion by indicating that various factors, including socioeconomic conditions, disability, language, territory, and displacement, may affect educational opportunities. Attention to diversity, therefore, should not be confused with creating a fixed category of students who supposedly require special intervention while all others are regarded as homogeneous. Inclusive pedagogical organization begins with the recognition that any student may encounter barriers in particular teaching experiences.

We therefore understand that Inclusive Education must be grounded in the principle of equality, according to which respecting difference is not opposed to equality but instead ensures equal rights by addressing each person's specific needs, given that everyone is different. This idea is complemented by the principle of equity, which, in turn, calls for differentiated conditions to remedy the social, cultural, and economic inequalities affecting those in disadvantaged situations (Oliveira; Leite, 2007, p. 517).

This recognition requires a distinction between formal equality and equity. Offering everyone exactly the same activity, within the same timeframe and using the same means, may produce profoundly unequal outcomes when the conditions for participation are not equivalent. Equity does not authorize

reducing the importance of common knowledge; rather, it guides the provision of resources and forms of mediation proportionate to identified needs. In pedagogical terms, the priority is to preserve the right of access to relevant curriculum experiences while revising the conditions needed to make that access possible.

The analysis by Oliveira and Leite (2007) also warns against the mistaken idea that schools are neutral. Selecting content, organizing groups, setting timeframes, and interpreting difficulties are socially situated decisions. Thus, when an institution recognizes only one linguistic repertoire, reading pace, or form of communication as legitimate, it may establish barriers that remain invisible precisely because they appear natural. Questioning these barriers is part of the professional responsibility of those who plan and coordinate pedagogical actions.

A conceptual distinction must also be maintained: inclusive education is not synonymous with Special Education, although it encompasses it. Special Education provides essential knowledge, services, and support for particular students; the principle of inclusion, in turn, guides the entire school in responding to the diversity present in its classes. Advocating shared participation does not eliminate the need for specialized educational services, assistive technologies, or specific resources. The challenge is to establish connections so that these forms of support broaden, rather than replace, students' engagement with the common curriculum.

The quality of this engagement can be observed in seemingly minor situations: enabling a student to take part in a literary discussion with audio support; using visual materials to make a concept more understandable; introducing vocabulary in advance for those facing linguistic barriers; or expanding the ways a mathematical solution can be recorded. None of these decisions, in isolation, resolves every inequality. Taken together and guided by clear objectives, however, they indicate that learning is a right to be realized, not a privilege reserved for those who best adapt to the usual lesson format.

SCHOOL CURRICULUM AND FLEXIBILITY: WHAT CHANGES AND WHAT MUST BE PRESERVED

The curriculum is not a neutral list of topics distributed throughout the school year. It expresses choices concerning knowledge, cultural experiences, social relationships, and educational purposes. Sacristán (2000) problematizes the distance between curriculum prescriptions and their realization within institutions, drawing attention to the processes through which the curriculum is interpreted and experienced. This perspective helps us understand that inclusion will not be achieved merely by changing a document; it depends on the forms of mediation and decisions through which the curriculum reaches students.

In Basic Education, national curriculum guidelines seek to establish essential learning. The National Common Curricular Base (Base Nacional Comum Curricular – BNCC) may serve as a shared reference for organizing teaching, but it does not eliminate the need for pedagogical interpretation of specific contexts. A skill established in a regulatory document does not, in itself, determine the sequence of activities, teaching resources, language accessible to different groups, or ways of verifying progress. Between the prescribed curriculum and the curriculum actually learned lie decisions that require professional knowledge.

Curriculum flexibility should be understood within this space of mediation. Rather than opposing a common curriculum to responses addressing individual needs, the relevant question is how to preserve educational objectives without requiring uniform pathways. In each situation, this task requires distinguishing the essential core of the knowledge from what is merely one particular way of teaching or demonstrating it. If the objective is to understand the argumentative organization of a text, for example, silently reading a printed version need not be the only point of entry into the work, provided that the activity retains its focus on examining the text, its argumentation, and its linguistic resources.

Santos and Cruz (2022) investigated curriculum flexibility through observation and documentary analysis within a public-school context. By relating guidance documents to everyday experiences, the

authors identified obstacles associated with planning and the realization of inclusion. Their contribution is especially relevant because it shifts the debate away from the abstract claim that the curriculum should be flexible and toward the need to examine what actually happens during lessons.

In summarizing the implications for teachers' work and education systems, the researchers state:

Making the curriculum flexible or adapting it requires teachers to receive continuing education that addresses this dimension, but it also requires accessible resources and investment in education by state, federal, and municipal administrators. Inclusion requires collective work (Santos; Cruz, 2022, p. 16).

This passage prevents flexibility from being confused with individual improvisation. Teachers need conditions that enable them to understand the curriculum, know their students, engage with other professionals, prepare alternatives, and assess their effects. Demanding adaptations without organizing professional development and support may result in isolated responses disconnected from learning progression and the institution's collective decisions.

The concept of pedagogical differentiation, discussed by Perrenoud (2000), offers contributions to thinking about ways of teaching heterogeneous groups. Differentiating does not mean permanently separating a class into ability categories, nor does it mean offering impoverished tasks to students who experience difficulties. It refers to organizing learning situations capable of accommodating different processes and guiding appropriate interventions. Even so, it is important to recognize that differentiation may produce segregation when it fixes unequal expectations or excludes some students from more complex experiences.

In this sense, flexibility may involve time, the teaching sequence, language, resources, mediation, grouping arrangements, and assessment instruments. Altering essential objectives requires careful discussion, pedagogical justification, and monitoring, particularly because repeated decisions to remove curriculum content may compromise the student's right to knowledge. As a rule, the way something is

taught is more open to variation than the commitment to learning considered relevant to students' education.

In literacy instruction, for example, work with the same writing system may combine phonological-awareness games, shared reading, movable letters, written records, listening to texts, and specific forms of mediation. In Science, an investigation may include enlarged images, oral descriptions of phenomena, tactile diagrams where appropriate, and the collaborative production of explanations. In Portuguese Language, work with discourse genres may open different pathways for reading, speaking, writing, and revision. Diverse pathways do not replace conceptual rigor; they require clarity about the knowledge mobilized by each activity.

It is equally necessary to recognize that not every barrier can be resolved through changes to teaching. Physical inaccessibility, staff shortages, the absence of appropriate materials, prejudice, and socioeconomic conditions may limit the school experience. Planning must recognize these situations and mobilize institutional action rather than attributing to students the failure of conditions that were not adequately provided. At this point, curriculum flexibility and education policy become inseparable dimensions.

Another issue concerns the relationship between flexibility and expectations. There is a critical difference between understanding a student's pace of development and assuming that the student will be unable to access more complex concepts. The former justifies monitoring and mediation; the latter may restrict opportunities before they have even been explored. An inclusive approach must sustain high but adjustable expectations, taking account of evidence of learning, the support required, and the possibility of revising strategies.

The expression curriculum adaptation itself merits critical analysis. In some situations, it refers to resources indispensable to ensuring accessibility and participation. In others, it may represent the idea of an original curriculum, regarded as normal, from which some students receive a peripheral version. The point is not to reject the term in principle, but to examine its effects: Who participates in the activity?

Does the student have access to the same intellectual problem being discussed by the class? Does the support foster increasing autonomy, or does it establish permanent dependence?

Flexibility does not mean an absence of planning. On the contrary, the greater the diversity of possible pathways, the more necessary it becomes to define objectives, criteria, and indicators. A plan that is open to different pedagogical responses is not an imprecise plan. It involves anticipating well-founded alternatives, recording what happens, and reorganizing interventions as students demonstrate new possibilities or difficulties.

For this reason, the central question should not simply be whether the teacher implemented an adapted activity, but whether the decisions made expanded the student's relationship with knowledge. This change in perspective provides a criterion for assessing the practice itself: flexibility is inclusive when it creates more powerful conditions for participation and learning; it becomes problematic when it produces busywork without challenge, parallel activities without interaction, or the premature removal of meaningful content.

PEDAGOGICAL PLANNING AS INTENTIONAL AND COLLECTIVE MEDIATION

Planning is an intellectual and professional activity that accompanies teachers' work before, during, and after a lesson. Libâneo (1994) understands didactics as a field of reflection on teaching objectives, content, methods, and conditions, providing a foundation for recognizing planning as an intentional and context-sensitive choice. From this perspective, a written plan is an important record, but it does not encompass the full scope of planning. Planning is also expressed in the ability to observe the class, reinterpret a task, revisit an explanation, and decide when to persist with, expand, or modify an activity.

The starting point for inclusive planning is the careful definition of learning objectives. It is necessary to ask which concept, procedure, or attitude is to be developed and why that knowledge matters to the student's education. Without this clarity, methodological diversification risks becoming an

accumulation of interesting activities disconnected from educational progression. Once the objective has been made explicit, different pathways can be compared according to how they contribute to achieving it.

Diagnostic observation is another essential component. Diagnosing does not mean definitively classifying the group into strong and weak students, nor does it mean reducing a child to a diagnosis they may have received. It means gathering information about prior knowledge, forms of communication, experiences, barriers, interests, and useful forms of support. This information must be revised over time because students change, learn from their peers, and respond differently depending on the activity proposed.

Vygotsky's work (2007) contributes to thinking about learning as a socially mediated process. Interaction with peers, teachers, cultural tools, and languages can reorganize ways of understanding and acting. From this perspective, planning does not merely involve adjusting a task to what a child can accomplish independently. It also entails organizing supported experiences in which collaboration and mediation make emerging forms of learning possible.

This perspective changes the pedagogical use of grouping. Collaborative work can expand exchanges and forms of participation, provided that the tasks require genuine collaboration and distribute opportunities for contribution. Simply placing students in groups is not enough; it is necessary to define shared problems, organize roles without entrenching hierarchies, and monitor whether everyone has the opportunity to participate in constructing knowledge. Flexible groups, study pairs, and cooperative activities can be important resources, but they are not automatically inclusive.

Freire (1996) calls attention to the ethical dimension of teaching and the need to consider the people involved in the educational process. Knowing students means listening to their experiences and recognizing their knowledge without allowing this appreciation to result in the abandonment of their right to new knowledge. Inclusive planning engages with the reality of each group, but it cannot restrict the school repertoire to what is already familiar. Schools are responsible for broadening cultural horizons and

providing conditions for the appropriation of knowledge that would otherwise remain unequally distributed throughout society.

Collective work is equally decisive. Classroom teachers, specialized educational service professionals, pedagogical coordinators, school administrators, and families have different perspectives on students' needs and potential. The most productive form of collaboration does not consist in transferring responsibility for teaching to a specialized professional; it consists in bringing together different forms of knowledge so that students can participate in school experiences and the team can monitor the effects of the support provided.

In the study by Santos and Cruz (2022), the analysis of lesson plans and the political-pedagogical project revealed a gap between documented commitments and observed practices. The authors report an absence of systematic planning during the initial observation period and describe strategies developed during their teaching practice to encourage participation. The incident, reported by the researchers, in which a student with a disability was removed from the classroom to complete an assessment demonstrates how certain decisions, even when justified as organizational measures, may affect belonging and relationships at school.

It is therefore essential to examine the intent and effects of support. Completing an assessment in another environment may be necessary and legitimate when it constitutes an accessibility measure, respects the student, and seeks to obtain a valid measurement of learning. It becomes exclusionary when the justification is to remove someone considered disruptive or incapable of participating. The same spatial arrangement may assume different meanings depending on the context, objectives, possible consent, and conditions provided.

The political-pedagogical project (projeto político-pedagógico – PPP) should embody these choices at the institutional level rather than serve as a document consulted only for bureaucratic purposes. A PPP committed to inclusion must clearly set out principles, responsibilities, forms of monitoring, collective planning, and review mechanisms. When it becomes outdated or detached from everyday

practice, it loses some of its power to provide guidance. The documentary analysis presented by Santos and Cruz (2022) helps identify precisely the problem of formal documents that lack sufficient correspondence with practice.

Among the necessary working conditions, planning time deserves particular attention. Producing accessible materials, developing alternatives, consulting colleagues, and analyzing records require dedicated professional time. Attributing the success of inclusion solely to teachers' creativity conceals the effort involved and may normalize precarious structures. Continuing education, in turn, must extend beyond occasional lectures and take the form of study processes connected to the concrete situations experienced by the team.

In short, planning for diversity means making justified and revisable decisions. Teachers cannot anticipate every situation, but they can prepare consistent objectives, identify likely barriers, make relevant options available, and organize opportunities for observation. Openness to change is not evidence of a lack of rigor; it is one dimension of the rigor required by pedagogical practice committed to real people.

INCLUSIVE STRATEGIES, UNIVERSAL DESIGN FOR LEARNING, AND ASSESSMENT

Universal Design for Learning (Desenho Universal para a Aprendizagem – DUA), frequently referred to in English as UDL, makes an important contribution by shifting part of the work of inclusion to the initial design of pedagogical experiences. Rather than constructing a single pathway and only later making adjustments for those unable to follow it, UDL proposes that student variability be considered in advance. CAST's updated guidelines (2024) emphasize the removal of barriers, learner agency, and the organization of multiple means of engagement, representation, and action and expression.

An instrumental and oversimplified interpretation of these guidelines must be avoided. Offering slides, videos, and images in the same lesson does not necessarily constitute universal planning. The relevant question is whether these resources expand understanding, opportunities for choice, and the

expression of knowledge in relation to the objective of the experience. In some situations, diversification requires digital technologies; in others, it calls for concrete materials, dialogic explanations, advance instruction in vocabulary, visual organization, or changes to the time available for completing tasks.

Organizing different means of engagement acknowledges that interest and participation are not produced uniformly. Activities involving socially relevant problems, opportunities for guided choice, cooperative work, and the clear presentation of objectives may foster student involvement. Learning, however, also requires students to confront difficulties and knowledge with which they may initially be unfamiliar. Pedagogical engagement is not synonymous with constant entertainment; it means creating conditions that enable students to find meaning in a task and recognize their ability to act in relation to it.

Multiple means of representation concern how information and concepts are made accessible. A text may be accompanied by reading aloud, magnification resources, image descriptions, glossaries, graphic representations, and materials compatible with assistive technologies. Each resource should be selected in response to barriers that have actually been identified. An indiscriminate proliferation of stimuli may cause overload, which is why diversification must be accompanied by prioritization and conceptual clarity.

The dimension of action and expression recognizes that students may demonstrate knowledge through different means, depending on the nature of the objective. An oral explanation, a written text, a model, a presentation, or a diagram may provide relevant evidence, but these forms are not automatically equivalent. If the skill being assessed is argumentative writing, for example, permanently replacing written production with speech does not make it possible to assess the full scope of the intended learning. In this case, accessibility should guide the selection of production resources and support without erasing the knowledge to be developed.

Inclusive planning also involves teaching students how to use the available resources. A reading tool, graphic organizer, or communication application does not create autonomy merely by being available. Students need to learn how to use these resources, understand their possibilities, and participate

in decisions about which forms of support are useful to them. This attention prevents materials from being treated as automatic solutions to situations that depend on human mediation and pedagogical monitoring.

Assessment is inseparable from this process. Hoffmann (2014) advocates a mediational understanding of assessment, in which observing and interpreting learning serves to guide new interventions. This approach is particularly relevant when learning trajectories unfold at different paces. Assessment comes to include records of learning processes, feedback, opportunities to revisit content, revision, and decisions about new forms of support, rather than merely the final assignment of a result.

In discussing learning assessment, Luckesi problematizes classificatory uses that turn difficulties into labels and weaken the diagnostic nature of assessment activities. In inclusive planning, assessing means identifying what the student has actually understood, which barriers affected the response, and what needs to be taught again in a different way. This does not eliminate criteria or dispense with reporting results; it requires criteria to be aligned with the objectives and applied fairly.

Diversified assessment must preserve pedagogical validity. Providing additional time, allowing the use of an accessibility resource, or changing the format in which questions are presented may remove barriers without changing the competency being assessed. In other cases, the change alters the object of assessment itself and must be addressed transparently. Decisions require analysis of the content in question, monitoring of the student's trajectory, and professional dialogue, avoiding both inflexible standardization and flexibility without criteria.

Spaces must also be created for students to understand the feedback they receive and participate in monitoring their progress. Simple records of goals, guided self-assessments, understandable rubrics, and opportunities to discuss strategies may increase autonomy. This work requires a gradual approach: not all students initially master the language of school assessment, and teachers are responsible for teaching it accessibly.

Effective pedagogical planning also provides opportunities for reteaching. Identifying and documenting difficulties without revising the available learning opportunities does little to ensure

learning. Revisiting a concept using another representation, reorganizing groups, proposing an intermediate task, or intensifying mediation are decisions that connect diagnosis and intervention. A diversity of responses thus becomes part of the regular teaching cycle rather than appearing only at the end of the school term.

The CAST guidelines (2024) reinforce that UDL is not a prescribed set of techniques that must be used in every lesson. Teachers select possibilities according to the context, objectives, and barriers. This interpretation safeguards professional autonomy and requires reflection on the actual effects of each choice. Inclusive planning improves when its quality is no longer measured by the number of resources used but by whether those resources have expanded meaningful opportunities to learn.

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The article was developed through a qualitative bibliographic and documentary study with a theoretical-analytical purpose. The bibliographic research focused on works discussing school inclusion, curriculum, didactics, mediation, pedagogical differentiation, and assessment, prioritizing references capable of establishing relationships between everyday teaching decisions and institutional conditions. The documentary corpus comprised Brazilian regulatory frameworks related to the right to education and inclusion, the National Common Curricular Base, and international guidelines on inclusive education and Universal Design for Learning.

Among the studies examined directly, particular attention was given to Santos and Cruz (2022) and Oliveira and Leite (2007), whose full texts underpin the discussion of flexibility, planning, and organizational challenges. The dialogue with Sacristán, Libâneo, Mantoan, Perrenoud, Freire, Vygotsky, and assessment researchers was used to develop interpretive categories without assuming that these theoretical frameworks offer identical answers. The recommendations of CAST (2024) and UNESCO (2020) were used as guidance documents, with due regard for the fact that their purposes differ from those of empirical research.

The materials were read and organized into five thematic areas: the right to learn and inclusion; curriculum and flexibility; planning and teacher mediation; assessment and accessibility; and institutional conditions for implementing practices. The analysis consisted of critically examining the relationships among these areas to identify convergences, tensions, and implications for work in Basic Education. The framework presented in the following section is an interpretive synthesis developed through this process, not an empirically validated instrument.

Because of its bibliographic and documentary nature, the study does not present original observational data, interviews, or assessments of interventions in schools. The pedagogical examples mentioned throughout the article are illustrative situations developed to clarify conceptual implications rather than accounts of experiences collected by the author. This delimitation makes it possible to distinguish theoretical arguments, findings published in the studies consulted, and propositions formulated in this analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION: DIMENSIONS OF INCLUSIVE PLANNING

The articulation of the theoretical frameworks shows that ensuring the right to learn does not depend on an isolated action but on a sequence of decisions. Planning establishes purposes, organizes conditions of access, anticipates interventions, and produces information for review. When one of these stages becomes disconnected from the others, the proposal risks remaining merely declaratory. Six interdependent dimensions can therefore be identified to guide the analysis and development of inclusive practices.

The first dimension is a pedagogical reading of the context. This involves knowing students, their experiences, and the barriers they face without reducing them to diagnoses or isolated results. The second dimension involves defining the core body of knowledge to be ensured, distinguishing curriculum purposes from conventional presentation methods. The third concerns accessibility and the intentional selection of strategies. The fourth encompasses participation and interaction, including a sense of

belonging to the group. The fifth addresses assessment and monitoring, while the sixth concerns institutional shared responsibility, without which teachers' efforts may remain fragmented.

Table 1

Dimensions of inclusive pedagogical planning in Basic Education

Dimension	Planning decision	Guiding question
Diagnostic understanding	Map students' repertoires, barriers, and available support.	What do they already know, and what makes participation difficult?
Curriculum core	Define essential objectives and different pathways.	What knowledge must not be lost?
Instructional accessibility	Select languages, resources, timeframes, and forms of mediation.	What barriers can the proposal remove?
Interaction and belonging	Organize collaborative tasks and meaningful participation.	Does everyone have a place in the intellectual work?
Mediational assessment	Vary the evidence collected, provide feedback, and plan opportunities to revisit learning.	What has been learned, and what will the next action be?
Shared responsibility	Coordinate teachers, school administrators, AEE, and parents or guardians.	What conditions must the school ensure?

Source: Prepared by the authors based on the analysis of the theoretical frameworks discussed in this article.

The framework does not propose a rigid sequence of procedures. Its dimensions may be revisited continuously according to the evidence produced in everyday school life. When planning a reading sequence, for example, teachers may define in advance the interpretive knowledge they intend to develop, identify students who require specific support, organize mediated reading and different forms of recording, observe participation in discussions, and replan interventions. The expected outcome is not for every student's work to be identical, but for pedagogical choices to be relevant and consistent with the intended objectives.

The analysis also reveals a persistent tension between individualized planning and collective experience. Schools can recognize individual needs without isolating students in tasks disconnected from the activities of the class. No universal formula can resolve this balance. It requires an examination of concrete situations: Does specific support expand participation? Does the differentiated activity enable the student to engage with the common topic? Are there genuine opportunities for interaction? Can the

student demonstrate progress and take on new challenges? These questions are more productive than simply opposing identical and differentiated treatment.

A third issue concerns teacher education. The literature examined rejects the view that inclusion is achieved solely through personal willingness or individual sensitivity. Didactic knowledge enables teachers to identify objectives and organize interventions; knowledge of accessibility helps them recognize barriers; and collaborative work provides a repertoire that would be difficult to develop in isolation. Continuing education must therefore encourage case studies, material analysis, the joint development of teaching sequences, and reflection on practices that have actually been implemented.

At this point, the argument of Santos and Cruz (2022) gains strength by placing the need for resources and investment alongside professional development. When time, materials, and institutional support are lacking, dependence on emergency solutions tends to increase. Practice may become characterized by constant attempts to respond to situations that have already arisen rather than by anticipating barriers. More inclusive planning does not eliminate unforeseen events, but it reduces the centrality of improvisation as the primary response mechanism.

It is important to recognize that specialized educational services have an articulating rather than substitutive role in mainstream schooling. Collaborative work may involve analyzing the accessibility of materials, organizing assistive technology, developing communication strategies, and monitoring specific needs. Nevertheless, teaching curricular content remains a shared responsibility of the different professionals involved in the educational process. Fragmented responsibilities may lead to discontinuity and compromise student participation.

In the field of assessment, the discussion demonstrates that merely diversifying instruments without examining the criteria used is insufficient. A test with fewer questions may reduce the reading burden without necessarily preserving all the objectives being assessed. An oral response may be appropriate for verifying conceptual understanding but insufficient when the objective is to assess a specific writing skill. Visually enlarging a task may resolve an access barrier without changing its

cognitive demands in any way. The fairest decision depends on the correspondence among the objective, resource, and evidence.

Developing inclusive planning also requires care with the language used to refer to students. Expressions that turn temporary difficulties into fixed characteristics shape expectations and influence decisions. Saying that a student has not yet consolidated a particular skill under the teaching conditions provided thus far creates room for pedagogical action; stating that the student simply cannot learn tends to end the inquiry. This shift does not minimize genuine difficulties, but it avoids treating as natural limitations that may be changed through mediation.

Families' participation must be developed through respectful dialogue that acknowledges their knowledge of students without transferring to them responsibilities that belong to the school. Information about interests, forms of communication, and support needs may contribute to planning, provided that it is used ethically. The right to learn requires cooperation, but the school institution retains its duty to provide educational experiences and conditions consistent with its legal responsibilities.

Finally, the analysis identifies a political dimension within everyday teaching practice. Choosing an accessible resource, organizing an assessment under appropriate conditions, and refusing to systematically lower curriculum expectations are not purely technical decisions. They express an understanding of who should participate in socially produced knowledge. In this sense, inclusion is not limited to managing individual differences; it challenges school conventions that have historically determined which students could fully occupy the position of learners.

The potential of inclusive planning lies in making this reflection a recurring and shared practice. Teachers do not need to anticipate every possible way of learning, but they must have the conditions to observe, experiment, document, and revise different pathways. Students should not have to demonstrate an unlimited capacity to adapt in order to deserve participation; they need intellectually relevant opportunities and support proportionate to the barriers they face. Schools, in turn, must recognize that ensuring this right requires sustained institutional work.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Discussing inclusive pedagogical planning in Basic Education means recognizing that the right to education is not fully realized through enrollment and students' physical presence at school. Ensuring the right to learn depends on the quality of the experiences provided, opportunities to participate in collective activities, access to curriculum knowledge, and careful monitoring of developmental processes. This requirement moves inclusion beyond the realm of intentions and toward an examination of the concrete decisions made in everyday school life.

The bibliographic and documentary analysis showed that curriculum flexibility can constitute a relevant equity strategy when it preserves the centrality of knowledge and reorganizes conditions of access, mediation, time, resources, and assessment. Conversely, when used merely to permanently reduce content or assign parallel tasks, it may reinforce inequalities under the guise of a differentiated response. The challenge, therefore, is not to choose between common objectives and attention to individual characteristics, but to connect both through well-founded decisions.

Planning proved essential to establishing this connection. Defining objectives, developing a diagnostic understanding, anticipating barriers, and monitoring evidence of learning form a continuous process open to revision. The contribution of Universal Design for Learning lies precisely in broadening attention to diversity from the proposal's initial development without turning its guidelines into a catalog of techniques or prescribing that every activity offer every available alternative.

The importance of institutional conditions was also confirmed. Inclusion cannot depend exclusively on the creativity or individual commitment of teachers working in contexts often characterized by excessive workloads and insufficient resources. Time for study, continuing education, collaboration among professionals, accessibility, and the commitment of school administrators are part of pedagogical planning and the responsibilities of education systems. Inclusive experience requires consistency among documents, teaching choices, and the conditions actually ensured.

As a concise contribution, the proposed framework brought together dimensions that may guide collective discussions about planning: diagnostic understanding, curriculum core, accessibility, interaction, mediational assessment, and institutional shared responsibility. This is a theoretical systematization whose use in specific school settings requires adaptation and further study. The lack of original field research limits conclusions regarding the effectiveness of these dimensions, but it does not prevent their presentation as a reference for analysis and teacher education.

It is concluded that planning inclusively means treating diversity as a starting point rather than an exception to be managed at the end of a lesson. This does not mean expecting everyone to follow identical pathways, nor does it mean abandoning the rigor of formal education. It means creating conditions that give students access to meaningful experiences with knowledge, together with support, challenges, and opportunities for participation. When planning expresses this commitment, flexibility ceases to be a peripheral resource and becomes integral to ensuring the right to learn.

REFERENCES

- Booth, Tony; Ainscow, Mel. *Index for inclusion: developing learning and participation in schools*. 3rd ed. Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education, 2011.
- Brasil. *Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil de 1988* [Constitution of the Federative Republic of Brazil of 1988]. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 1988.
- Brasil. *Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996* [Law No. 9,394 of December 20, 1996]. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional [Establishes the national education guidelines and framework]. Brasília, DF, 1996.
- Brasil. *Lei nº 13.146, de 6 de julho de 2015* [Law No. 13,146 of July 6, 2015]. Institui a Lei Brasileira de Inclusão da Pessoa com Deficiência [Establishes the Brazilian Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities Law]. Brasília, DF, 2015.

Brasil. Ministério da Educação. *Base Nacional Comum Curricular* [National Common Curricular Base].

Brasília, DF: MEC, 2018.

CAST. *Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 3.0*. 2024. Available at:

<https://udlguidelines.cast.org>. Accessed on: 14 Oct. 2026.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogia da autonomia: saberes necessários à prática educativa* [Pedagogy of autonomy: necessary knowledge for educational practice]. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1996.

Hoffmann, Jussara. *Avaliação mediadora: uma prática em construção da pré-escola à universidade* [Mediational assessment: a practice under development from preschool to university]. Porto Alegre: Mediação, 2014.

Libâneo, José Carlos. *Didática* [Didactics]. São Paulo: Cortez, 1994.

Luckesi, Cipriano Carlos. *Avaliação da aprendizagem escolar: estudos e proposições* [Assessment of school learning: studies and propositions]. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011.

Mantoan, Maria Teresa Eglér. *Inclusão escolar: o que é? por quê? como fazer?* [School inclusion: what is it? why? how can it be achieved?]. São Paulo: Moderna, 2003.

Oliveira, Anna Augusta Sampaio de; Leite, Lucia Pereira. Construção de um sistema educacional inclusivo: um desafio político-pedagógico [Building an inclusive education system: a political-pedagogical challenge]. *Ensaio: Avaliação e Políticas Públicas em Educação*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 15, n. 57, p. 511–524, 2007. DOI: 10.1590/S0104-40362007000400004.

Perrenoud, Philippe. *Pedagogia diferenciada: das intenções à ação* [Differentiated pedagogy: from intentions to action]. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2000.

Sacristán, José Gimeno. *O currículo: uma reflexão sobre a prática* [The curriculum: a reflection on practice]. 3rd ed. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2000.

Santos, Maylan Barbosa; Cruz, Lilian Moreira. Flexibilização curricular e seus reflexos na prática e no ambiente escolar para a educação inclusiva [Curriculum flexibility and its effects on practice and

the school environment for inclusive education]. *Revista de Estudos em Educação e Diversidade*,
v. 3, n. 9, p. 1–18, 2022. DOI: 10.22481/reed.v3i9.11390.

UNESCO. *Global education monitoring report 2020: inclusion and education: all means all*. Paris:
UNESCO, 2020.

Vygotsky, Lev Semionovitch. *A formação social da mente: o desenvolvimento dos processos psicológicos
superiores* [The social formation of the mind: the development of higher psychological processes].
São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2007.