

**COLLABORATIVE PLANNING: NEED AND POSSIBILITY IN TEACHING WORK
IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

***PLANEJAMENTO COLABORATIVO: NECESSIDADE E POSSIBILIDADE NO
TRABALHO DOCENTE NO ENSINO SUPERIOR***

***PLANIFICACIÓN COLABORATIVA: NECESIDAD Y POSIBILIDAD EN EL TRABAJO
DOCENTE EN LA EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR***



Hilda Maria Martins BANDEIRA¹
e-mail: hildabandeira@ufpi.edu.br



Eliana de Sousa Alencar MARQUES²
e-mail: esalencar123@ufpi.edu.br

How to reference this paper:

BANDEIRA, H. M. M.; MARQUES, E. S. A. Collaborative planning: Need and possibility in teaching work in Higher Education. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 18, n. 00, e023028, 2023. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v18i00.16173>



| Submitted: 25/01/2022
| Revisions required: 23/05/2022
| Approved: 10/09/2022
| Published: 04/05/2023

Editor: Prof. Dr. José Luís Bizelli
Deputy Executive Editor: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

¹ Federal University of Piauí (UFPI), Teresina – PI – Brazil. Professor of the Pedagogy course and the Graduate Program in Health and Community. Associate Professor at the Department of Teaching Methods and Techniques (CCE/UFPI). Doctorate in Education (UFPI).

² Federal University of Piauí (UFPI), Teresina – PI – Brazil. Professor of the Graduate Program in Education. Doctorate in Education (UFPI).

ABSTRACT: This article addresses the issue of the organization of teaching action from the understanding of the need for planning education in higher education. The reflections developed in the article start from the premise that teaching planning, from a collaborative perspective, surpasses the instrumental conception of planning, giving rise to questions such as: what do we mean by planning? What are the structural components of the teaching plan and / or lesson plan? What are the possibilities of collaborative planning? The research of bibliographic nature points out as results that, in the context of thinking and carrying out teaching planning, it is urgent to break with the tendency of isolation in the teaching profession. In this sense, the culture of collaborative practice among teachers is a possibility for the production of a meaningful curriculum, given that the shared teaching work encourages discussion, debate, reflection and decision on the content and form of planning, on the purposes and means to achieve transforming educational practices.

KEYWORDS: Teaching planning. Didactic action. Collaboration.

RESUMO: O artigo aborda a organização da ação docente a partir da compreensão da necessidade de planejamento de ensino na educação superior. As reflexões desenvolvidas partem da premissa de que o planejamento de ensino, na perspectiva colaborativa, supera a concepção instrumental de planejamento, ensejando questões como: o que entendemos por planejamento? Quais os componentes estruturantes do plano de ensino e/ou plano de aula? Quais as possibilidades de um planejamento colaborativo? A pesquisa de natureza bibliográfica aponta como resultados que, no contexto de pensar e realizar o planejamento de ensino, é urgente romper com a tendência do isolamento na profissão docente. Nesse sentido, a cultura da prática colaborativa entre os docentes constitui possibilidade para a produção de currículo significativo, tendo em vista que o trabalho docente compartilhado fomenta a discussão, o debate, a reflexão e a decisão sobre o conteúdo e a forma do planejamento, sobre os fins e os meios para se alcançar práticas educativas transformadoras.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Planejamento de ensino. Ação didática. Colaboração.

RESUMEN: El artículo aborda la organización de la acción docente desde la comprensión de la necesidad de planificación docente en la educación superior. Las reflexiones desarrolladas en el artículo parten de la premisa de que la planificación de la enseñanza, desde una perspectiva colaborativa, supera la concepción instrumental de planificación, dando lugar a preguntas como: ¿qué entendemos por planificación? ¿Cuáles son los componentes estructurales del plan de enseñanza y / o plan de clase? ¿Cuáles son las posibilidades de la planificación colaborativa? La investigación de carácter bibliográfico apunta como resultados que, en el contexto de pensar y llevar a cabo la planificación de la enseñanza, es urgente romper con la tendencia al aislamiento en la profesión docente. En este sentido, la cultura de la práctica colaborativa entre docentes es una posibilidad para la producción de un currículo significativo, dado que el trabajo docente compartido fomenta la discusión, el debate, la reflexión y la decisión sobre el contenido y forma de planificación, sobre los fines y los medios para lograr prácticas educativas transformadoras.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Planificación de la enseñanza. Acción didáctica. Colaboración.

Introduction

“The flow of life wraps everything up, life is like that: it heats up and cools down, it tightens up and then loosens up, it quiets down and then relaxes. What it wants from us is courage”³
(Guimarães Rosa, our translation)

The main purpose of this text is to create conditions for reflection on the organization of pedagogical work as one of the attributions of teaching activity. Among several ways to approach the issue, we chose to deal with the planning of teaching in higher education, explaining its possibilities of effectiveness, as well as its limitations, caused, among other things, by the isolation that affects most teachers who work in higher education.

The professional isolation of teachers is a social phenomenon that still prevails in educational institutions, especially in higher education, and this situation requires reflection and consideration. It is necessary, therefore, to reflect on the urgency of thinking the teaching work beyond isolation and, as a result, to understand the planning and organization of the class as collaborative activities.

In this text, we chose to focus our attention on the planning of teaching, considering that it is a subject of discussion in the field of Didactics, particularly in the Seminar on Higher Education Teaching, an integral part of the Program for Higher Education Training at the Federal University of Piauí (UFPI), which takes place at the beginning of each school term with the teachers recently hired by the institution. Therefore, as professors working at the Department of Teaching Methods and Techniques of the Science Center of UFPI (DMTE/CCE/UFPI), lecturers of Didactics at the undergraduate and graduate levels, we were provoked to produce this dialogue, thinking about the professors entering UFPI who participate in the Teaching Seminar and the undergraduate and graduate students. Therefore, this theme is of interest both to undergraduate and undergraduate students, as well as to teachers who work in higher education in general.

In no way, we disregard the need for the teacher to know and relate his work to the levels of educational, institutional and curricular planning, as highlighted by Gil (2008), we only give centrality to the planning of teaching because we consider this a teaching activity capable of favoring an additional quality to the pedagogical work.

³ Original quote in Portuguese: “O correr da vida embrulha tudo, a vida é assim: esquenta e esfria, aperta e daí afrouxa, sossega e depois desinquieta. O que ela quer da gente é coragem”

Starting from the premise that the planning of teaching, in the collaborative perspective, overcomes the instrumental conception of planning, some questions immediately mobilized the production of this dialog: what do we mean by planning? What are the structuring components of the teaching plan and/or lesson plan? What are the possibilities of a collaborative planning?

In order to present alternatives to the questions raised, we establish a dialog in this article with reference to the contributions of researchers in the field and our professional experience as teachers who work in teacher education with a concentration area in Didactics. To this end, we begin by contextualizing the theme, as well as our understanding about the planning of teaching, highlighting its function, its principles and structuring components. Next, we discuss the possibilities of collaborative planning. We end with considerations that help us to understand that the transformation of the relationship between teachers and the planning of education goes through the overcoming of bureaucracy and instrumental that currently prevails, and the adoption of planning as a teleological act, therefore, essentially human.

What, how and why to plan: thinking, doing and reworking

Education is a human uniqueness and, by force of needs, we continuously produce our own existence, therefore, not only we adapt to nature, we also adapt it to our needs, that is, we have the possibility to transform ourselves and our contexts. And this is done through work, human vital activity, activity through which the natural human being is confirmed as singularity and as universality, as individual and as gender (MACÁRIO, 2013).

This human condition of doing work is the primary factor that ensures human beings the primacy in their relationship with the world, since, according to Saviani (2005, p. 11, our translation), "[...] work is established from the moment its agent mentally anticipates the purpose of the action. Thus, the act of planning is a universal trait of our humanity, an essential quality of the human race and fundamental in the elaboration of the objective world.

In terms of teaching work, Saviani (2005) also points out that educational work is an intentional and purposeful activity, and its particularity lies in the fact that it mediates the production of human beings' second nature - the cultural one. According to this theorist, it is through the intentional and purposeful (planned) educational work that education affirms its cultural and, therefore, human nature. In this way, thinking about planning is not enough to enable the conditions of its elaboration, but the necessary relationship between what is thought

and what is done. In the words of Leal (2005, p. 2, our translation): "planning requires a scientific attitude of doing didactic-pedagogical work".

By making a brief contextualization about the planning obligation in the Brazilian educational environment, we find its genesis in the 1960s, when the requirement for teachers to prepare plans to work at school arose. According to Gandin and Cruz (2010, p. 11, our translation), "[...] the only models available were those that, [...] prevailed in the developmental efforts of governments and companies [...] authoritarian models and without adequacy for the diverse needs that society presented". In this context, the figure of the supervisor was instituted, and one of his attributions was to demand the elaboration of plans by the teachers, in order to seek efficiency in the school, according to the influence of the industrial model.

The understanding about education underlies the understanding about the type of planning. If in the past there was a model in which everything had been previously decided and in which the questions "how to do it and with what?" were convenient, certainly the instrumental perspective fit, the teacher filled out a form and the act of planning was limited to this. However, as Gandin and Cruz (2010, p. 13, our translation) state "[...] this framework was losing respect".

These authors consider that filling out these forms became an obsolete function, since the contents are reiterated every year; and this model became just a list of what can be done, not portraying what and why it is done; the discourse of flexibility mischaracterized the preparation of the plan, since it was up to teachers to do it, but without the necessary requirement to follow them. In this case, it was reduced to a program in which the teacher's role was only to transmit the content - for an experienced teacher, it would be enough to think a little, before class, about the subject to be taught.

Planning is an action inherent to the existential condition of the human being. A house cannot be built without a plan and calculations, which shows that its construction begins well before the raising of the supporting pillars and walls. Any human activity requires planning, if we decide to go on a trip, we organize a route with the destination, we think about the conditions and resources; if we accept an invitation to a lecture, a conference, we plan what the intentionality is, under what conditions, for what, with whom and with what resources, and how to evaluate the results of this action. Therefore, education cannot be thought and produced without planning.

This is what happens with the classes. Just like the house that starts to be built well before the walls are put up, the classes start well before they become effective. Sometimes the

teacher spends hours, even days, selecting materials, doing readings and producing what will be used by the students. In other circumstances, a few minutes is enough, but there is always an effort to systematize the teaching work. As Bandeira says (2018, p. 21, our translation):

Planning constitutes a theme of theoretical and methodological reflection and is a necessary and determining condition in educational work. Whatever the field of activity that the professional dedicates himself to, reflection on and in the work, he does and the socio-historical purposes cannot remain apart from the professional's area of interest, especially for those who exercise the teaching function.

Given the above, the planning is a possibility meant in the reality of the classroom context and its determinants. For Moretto (2010, p. 100, our translation), "[...] planning is an exit route, without certainty of the arrival points". In this sense, it is between predictability and the unexpected, considering that what occurs in the class movement influences the previously systematized, because, as Veiga (2011, p. 267, our translation) states, "[...] the class, privileged place of pedagogical life, refers to the dimensions of the didactic process teaching, learning, research and evaluation, prepared and organized by the teacher and his students".

In general, the teacher performs different functions, among them that of planner. It is notorious the recognition of the need for teaching planning, however, we do not always conceive our activities in a creative way, and sometimes we just follow the chapter in the book, leaving the reflection around "what", "under what conditions", "for what", "with whom" and "with what resources" to develop the pedagogical activity in a secondary plan.

When dealing with educational planning, we consider that there is a variety of definitions, therefore, we cannot lose sight of the fact that what is essential in the activity of planning is the balance between means and ends, between resources and objectives, between the idealized and the possible within the objective and subjective conditions of work, in addition to a theoretical and methodological frame of reference that guides the planned actions.

In general, in the reality of Brazilian schools, it is at the beginning of each school term that teachers are called upon to plan activities. The pedagogical weeks are part of the planning period in basic education schools, both in the public and private spheres. In higher education, this reality is no different. In the context of UFPI, particularly, it is always at the beginning of each school semester that the pedagogical meetings are foreseen in the academic calendar of the undergraduate courses (RESOLUTION 177/12 CEPEX/UFPI). And it is at this moment that the teaching planning actions are materialized by the professors.

In the context of the DMTE, where we work in the undergraduate course, the professors who have related disciplines meet, discuss, prepare and share the course plan or discipline plan which, in turn, is approved in the Department's assembly.

In this context, in which we develop our teaching activities, in the circumstances of the pedagogical meetings to prepare the course plans of the disciplines, in 2019, we came across narratives such as: "[...] well, I do not agree with some texts suggested for the discipline and I will not work with part of these texts nor with the methodology suggested, but it's okay, you can insert my name in the course plan, to be approved in the assembly". When asked about which suggestions should be added, the answer from some teachers is almost always the same: "I prefer to do my own planning.

These narratives remind us of the remnants of pedagogical practice, especially during the years of dictatorship (1964-1985), developed under the aegis of educational technicism. In this period, planning prevailed as a mechanism to standardize and control the teaching work, emphasizing the form, the technical writing, and the filling out of forms. This approach to planning benefited individualistic and fragmented teaching practices that promoted copying, reproduction, and silence, which, besides serving the purpose of meeting the needs of the required bureaucracy, favored the isolation of teachers.

The political reopening in subsequent years provided the holding of meetings, the exchange of collective experiences in educational institutions. Criticism of the bureaucratic planning prevailed, which denounced this instrumental aspect - the technical dimension dissociated from the other dimensions of the teaching and learning process (CANDAU, 2014, 2011). This scenario did not have enough time to consolidate the overcoming of the instrumental character in the organization of teaching practice, given that the 1990s was the period of reconfiguration of technicism influenced by globalization, and, as every cause has effects, this contributed to the demobilization of groups and professional categories.

Considering the due proportions, we understand that it is through planning that we elaborate possibilities before the needs and the social and cultural reality of our students. It happens that there are feasible possibilities of realization and those that dwindle due to unfavorable conditions in certain circumstances of time and space of the teaching work. Thus, it is the teacher's role to try to know the necessary and sufficient material conditions to relate what was thought with the existing reality and what is possible to be objectified. In this sense, planning is an indispensable mediation to pedagogical work and can substantially change its quality.

Structuring components of teaching planning: orientation path for didactic action

Starting from the assumption that planning is not a neutral act, since the planned actions, when carried out, can favor both the reiteration of conservative practices and the production of transformative possibilities, such activity cannot be performed in the absence of deep critical reflection. It is through critical reflection between the ends of pedagogical practice and the means to achieve these ends that we have the chance to realize a transforming praxis in education. This presupposition is fundamental to think of planning as a teleological activity that defines the ends of the didactic action. And how is this concretized in practice? By the conscious articulation between the structuring components of the teaching planning that will guide the didactic action.

In this sense, the teacher is one of the main actors in planning, given that when planning he/she exercises the power to intervene on the directions of the thinking and doing of the teaching work. For this reason, whether when called to review the Pedagogical Project of the Course (PPC), or even when challenged to plan their daily didactic action, the teacher needs to understand that the act of planning goes beyond the mere obligation and constitutes an opportunity for sharing, learning, and personal and professional development.

Despite the advances in legislation (Law No. 9.394/96, articles 14 and 15) (BRAZIL, 1996), in evidencing the participation of teachers in the management of education, effective in the construction of the Pedagogical Project of the Course (PPC), in the case of higher education, the constitution of councils, as well as the realization of forums, congresses, seminars, among other events involving teachers, students and civil society to discuss the school and the quality education, we have the challenge of overcoming individual practices of planning for the constitution of collective, contextualized and interdisciplinary experiences. Certainly, shared action presupposes time, material conditions for study and work, support, and pertinent mediations.

We reiterate that the act of planning didactic action implies critical reflection on the "what for, what and how to teach". The answers to these questions manifest the structural components of the planning of teaching, which guide the didactic action: objectives, content, methodology, teaching resources, assessment of learning, and references. In the case of higher education, and only in this case, the component defined as the course or course outline is added to the planning.

In the following subsections, we will make a brief explanation of the structuring components of the plans.

On the *ementa* (syllabus)

The word *ementa* (syllabus) has Latin origin and etymologically originates from the term *demens - entis*, which, in general, is applied with meaning of "list, note, summary" (CUNHA, 2010, p. 421). In the planning of teaching, it is the component that appears in the course plan with the function of summarizing the content of the discipline. Usually, the menu is described in the form of topics, themes or keywords that can give a general notion of the content that cannot fail to be worked in the course. As for the curriculum, it functions as a general guideline to guide the planning of each subject.

In higher education, undergraduate PPCs (licentiate and bachelor degrees) normally present, at the end of the document, the set of *ementas* of all course subjects (syllabus), accompanied by the basic and complementary references of each subject. It is essential that the teachers understand that this component of the curriculum planning should be kept in its entirety in their course plans - unlike the other components of the didactic planning, the menu is the only one that cannot be changed by the teacher individually and deliberately. If any teacher feels the need to revise the course outline of the subject he or she teaches, he or she must provoke a collective discussion. This is because changing it also implies changing the course curriculum, thus, this decision must be collective and widely discussed whenever the curriculum undergoes evaluation and reformulation.

On general and specific objectives

The mark of a life with purpose is the indication of the direction, of the horizon. Surely we all have purposes or goals, from the most circumstantial, such as eating, cleaning the house, visiting friends and family; to the most creative, such as writing a scientific article, systematizing the lessons of a certain subject, or giving a lecture. In the Roman Empire, the goal referred to a column that marked the decisive point in a race, that is, even today the goal carries this perspective of marking a path to be trodden with effort for its operationalization.

Educational goals were the object of study of the psychologist Bloom and collaborators in the 1950s, in the United States, and, in the following decade, they appeared in Brazil. It is possible to see that this approach has been the object of new studies in the 21st century, and one of the explanations for this is linked to the State's increased control over the performance of students in higher education, as an example, we can cite the National High School Exam (ENEM in the Portuguese acronym), and the National Student Performance Exam (ENADE in

the Portuguese acronym). The educational objectives, also called Bloom's taxonomy (1983), propose the classification of learning levels in three domains: cognitive, affective and psychomotor.

Developing objectives is a previous activity in the educational work, in order to define what is expected from students. According Libâneo (2013, p. 131, our translation): "[...] the objectives anticipate results and processes expected from the joint work of teacher and students, expressing knowledge, skills and habits (content) to be assimilated according to the methodological requirements [...]". Any educational practice has intentionality, therefore, it needs goals, given that the pedagogical character of the educational practice implies the explicitness of the ends and means that guide the functions of the teacher and the student in a certain direction.

When dealing with educational objectives, Libâneo (2013) highlights three interconnected references for their development: values and ideas announced in educational legislation; basic science content, produced during the social practice of humanity; needs and expectations of cultural training. Thus, the elaboration of objectives presupposes, on the teacher's part, the necessary critical analysis of the references used, marked by their theoretical and methodological options in the face of social determinants of educational practice, because "[...] the teacher needs to know how to assess the relevance of the objectives and contents proposed by the system [...] to what extent they meet the requirements of democratization [...] know how to match the content with needs, aspirations [...]" (LIBÂNEO, 2013, p. 133, our translation). It is evident that the three references mentioned by the author are interconnected and require the teacher to take an active position to understand the contradictions involved and the real possibilities of the student.

The objectives are mentioned in the plans (course plan, lesson plan), through verbs in the infinitive that express competencies, behaviors, skills, and attitudes expected from students, and may indicate broad and specific purposes. In this sense, the literature (LIBÂNEO, 2013; GIL, 2008) emphasizes that there are two levels of educational objectives: general objectives and specific objectives.

General objectives express broad goals or purposes to be achieved always in view of a relatively long- and broad-time frame, which requires extensive pedagogical work. Therefore, we only find general objectives in curriculum planning, annual, semiannual or monthly planning. For a class, the definition of general objectives is not recommended, in view of the specificity of the content and the short space-time for the development of pedagogical work.

For this, there are specific objectives. In summary, the general objectives need to be broken down precisely and operationally for a specific time and space, that is, into specific objectives. These should reflect a specific content, a specific methodology, specific resources and specific learning evaluation. In short, in a course plan, general objectives are foreseen; and in lesson plans, specific objectives.

Gil (2008) warns of the need to consider the following criteria in the development of appropriate objectives: orientation of what the student will be able to learn and not what the teacher teaches; clarity and precision in the selection of verbs; use of technical language that can be understood by others; relevance to the purposes of learning and the content selected; and the condition that they be achievable.

The elaboration of educational objectives constitutes a moment in which professionals are provoked to reflect about the social function of the work they do, the subject they teach, the training of students and teachers, as well as about the content and the way teaching is organized, among other reflections that emerge according to socio-historical and cultural needs. Certainly, the objectives always manifest pedagogical character, since they guide the educational work around a training program, therefore, there is a close relationship between the objectives, the contents and the methods, because, according to Libâneo (2013, p. 139, our translation): "[...] the objectives contain the pedagogical explicitness of the contents [...] the teacher must link the specific objectives to the general objectives, without losing sight of the concrete situation (of the school, the subject, the students) in which they will be applied".

On teaching content

When dealing with the nature and specificity of education, Saviani (2005) draws attention to two aspects that ensure this specificity when dealing with the educational work: on the one hand, the identification of cultural aspects, which need to be learned by individuals to become human; and, on the other hand, the search for more appropriate ways to achieve this goal.

Regarding the first aspect, Saviani (2005) warns that the teacher needs to be able to distinguish between the contents that are considered fundamental and those that can be considered accessory in the student's cultural formation; as for the second aspect, it concerns the organization of the means (contents, spaces, time and procedures) by which each individual produces his humanity.

The planning of teaching is the content of this text, whose organization, for its explicitation, initially was through a lecture at the Seminar on Higher Education at UFPI and that needed to be updated so that, in this context, it acquired the form of scientific article. According to Afanasiev (1968, p. 156, our translation), "[...] the content is distinguished by a great activity. By virtue of the contradictions inherent in them, it develops, moves continuously and, according to the transformations, its form is modified. The content determines the form".

And where do the contents come from? In general, they come from culture, science, technique, art and their modes of action, which manifest the practical activity of human beings in their relations with the social and historical context. In this process of interaction with the world and nature, we produce experiences that can be expressed in different forms of knowledge, including scientific knowledge. According to Vieira Pinto (1979, p. 88, our translation), "[...] it is not possible, [...] to understand the origins and the essence of science if not interpreting it as a particular effect of the general process by which man produces his existence, acting upon nature and transforming it [...]".

In particular, the teaching contents are the set of knowledge, skills, attitudes and values systematized pedagogically and didactically with the purpose of active understanding and application by students in their social practice. These contents are expressed in the official programs, in the textbooks, in the teaching plans, in the lessons, in the attitudes and convictions of education professionals, in the methods and forms of organizing teaching (LIBÂNEO, 2013).

It is through the appropriation and objectification of the teaching content that the students will constitute and expand their world view, their values, their attitudes, and their ways of being, thinking, feeling, and acting. There is no teaching without content. The social function of educational institutions is to ensure that students can advance from the contents that they appropriate in everyday life, known as spontaneous concepts, to the formation of scientific concepts (VIGOTSKI, 2004). Without fulfilling this purpose, educational institutions lose their social function, since they limit themselves to doing what any other institution is capable of doing: mediating the individual's production of spontaneous knowledge. In this sense, the planning of the didactic action is essential, as it determines the conditions that need to be produced for the students to advance in the production of knowledge, which occurs through the appropriation of scientific content and, thus, develop categorical thinking.

It is important to highlight that, in the course plans, the contents are divided into didactic units, to ensure an equitable distribution among the months during the pedagogical work. In summary, in the teaching plan, the contents are the means to achieve the teaching objectives.

In this sense, the emphasis is on learning, in which the apprehension of content encompasses both the treatment of the information that is transmitted to the student and his manifestations of social needs.

On the methodology⁴

In general, human life is driven by goals and the search for the appropriate means to achieve them. For example, a scientist, when elaborating his research, foresees objectives and methods of scientific investigation; a student, when intending to acquire knowledge, uses adequate procedures for its comprehension.

In a broad sense, method is the path to be followed to reach certain objectives. In this process of making the path explicit, we need to manifest the ways in which objectives and content are intertwined in the teaching and learning process. It is in this sense that we define methodology in the planning of teaching as the set of procedures that mediate the appropriation of content, in order to enable the defined objectives to be achieved; in other words, the methodology should ensure coherence between objectives and content. These are choices that reflect the ethical, aesthetic, technical, and political dimensions of teaching and are deeply determined by the objective and subjective conditions of work.

In the planning of teaching, the methodology elucidates that the teaching and learning process occurs through the implementation of actions planned for the teacher and students, and should articulate teaching activities and study activities. The conduction of this process depends on the teacher's systematized work, who, by planning and developing the classes, articulates objectives, contents, methodologies, resources and assessment. In this sense, "[...] the methods are determined by the objective-content relationship, and refer to the means to achieve general and specific teaching objectives" (LIBÂNEO, 2013, p. 164, our translation).

The necessary link between methodology and the general and specific objectives and the decision to use them in didactic situations are subordinated to the broader methodological conception of the educational process, according to Libâneo (2013, p. 164, emphasis added, our translation): "[...] to say that the teacher 'has method' is more than saying that he or she masters procedures and teaching techniques, because the method should also express a global understanding of the educational process in society".

⁴ When we analyze the Didactics textbooks, we find variety of terms to address methodology as a constituent component of the teaching plan and lesson plan. Farias (2014) uses methodology; Libâneo (2013) opts for teaching methods and justifies them; Haydt (2006) uses teaching procedures.

The understanding of method presupposes the logic to make reality explicit. For Kopnin (1978, p. 91, our translation), method "[...] is a means of obtaining certain results in knowledge and practice [...] the method is heuristic, it reflects laws of the objective world under the viewpoint of the procedure that man must adopt to obtain new results in knowledge and practice". It happens that if the subjective aspect of method is absolutized, then it is interpreted as a set of procedures detached from the objective aspect. Thus, the term procedure is commonly attributed to method - any method acts as procedure, however, not every procedure acts as method.

When dealing with teaching planning, Libâneo (2013, p. 166, our translation) opts for the term method, but makes evident the distinction between method and methodology, "[...] teaching methods [...] arise from a conception of society, the nature of human practical activity in the world, the process of knowledge and, particularly, the understanding of educational practice in a given society. What the author wants to emphasize is that the choice and systematization of the methodology express an intrinsic relationship between the ethical, aesthetic, technical and political dimensions of didactic action, which legitimizes education as an intentional and determined action, never being neutral.

Objectively speaking, the ethical dimension expresses the teacher's commitment to the students' education, with the impacts that this education will bring to their future lives. The aesthetic dimension is revealed as the teacher demonstrates concern about how to present the content in a creative and innovative way to the students, mobilizing their senses and affections. The technical dimension is what ensures organization, systematization, and quality in teaching, never to be confused with technicality. The political dimension corresponds to the teacher's commitment to collaborate with the critical formation of the students, for which it is fundamental that reality be problematized in the classroom. According to the above, it is in the teaching methodology that all these dimensions are articulated, ensuring a particular quality to the didactic action.

It is very common to find in course plans, in higher education, the methodology expressed in phrases such as "expositive or dialogued classes". It is important to understand that expressions like these do not characterize methodology in its totality and multidimensionality. "Lectures and dialogues" are techniques, as are "Seminars", "Directed discussion groups", etc. Methodology requires careful and rigorous reflection, detail and description of both teaching and study activities.

The fundamental thing, therefore, is to keep in mind that there is a variety of methods and their choice depends on the contents of the subjects, the specific didactic situations and the characteristics of the students, as well as the theoretical and methodological options of the teacher, which reflect his or her vision of the world, of man, and of society.

On teaching resources

The didactic resources, or teaching resources, are material means, technological instruments that support the teaching action, serving the purpose of assisting the teacher in the development of the didactic action. According to Farias et al. (2014, p. 125, our translation), teaching resources "[...] function as supporting actors [...] their role is not only to illustrate, reinforce or make concrete what the teacher says, but, above all [...] provoke challenges and opportunities for deepening and opposition to the knowledge professed as unquestionable".

In view of the above, the course plan of the discipline taught by the teacher and the suggested texts are didactic resources that we used to materialize the methodology worked on. In short, any material artifact that can help the teacher to mediate the relationship of the students with the contents, in order to achieve the defined objectives, is a didactic resource. Therefore, teaching resources are components that help the teacher in pedagogical mediation, aiming to ensure that the defined objectives are met. However, they do not perform pedagogical mediation. They are material and symbolic artifacts that, when well used by the teachers, will be able to provide a better quality to the didactic action, as long as the teacher dominates the contents for which the resource is at the service of. The teaching resource will never replace the teacher or perform pedagogical mediation. It is only an element that helps the teacher in the development of his or her practice.

Its provision in the planning should always be in line with the objective working conditions of the teacher, whether at the university or at the basic education school. One should not foresee teaching resources that are not within the reach of the teacher and the students. It is necessary to know the reality in which one operates, so that the planning can, in fact, meet the social and historical needs of teachers and students.

On Learning Assessment

Assessment is a complex activity in the teaching work and has a continuous character in the teaching and learning process. Through it, the manifestations of the teaching and students' work are analyzed with the proposed objectives, in order to bring to light the difficulties, the development, and, consequently, the reworking of the planning, according to the identified needs.

For Luckesi (2006, p. 85, our translation), "[...] the assessment of learning [...] acquires meaning to the extent that it is articulated with a pedagogical project and its consequent teaching project". In this sense, assessment is a qualitative analysis of relevant data from the teaching and learning process that helps the teacher to make decisions about his teaching activity. These relevant data constitute the manifestations of the didactic situations that involve teacher and student, and are foreseen in the teaching plans. A qualitative analysis situation can be, for example, the analysis of seminars, tests, student responses, the performance of activities, among other actions.

Learning assessment is an integral part of the pedagogical process, which, articulated with the proposed objectives, assumes the function of guiding the teacher's decision making, according to Libâneo (2013, p. 217, our translation): "[...] school assessment fulfills at least three functions: pedagogical-didactic, diagnostic and control". The pedagogical-didactic function concerns the evaluation function in the materialization of general and specific objectives; the diagnostic function allows to identify the needs of students and teaching performance; and the control function concerns the means used to qualify the results.

In the planning of teaching, the function of assessment that stands out is the pedagogical-didactic, because it makes up the didactic action, which reveals the level of learning and development of students, therefore, the level of achievement of the defined objectives. In the course plans in higher education, it is very important that the teachers make reference to the legislation that supports the practice of learning evaluation in the institution, as well as describe the stages of the evaluation process and the evaluation instruments that will be used throughout the course.

The most important thing is the understanding that we must have that the evaluation of learning reflects the moment of synthesis of the pedagogical process, therefore, it is essential that it be based on a critical, serious, and committed reflection at the time of planning the teaching. It is through this synthesis that the pedagogical process is revealed in its entirety, helping the teacher to review his priorities, his failures, his successes and his advances.

On the references

The references consist of the list of materials used to achieve the ends and means of the teaching plan. In higher education, two kinds of references are presented in the course plan, the basic ones and the supplementary ones. In the lesson plan, only the references related to the purpose of the lesson.

The basic references in the course plan should be the same as those in the PPC, and the complementary references are those that the teacher can suggest, according to the needs of the discipline. Therefore, books, articles, videos, conferences, proceedings of events, among others, should be listed, according to the guidelines of the Brazilian Association of Technical Standards (ABNT).

The appropriation of culture by human beings constitutes one of the aspects that makes their humanization process possible. It is necessary to look for the most adequate ways to reach these goals with pedagogical dimension and, in this sense, it is necessary to consider the fundamental and the supplementary in the theoretical-methodological choices through which the individual enhances his humanity.

In this sense, experiences with collaboration, since the doctoral research (BANDEIRA, 2014), bring evidence of how collaboration is fundamental to provoke engagement, negotiation of intentions and actions of the participants. Thus, the need to develop a collaborative culture to share thoughts, knowledge and actions in the organization of the planning of teaching, as well as in educational practice and its manifestations, whether in pedagogical, teaching or praxis, is what justifies the purpose of humanizing, researching and training in higher education.

According to the above, Table 1 presents, in summary form, the structuring components of teaching planning.

Table 1 – The structuring components of educational planning

Components	Purposes in didactic action
Syllabus	Defines the essential contents of the discipline. It appears in the form of topics, keywords or general themes. It must obligatorily appear in the plan exactly as it is described in the PPC of the course.
Objectives	Defines what students need to develop in terms of knowledge, skills, behaviors, attitudes, and values. They can be general and specific.
Content	These are the cultural aspects produced by humanity that, when appropriated by the students, lead to the development of the knowledge, skills, behavior, attitudes, and values foreseen by the objectives.
Methodologies	They concern the set of procedures that will mediate the appropriation of content in order to enable the defined objectives to be achieved. They are choices that reflect the ethical, aesthetic, technical, and political dimensions of the teaching action and are deeply determined by the objective and subjective conditions of work.

Resources	They are technical and symbolic instruments that help the teacher in pedagogical mediation, in order to ensure that the defined objectives are met.
Learning assessment	It is a continuous reflective didactic action that reveals the level of student learning and development, therefore, the level of achievement of the defined objectives.
References	All didactic material that serves as guidance and foundation for the development of the didactic action.

Source: Data from this study

In summary, it is the internal coherence among these components that points to real possibilities of achieving top quality teaching with a higher level of autonomy, since they all involve decision making, critical reflection, and conscious action in directing our work.

For a collaborative culture of educational planning

The planning of teaching as a unit of analysis, from a collaborative perspective, constitutes a challenge for the teaching work. Lima (2002, p. 41, our translation), when investigating the professional cultures and collaborative practices of two Portuguese secondary schools, with about three hundred teachers, notes the professional isolation, in which: "[...] the individualistic nature of teachers' cultures has gradually been seen by official entities promoting educational reforms as a major obstacle to their plans for change."

What we can observe is that even though collaborative action is not a predominant practice in teachers' work, there is no doubt that it has been praised in academia, including by researchers and policy makers, because collaborative relationships among teachers are seen as possibilities that can instigate alternative forms of exercising power within the educational organization, as well as seek to understand the manifestations of needs.

We start in defense of collaborative planning that considers the manifestations of needs, because as contradictions are brought to the surface, difficulties, dilemmas, and concerns are not denied, but made explicit and shared among teachers and/or educational agents. In this sense, collaboration among teachers is more than cooperation, according to Lima (2002, p. 46, our translation): "[...] in cooperation, the actions of each individual may be pleasing to the other, but do not result in mutual benefits. In collaboration, each individual participates with his/her part in a common enterprise whose result benefits everyone involved". Collaborative work contributes greatly for teachers to produce knowledge, sharing their sayings and doings, as well as strengthening the interactive bonds that build and sustain the experiences and experiences of pedagogical practice.

Ibiapina's research (2008, p. 35, our translation) highlights the collaborative approach as a procedure that aggregates research and knowledge production, as the author states: "[...] the collaborative process is more complex than it is apparently supposed to be precisely because of its dual function of formation and knowledge production". In this sense, collaboration does not happen by chance, it needs to be taught and learned, therefore, we need to create conditions for reciprocal development between teachers and students.

When dealing with collaboration in the investigation of formative needs, Bandeira (2014, p. 45, our translation) points out that, in the collaborative process, "[...] we seek to listen and understand the veiled meaning, the surplus meaning, the woven relationships." Given the above, to think and carry out collaborative teaching planning requires the explicitness of the formative needs, therefore, it constitutes a movement of decision, negotiation, sharing, commitment, reflection and criticality.

As Veiga (2011, p. 275, our translation) demonstrates, a collaborative project, for the organization of the class, goes beyond the mechanistic conception of teaching planning. Thus, the planning of teaching, in a collaborative approach, begins with the questions proposed by the author: "[...] for what? (intention); what? (cultural content); how (methodology); with what? (teaching resources); what? how? Who? (evaluation); where (space); when? (time); who, for whom (teacher, student)". Thus, the relationships developed through the answers to these questions of the structuring components of the teaching plan and lesson plan will constitute the possibilities of formation and production of knowledge that lead to the overcoming of conservative educational practices and the expansion of transformative educational practices.

Final remarks

The teacher, when taking on a subject, whether in basic education or in higher education, needs to make decisions about the objectives to be achieved, the content, the methodologies, the resources, the assessments and the references. These components structure what is known as teaching planning, which, in turn, guides the didactic action. No didactic action takes place without these decisions, whether the teacher is aware of it or not. Hence the recurring statement that no educational practice is neutral, it is always the result of decisions that are taken, whether consciously, critically and deeply reflective, or spontaneously, the result of alienated consciousness.

Taking higher education as a particularity, these decisions that underpin the teachers' teaching planning are based on the students' reality, the curricular planning, that is, the PPC of the courses, as well as the Institutional Development Plan (IDP), the Unit Development Plan (PDU) and all these documents must be articulated with the current laws and resolutions of the National Education Council (CNE in the Portuguese acronym) and the policy of the Ministry of Education.

In the context of thinking and planning teaching, it is urgent to break with the tendency of isolation in the teaching profession. In this sense, the culture of a collaborative practice among teachers is a possibility for the production of meaningful curriculum, considering that the shared teaching work encourages discussion, debate, reflection and decision on the content and form of planning, on the ends and means. As we reflect on what was thought and what was done, we expand our understanding about the didactic needs and possibilities of the planning, and consequently, of the lessons.

In view of the above, planning in the teaching work is a complex activity and requires courage, as it both calms and disquiets, as stated in the epigraph by Guimarães Rosa. Therefore, collaborative planning creates possibilities to share difficulties, concerns, dilemmas, theories, and appropriate practices, as well as successful experiences.

REFERENCES

AFANASIEV, V. **Fundamentos de filosofia**. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1968.

BANDEIRA, H. M. M. Planejamento da ação docente: para quê? *In*: BANDEIRA, H. M. M.; LOPES, M. S. L. **Encontro com a didática**: Tecendo fios com a educação e saúde. Curitiba, PR: Appris, 2018.

BANDEIRA, H. M. M. **Necessidades formativas de professores iniciantes na produção da práxis**: Realidade e possibilidades. 2014. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Universidade Federal do Piauí, 2014. Available at: <http://leg.ufpi.br/subsiteFiles/ppged2/arquivos/files/Hilda%20Bandeira%20-%20Necessidades%20formativas%20de%20professores%20iniciantes%20-%20Tese%20de%20Doutorado.pdf>. Access: 17 Mar. 2020.

BLOOM, B. **Taxonomia dos objetivos educacionais**: Domínio cognitivo. Porto Alegre: Globo, 1983.

BRAZIL. **Lei n. 9394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996**. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da Educação Nacional. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 1996. Available at: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/19394.htm. Access: 02 Aug. 2022.

- CANDAU, V. M. **A didática em questão**. 36. ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2014.
- CANDAU, V. M. **Rumo a uma nova Didática**. 21. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes, 2011.
- CUNHA, A. G. **Dicionário etimológico da língua portuguesa**. Rio de Janeiro: Lexikon, 2010.
- FARIAS, I. M. S *et al.* **Didática e docência: Aprendendo a profissão**. Brasília, DF: Liber Livro, 2014.
- GANDIN, D.; CRUZ, C. H. C. **Planejamento na sala de aula**. 10. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes, 2010.
- GIL, A. C. **Metodologia do ensino superior**. São Paulo: Atlas, 2008.
- HAYDT, R. C. C. **Curso de didática geral**. 8. ed. São Paulo: Ática, 2006.
- IBIAPINA, I. M. L. M. **Pesquisa colaborativa: Investigação, formação e produção de conhecimentos**. Brasília, DF: Liber Livro, 2008.
- KOPNIN, P. V. **A dialética como lógica e teoria do conhecimento**. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1978.
- LEAL, R. B. Planejamento de ensino: peculiaridades significativas. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Educación/Educação**, v. 37, n. 3, p. 1-6, 2005. Available at: <https://rieoei.org/historico/deloslectores/1106Barros.pdf>. Access: 07 Aug. 2022.
- LIBÂNIO, J. C. **Didática**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2013.
- LIMA, Á. **As culturas colaborativas nas escolas: Estruturas, processos e conteúdos**. Portugal: Porto Editora, 2002.
- LUCKESI, C. **Avaliação da aprendizagem escolar: Estudos e proposições**. 18. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2006.
- MACÁRIO, E. Práxis, gênero humano e natureza. **Serv. Soc. Soc.**, São Paulo, n. 113, p. 171-191, jan./mar. 2013. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/ssoc/a/Q8P9G6nwkqfyfvFwxqghQmv/?lang=pt>. Access: 07 Aug. 2022.
- MORETTO, P. V. **Planejamento: Planejando a educação para o desenvolvimento de competências**. 6. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes, 2010.
- UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO PIAUÍ. Pró-Reitoria de Ensino de Graduação-PREG (org.). **Regulamento geral da graduação**. Resolução 177/12 CEPEX-UFPI. Available at https://ufpi.br/arquivos_download/arquivos/PREG/resolucoes_preg/Resolu%C3%A7%C3%A3o_n%C2%BA_17712_e_altera%C3%A7%C3%B5es_atualizada_20.06.201820180807101442.pdf. Access: 20 Mar. 2020.

SAVIANI, D. **Pedagogia histórico-crítica: Primeiras aproximações**. 9. ed. São Paulo: Autores associados, 2005.

VEIGA, I. P. A. (org.). **Aula: Gênese, dimensões, princípios e práticas**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Papyrus, 2011.

VIEIRA PINTO, Á. **Ciência e existência**. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1979.

VIGOTSKY, L. S. **Teoria e método**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2004.

CRedit Author Statement

- **Acknowledgements:** Thanks to the master's students of the Graduate Program in Health and Community (PPGSC) who contributed with suggestions to the text discussed in the course Didactics.
 - **Funding:** Own financing.
 - **Conflicts of interest:** None.
 - **Ethical approval:** The theme discussed is an integral part of curricular components taught by the authors of the article, including the axes Didactics, Collaboration and Educational Practice, among others, are the object of studies of their investigations. Although the study is bibliographical, the authors have a research project approved by the research ethics committee at UFPI, contemplating the aforementioned axes, as assured by the Resolutions Nº 466/2012 and 510/2016 that dispose about the Research Ethics Committee.
 - **Data and material availability:** The study is of the bibliographical type, therefore the references are in the public domain.
 - **Authors' contributions:** Author 1: The initial text was produced for the Didactics course at the PPGSC. Author 2: Contributed to the production of the article, as she also teaches Didactics at the PPGSC.
-

Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação.
Proofreading, formatting, normalization and translation.

