

MANAGEMENT, EVALUATION, AND AI: *POSSIBILITIES AND CHALLENGES FOR PEDAGOGICAL MEDIATION*

GESTÃO, AVALIAÇÃO E A INTELIGÊNCIA ARTIFICIAL: *AS POSSIBILIDADES E DESAFIOS À MEDIAÇÃO PEDAGÓGICA*

GESTIÓN, EVALUACIÓN E INTELIGENCIA ARTIFICIAL: *POSIBILIDADES Y DESAFÍOS DE LA MEDIACIÓN PEDAGÓGICA*

Sebastião de Souza Lemes¹ 0000-0002-0750-9294

¹ São Paulo State University “Júlio de Mesquita Filho” – Araraquara, SP, Brazil;
sebastiao.lemes@unesp.br

Abstract:

This article discusses the foundations and contemporary challenges of management, evaluation, and technology in the context of democratic schooling. It problematizes the role of curricular and institutional management as an articulating axis of public policies and pedagogical practices, highlighting Situational Strategic Planning (SSP) as a methodological alternative for decision-making in the administrative and management field. In dialogue with the epistemology of technology, it addresses the presence of digital technologies and artificial intelligence as frontiers of pedagogical practice, emphasizing the need for ethical, critical, and humanizing mediations. It argues that educational innovation should be guided by principles of equity and cognitive justice, in order to guarantee the human right to education and the effectiveness of the democratic public school.

Keywords: curricular management; institutional evaluation; educational technology; equity; democratic schooling.

Resumo:

O artigo discute os fundamentos e desafios contemporâneos da gestão, da avaliação e da tecnologia no contexto da escolarização democrática. Problematiza o papel da gestão curricular e institucional como eixo articulador de políticas públicas e práticas pedagógicas, destacando o Planejamento Estratégico Situacional (PES) como alternativa metodológica para a tomada de decisões no campo administrativo e da gestão. Em diálogo com a epistemologia da técnica, aborda-se a presença das tecnologias digitais e da inteligência artificial como fronteiras do fazer pedagógico, enfatizando a necessidade de mediações éticas, críticas e humanizadoras. Defende-se que a inovação educacional deve estar orientada por princípios de equidade e justiça cognitiva, de modo a garantir o direito humano à educação e a efetividade da escola pública democrática.

Palavras-chave: gestão curricular; avaliação institucional; tecnologia educacional; equidade; escolarização democrática.

Resumen:

Este artículo analiza los fundamentos y los desafíos contemporáneos de la gestión, la evaluación y la tecnología en el contexto de la educación democrática. Problematisa el papel de la gestión curricular e institucional como eje articulador de las políticas públicas y las prácticas pedagógicas, destacando la Planificación Estratégica Situacional (PES) como alternativa metodológica para la toma de decisiones en el ámbito administrativo y de gestión. En diálogo con la epistemología de la tecnología, aborda la presencia de las tecnologías digitales y la inteligencia artificial como fronteras de la práctica pedagógica, enfatizando la necesidad de mediaciones éticas, críticas y humanizadoras. Argumenta que la innovación educativa debe guiarse por los principios de equidad y justicia cognitiva, para garantizar el derecho humano a la educación y la eficacia de la escuela pública democrática.

Palabras-clave: gestión curricular; evaluación institucional; tecnología educativa; equidad; educación democrática.

Introduction

The pursuit of quality and equity in education within a democratic State imposes complex challenges on the education system in the twenty-first century. Although essential, the democratization of education has revealed a persistent paradox of inclusion and exclusion, whereby universal access does not guarantee equitable and meaningful student retention. In this context, two pillars stand out as crucial for overcoming these challenges: formative assessment and the reflective incorporation of technology, particularly Artificial Intelligence (AI), into curricular management and pedagogical practice.

This article seeks to integrate and update the discussions presented in two previous studies: the first, focused on the complexity of technological support for schooling, examines technology as a necessary condition for a networked society and AI as a new cultural and cognitive frontier; the second, centered on the challenges of curricular management, emphasizes assessment as a value-laden and specialized act designed to reorient pedagogical practice and mitigate educational inequalities. The synthesis of these perspectives proposes a reflection on how the convergence of technology, assessment, and curricular management can, in fact, enhance the schooling process in a context marked by profound socioeconomic inequality and rapid digital transformation.

From curricular management to educational technology: new challenges for democratic schooling

Schooling, in its fullest sense, constitutes one of the fundamental pillars of the Democratic Rule of Law, as it represents the main instrument for promoting citizenship and

realizing human rights. When guided by principles of equity and quality, curricular management assumes a strategic role in consolidating a democratic, plural, and inclusive education system. From this perspective, schools are not merely spaces for transmitting knowledge, but territories of social, cultural, and technological mediation that connect the foundations of educational policy to the historical demands of contemporary society.

The challenge for contemporary curricular management is to articulate structural dimensions—planning, assessment, indicators, and public policy—with the new demands of an educational context strongly mediated by technology¹ (Pinto, 2005). Teacher education, pedagogical autonomy, and an evaluative culture become interdependent axes of a single process: ensuring the effectiveness of democratic schooling (Boniol; Vial, 2001; Mendes, 2020). This process involves expanding opportunities for access and retention, valuing diversity, and incorporating technical and scientific innovations in a critical and contextualized manner.

In this scenario, educational technologies emerge not as accessory tools but as constitutive elements of contemporary culture. Understanding technology through the lens of the “epistemology of technique,” as proposed by Álvaro Vieira Pinto (2005), means recognizing that it simultaneously expresses and conditions societal development. When situated within the context of schooling, technology becomes a mediating element between humans and knowledge; the real and the virtual; learning and teaching.

In this sense, democratic schooling faces a paradox in which the expansion of access to education coexists with persistent mechanisms of exclusion and inequality inherent to Brazilian society. From the enactment of the National Education Guidelines and Framework Law (LDB) to the current directives of the National Common Curricular Base, the promise of universal education has faced long-standing qualitative challenges in the schooling process. Infrastructure inequalities, gaps in teacher training, and unequal technological access continue to constrain the transformative potential of public education in Brazil.

Thus, discussing the foundations of curricular management and the role of technologies in schooling requires re-signifying the relationships among public policy, institutional assessment, and pedagogical innovation. Educational planning—particularly situational strategic planning—assumes methodological and ethical value in this context: aligning

¹ See Álvaro Vieira Pinto’s text for an in-depth discussion of this subject, where he discusses *The concept of technology*.

diagnosis, action, and assessment under the principles of governability, social participation, and inclusion.

Education, as a fundamental human right, must be conceived as a practice of freedom and an instrument of social justice. The critical integration of digital technologies and artificial intelligence into formative processes requires ethical, epistemological, methodological, and political consideration that transcends the mere instrumental adoption of tools. The true challenge lies in making technological resources a means of promoting equity and improving the quality of schooling, re-signifying curriculum, assessment, and pedagogical practice in alignment with democratic ideals and the complexity of the networked society (Castells, 2011; Han, 2019).

Accordingly, the new challenges of democratic schooling extend beyond technological integration and encompass the construction of a management culture capable of articulating public policy, innovation, cognitive justice, and civic participation. It is within this horizon that the present reflection is situated, seeking to understand how the foundations of management, assessment, and digital technology intertwine in the pursuit of effective public schooling and the realization of an inclusive and emancipatory educational project.

Foundations of management and institutional assessment

Educational management, understood as a political, technical, and ethical action, plays a central role in building the social quality of education. More than a set of administrative procedures, it expresses a particular conception of school and society. From this perspective, management is not limited to operationalizing goals; it constitutes a mediating process between educational purposes, the objective conditions of school functioning, and the values guiding the pedagogical project. Democratic management—enshrined in the 1988 Federal Constitution and reaffirmed in the 1996 LDB—has been consolidated as a structuring principle of Brazilian educational policy, articulating autonomy, participation, and public responsibility. At this point, a necessary transition becomes evident: from a traditional, patrimonial, Eurocentric, reproductive, and simplifying model toward a systemic conception of education and schooling characterized by high complexity, which requires the re-signification and reorientation of pedagogical practice. Learning, in this new context, presupposes the learner's interaction with the object of knowledge, constructing and reconstructing meaning beyond traditional forms of simplification in schooling. To that end, curriculum management must be aligned with stages

of cognitive and social development, cultural plurality, and the country's digital communication landscape.

The consolidation of management practices committed to equity and learning implies rethinking assessment mechanisms, both of performance and of institutions. In this context, assessment, when reduced to a logic of control and ranking rooted in a purely meritocratic structure, tends to reinforce inequalities and disregard the sociocultural contexts in which schools operate. However, when conceived as a formative and dialogical process, it becomes an instrument of institutional self-knowledge and of improvement in pedagogical practices. Scholars such as Sacristán (1994), and Dias Sobrinho (2018) advocate for an emancipatory form of assessment capable of fostering critical reflection and collective development.

Institutional assessment must therefore be understood as a public policy guided by indicators that capture the complexity of the educational phenomenon. Quantitative indicators, such as those from the Basic Education Development Index (IDEB), provide important comparative parameters but do not exhaust the meaning of quality. It is necessary to consider qualitative dimensions, such as school climate, community participation, teacher training, and infrastructure conditions, that directly influence educational outcomes. The challenge is to overcome the fragmentation between strategic planning and evaluation, building integrated management systems that articulate diagnosis, monitoring, and decision-making.

The Situational Strategic Planning (PES) approach, proposed by Carlos Matus (1993), offers a fertile theoretical and methodological framework for understanding and intervening in complex educational realities. Unlike normative and prescriptive models, PES recognizes the conflictive and political nature of planning. In this context, the educator-manager is understood as a social actor who interprets, negotiates, and decides amid uncertainty, articulating technical knowledge and ethical commitment. When applied to schools, situational management fosters the collective construction of objectives and the continuous redefinition of strategies in response to changes in the institutional environment.

This perspective aligns with recent approaches to educational governance (Mainardes, 2018), which emphasize the interdependence among the State, civil society, and local actors in the formulation and implementation of public policies. Democratic management, in this scenario, is not limited to the election of principals or the existence of school councils; it entails the creation of spaces for listening, deliberation, and shared responsibility. When associated with participatory governance, the evaluative culture becomes an instrument for institutional strengthening and for legitimizing educational policies.

It is essential, however, to acknowledge that management and evaluation processes are permanently and intensely shaped by structural tensions. On the one hand, efficiency and accountability demands impose managerial models with a technical-bureaucratic orientation; on the other, the pursuit of cognitive justice and equity requires humanizing and critical approaches. Overcoming this dichotomy depends on a paradigm capable of integrating technical rationality and communicative rationality, or, in Habermas's (1987) terms, reconciling instrumental and communicative action in the search for consensus oriented by public reason.

In the contemporary context, digital technologies and artificial intelligence introduce new possibilities and challenges for educational management and evaluation. Information systems, data analysis platforms, and performance-prediction algorithms can support more precise diagnostics, but they also raise ethical concerns related to privacy, visibility, and the risk of excessive standardization (Fernandes *et al.*, 2025). Thus, the role of the educational manager is that of a critical mediator who uses technological resources as instruments to support pedagogical decisions, without relinquishing the ethical and political judgment that characterizes educational action.

Institutional evaluation—articulated with situational planning—must therefore assume a prospective and transformative function. To evaluate is to understand reality in order to act on it: to recognize the limits and potentialities of each context and, from there, collectively plan feasible paths. Only management practices committed to participation, reflection, and innovation will be able to address the challenges of democratic schooling and the complexities of the digital society.

Technology and AI as frontiers of pedagogical practice

The incorporation of digital technologies and AI into the educational field represents one of the most significant transformations of the twenty-first century. More than a change in tools, it constitutes a profound shift in the ways knowledge is produced, organized, and shared. Advances in Information and Communication Technologies challenge traditional conceptions of teaching and learning, requiring new pedagogical and epistemological rationalities. In this context, schools are called to reinvent themselves as spaces of mediation between the human and the technological, the individual and the social, the local and the global. For this reason, the relationship between technology and education cannot be reduced to the instrumental adoption of resources. As Pinto (2005) warns, technique is an expression of human

consciousness in its effort to solve concrete problems. Technology—far from being neutral—is both a product and producer of values, ideologies, and ways of thinking. Its presence in schools must therefore be the subject of critical and contextualized analysis to avoid the risk of “technological fetishization,” which transforms instruments into ends and reverses pedagogical logic. Technological support for schooling must be employed reflectively and critically, understanding technology as a fundamental component of the epistemology of technique (Pinto, 2005) and as inherently pedagogical. This understanding transcends the instrumental view of technology as a mere tool, positioning it as a body of knowledge that influences and is influenced by culture. In this sense, information technology is not the cause of social transformation but a necessary condition for the type of society in which we live: the network society (Castells, 2011). The absence of such technologies would render ongoing processes of social transformation unviable, as interconnection and virtuality have become structuring dimensions of contemporary life. In this context, artificial intelligence emerges as a new frontier of knowledge, expanding the capacities of an ultra-connected society immersed in an almost immeasurable universe of data. AI is not merely a technological advance; it constitutes a foundational architecture in the fabric of the twenty-first-century network society. Its ability to process large volumes of data and to adapt procedures to individual cognitive styles enables unprecedented forms of guidance in schooling, pedagogically and methodologically personalizing teaching and becoming a key element for inclusion processes and for meeting individual needs (Vorst; Jelicic, 2019).

The AI, in particular, has asserted itself as an emerging frontier of pedagogical practice. Adaptive learning tools, automated tutors, content-recommendation systems, and performance-analysis algorithms are reshaping the teacher’s role and the nature of the educational process. Although such innovations may contribute to learning personalization and more efficient data management, it is essential to understand their limits and ethical implications. The contemporary challenge is to balance the use of these technologies with the preservation of teacher autonomy, intellectual freedom, and the relational dimension of educational practice. After all, AI—like any technological product—is not merely a tool or procedure; it becomes part of a people’s cultural repertoire as both product and producer within the fabric of networked relations. Its borderless nature and development in multicultural contexts make AI a culturally hybrid product, aligning with the concept of hyperculturality (Han, 2019). Hyperculturality implies a complex layering of diverse cultures, creating an environment in which multiple perspectives coexist. In the case of AI, this layering is evident, as it is fed by a wide range of cultural influences, data, and development methodologies. Whether understood

as culture, hybrid culture, or cultural expression will depend on the theoretical framework, but the school is a critical point of interconnection within this network, demanding continuous reflection on ethical challenges and the need for equitable access. Here, the thought of Paulo Freire (1996) becomes imperative: teaching is an act of creation and freedom, not a mere transfer of information. Critical pedagogical thought thus offers an essential counterpoint to purely instrumental trends that reduce teaching to automated processes. AI can assist in analyzing learning trajectories, but it can never replace the dialogue, listening, care, and pedagogical intentionality that characterize humanizing teaching practices. The teacher remains the ethical and epistemological mediator between the student and knowledge, even in digital and hybrid environments (Villar, 1994).

Our attention turns to the network-integrated digital environment, where pedagogical mediation in cyberspace takes shape. This environment goes beyond the mere transmission of information due to the multidimensionality of concepts, interpretations, and cultures. Knowledge is no longer a pre-constructed product but the outcome of individual and/or collective construction within a social environment of communication and group-based action. AI enhances this mediation by offering sophisticated mechanisms of interaction, personalization, and territorialization. Within this context, the concept of “expanded learning” (Santaella, 2013) becomes pertinent, as it helps to understand the new cognitive ecologies in which subjects construct knowledge. In such ecologies, information circulates in a decentralized, hypertextual, and multimodal manner, breaking the boundaries of the classroom and school time. This dynamic demands a curriculum that is more flexible, integrated, and meaningful, prioritizing competencies such as critical thinking, problem-solving, and collaboration. In this scenario, school management must create conditions for technological innovation to be integrated into the pedagogical project rather than substituted for it. This form of pedagogical mediation—within the era of AI—extends beyond academic content and encompasses the development of essential digital competencies for active participation in contemporary society (Bulut *et al.*, 2024). It can generate interactive and collaborative environments through platforms that facilitate communication, knowledge construction, and immediate feedback (Santos; Silva; Lima, 2025).

Algorithms can analyze learning patterns and individual preferences, adapting educational content to the cognitive styles of different groups or each student. This adaptive and personalized capacity becomes fundamental for inclusion, enabling schooling processes to respond more effectively to diversity (Wang, 2025). However, the adoption of AI in Brazilian education still has a long path ahead. Recent studies indicate that 7 out of 10 high school

students use generative AI for school research, yet *only 32% have received any guidance on how to use these technologies* (Releases, 2025). The lack of preparedness in schools and the absence of intentional and proactive regulation risk allowing AI to reproduce the very inequality and exclusion it is expected to mitigate (Irio, 2025).

Ethical reflection on bias formation and privacy concerns is imperative for AI to translate into tangible and equitable improvements. The growing presence of automated assessment systems, data management tools, and decision-support mechanisms raises a new field of debate: algorithmic ethics in education. Issues such as algorithm transparency, student data protection, bias in recommendation systems, and digital surveillance demand urgent reflection on educational rights in the age of AI. As Williamson and Piattoeva (2022) observe, the “governance by data” paradigm tends to redefine how school performance is measured and compared, directly influencing accountability policies and the concept of educational quality.

Addressing these challenges requires educators and administrators to develop technopolitical competencies—meaning the ability to understand technology in its epistemological, social, and ethical dimensions. Teacher education, in this sense, must include not only technical mastery of digital tools but also the development of critical awareness regarding their uses and impacts. The “pedagogy” of technology is not limited to learning how to use tools, but to thinking about their use, situating them within the context of inequality, digital culture, and democracy.

Schools, therefore, cannot abdicate their humanizing function in the face of artificial intelligence. On the contrary, they must critically appropriate these tools to expand possibilities for learning and inclusion. Pedagogical practice mediated by technology must remain anchored in principles of cognitive justice, equity, and emancipation. If AI represents a frontier of knowledge, it is the responsibility of education to ensure that this frontier is crossed with ethics, reflection, and social commitment. The integration of these fields of study reveals that the challenges of curricular management and assessment can be addressed—and partially mitigated—by the potential of technology, but only with caution and critical reflection. AI—by integrating with the practices and modes of thinking of society—becomes a cultural expression that shapes and is shaped by educational values. Given the plural nature of schooling in Brazil, curricular management must incorporate AI not only as an administrative efficiency tool but as a pedagogical and ethical component, notwithstanding its algorithmic rationality. AI’s ability to analyze large volumes of performance data—from formative assessments and indicators such as the Basic Education Assessment System (SAEB)—can provide administrators and teachers with real-time situational insights into student needs, enabling more

precise and personalized pedagogical interventions. AI can function as a powerful tool for predictive and diagnostic analysis, transforming assessment from a merely classificatory act into a continuous process of decision support and curricular adjustment (Rahal; Zainuba, 2016).

Ongoing reflection and ethical guidance are imperative to align these interconnections in a way that supports sustainable inclusion. The curriculum must be revisited to prepare citizens for hyperculturality and technosociality (Canclini, 2008), developing digital competencies essential for active and critical participation in the networked society. By embracing AI critically and reflectively, schools can redefine their role as spaces of cultural and technological convergence, ensuring that digital advancement translates into equitable educational advancement.

Addressing these challenges requires educators and administrators to develop technopolitical skills, that is, the ability to understand technology in its epistemological, social, and ethical dimensions (Nguyen *et al.*, 2023). Teacher training, in this sense, should include not only technical mastery of digital tools, but also the development of critical awareness about their uses and impacts. The “pedagogy” of technology is not limited to learning how to use it, but also learning how to think about its use, placing it in the context of inequalities, digital culture, and democracy (Santos; Alves, 2022).

Schools, therefore, cannot renounce their humanizing role in the face of artificial intelligence. Rather, they must critically appropriate these tools to broaden possibilities for learning and inclusion. Pedagogical work mediated by technology must remain grounded in principles of cognitive justice, equity, and emancipation. If AI constitutes a frontier of knowledge, education must ensure that this frontier is traversed with ethics, reflection, and social responsibility.

Schooling, equity, and technological mediation

Schooling—understood in its historical and social sense—constitutes a space of symbolic and political dispute over the right to knowledge. The promise of a democratic and high-quality public school is intrinsically linked to the ability of the educational system to guarantee equity (Lemes, 2019), that is, to offer effective conditions for all students to learn, considering inequalities of origin, access, and opportunity. In the contemporary context marked by the ubiquity of digital technologies, educational equity acquires new contours and challenges that demand a redefinition of pedagogical and institutional mediation.

Equity is not limited to equal access; it involves the creation of differentiated strategies that ensure the success of all students. As D'Ambrosio (2011) and Dubet (2008) argue, educational justice requires the recognition of inequalities and action upon them in a contextualized, ethical, and participatory manner. In Brazil, policies such as the Education Development Plan and the National Education Plan have introduced goals aimed at expanding quality and inclusion, yet the implementation of these principles depends largely on the capacity of schools to translate guidelines into meaningful pedagogical practices.

In this scenario, digital technologies emerge simultaneously as instruments of democratization and as potential amplifiers of inequality. The COVID-19 pandemic, for instance, exposed the gap between those who had access to devices and connectivity and those who remained excluded from remote education. This experience revealed that technological infrastructure—although necessary—is insufficient: human mediation and school culture are decisive in transforming technological resources into meaningful learning experiences. Thus, digital equity requires integrated policies that address infrastructure, teacher training, accessible materials, and flexible curricular management (Lemes, 2025).

Technological mediation, when guided by ethical and pedagogical principles, becomes a powerful instrument of inclusion. It enables the creation of learning environments, broadens students' cultural repertoires, and diversifies languages and methodologies. However, mediation must be understood as a relational process rather than a mere technical interaction. Learning is always socially mediated; therefore, technology must be incorporated into the school as an extension of human cultural and cognitive practices, not as a substitute for them.

Teacher education plays a crucial role in this process. The mediating teacher (Villar, 1994) is one who articulates technical proficiency with political commitment, capable of using technology to foster authorship, critical thinking, and creative reasoning among students. When associated with the Freirean perspective of liberatory education, technological mediation strengthens the construction of meaningful knowledge, transforming the classroom into a space for dialogue and collective knowledge production. Thus, the pedagogical use of technology is not limited to tool use; it reflects an epistemological stance toward knowledge and social reality.

The concept of *cognitive justice* (Santos, 2009) is central to understanding the new demands of schooling in the digital era. It advocates recognizing and valuing multiple forms of knowledge and expression, challenging the monopoly of Eurocentric and technocratic epistemologies. In this sense, technological mediation may promote the circulation of local knowledge, the integration between communities and schools, and the development of more plural and contextualized curricula. The challenge is to ensure that technologies do not reinforce

cognitive hierarchies but instead expand access and diversify perspectives in the educational field.

Furthermore, integrating technologies into schooling requires curricular management that prioritizes interdisciplinarity and content contextualization. The digital curriculum must be understood as a living space of cultural and critical production, in which different areas of knowledge interact around real and meaningful problems. School management, in turn, must create institutional conditions for these practices to become established by ensuring pedagogical autonomy, planning time, and technical support.

Equity in contemporary education, therefore, depends on the school's ability to transform technology into an instrument of emancipation. This entails recognizing that digital inclusion is part of a broader inclusion: cognitive, cultural, and civic. The democratization of schooling mediated by technologies requires long-term public policies aligned with ongoing teacher education and the strengthening of school communities as spaces of innovation and solidarity.

In sum, equitable schooling mediated by technology constitutes a civilizing project: the formation of autonomous, critical, and participatory individuals capable of understanding and transforming the digital world in which they live. In this context, technology must be understood not as an end, but as a means to citizenship, the strengthening of democracy, and the realization of the human right to education.

Final considerations: the democratic school and its inclusion/exclusion paradox

The LDB guarantees the right to education for all, yet the reality of Brazilian schools remains marked by shortcomings and exclusions. The effectiveness of school democratization requires access and qualified permanence grounded in equity and justice (Lemes, 2019). The most significant potential of schooling in a democratic society lies in inclusion, which is expressed in the ability to make the knowledge and culture of a people accessible, reflecting a humanizing project. However, an exclusionary mentality persists, naturalizing school failure as an inherent insufficiency of schooling itself. Studies such as the Gini Index indicate that socioeconomic inequality—evidenced by these indicators—directly affects study and learning conditions (Lemes, 2019). Recent data reinforce this concern: Brazil's Gini coefficient reached 0.518 in 2023 (PNAD, 2023), while results show declines from elementary to secondary school levels. These indicators also reveal that the inequality between “poor” and “rich” schools

represents a learning gap of up to four years at the end of elementary school, with academic performance increasing across each socioeconomic level (IEDE, 2024). In this sense, the school—as an institutional model of schooling—finds itself in a transitional state, seeking to overcome the exhaustion of the traditional exclusionary model to become genuinely democratic and inclusive.

Contemporary schooling faces a historical dilemma: on the one hand, it must respond to the demands of an increasingly technological, digitalized, and globalized society—marked by borderless networks of connection—while on the other, it must uphold ethical, democratic, and humanizing principles that ground both the right to education and the democratic rule of law. The conceptual reflections developed throughout this work demonstrate that educational management, institutional assessment, and technological mediation constitute interdependent dimensions of a shared political and pedagogical project: the construction of democratic, equitable, and innovative schooling in a historically and profoundly unequal society.

Educational management, when guided by values such as participation, autonomy, and shared responsibility, becomes an emancipatory process; it ceases to function as a mechanism of control and transforms into a field of political and ethical action in which the collective defines pathways and constructs contextualized solutions. The perspective of Situational Strategic Planning—revisited in this text—proves particularly relevant, as it proposes a planning approach that recognizes uncertainty, the diversity of actors, and the ongoing need for negotiation. It entails a form of management that learns from reality and acts upon it, articulating diagnosis and transformative action.

Institutional evaluation, in turn, must be understood as an instrument of knowledge and emancipation, rather than punishment. Its primary function is to illuminate processes and support the improvement of educational practices. To evaluate is to learn from experience, reconstruct pathways, and reorient strategies in light of emerging challenges. When integrated into planning and supported by indicators that are sensitive to diversity, evaluation becomes an ally of equity and innovation.

Educational innovation—often associated solely with the introduction of new technologies—acquires a deeper meaning when understood as a transformative social practice. To innovate is to reinterpret and reframe the curriculum, reorganize school time and space, reinvent methodologies, and open oneself to listening to the community. In this sense, technology is not the core of innovation but its amplifier; a means of expanding voices, multiplying languages, and bridging different worlds. Artificial intelligence, when used

critically, can support the personalization of instruction, inform pedagogical decision-making, and strengthen teacher autonomy, provided it is grounded in ethical and democratic principles.

Equity—the transversal axis of the entire discussion—constitutes the primary criterion of legitimacy for educational policies and practices. In societies marked by historical and structural inequalities, such as Brazil, discussing educational quality necessarily entails discussing social justice. Guaranteeing the right to learn requires understanding the multiple dimensions of exclusion—economic, cultural, digital, and symbolic—and confronting them through integrated and sustainable policies. Technological mediation—digital and virtual—when guided by an emancipatory pedagogical project, can become an instrument of inclusion, strengthening individual agency and the collective construction of knowledge.

The school is therefore called upon to reinvent itself as a space of hope and transformation. Its social role goes beyond the transmission of knowledge: it must form critical and compassionate citizens capable of understanding and acting upon the complexity of the contemporary world. Management, evaluation, and technology are, within this horizon, complementary dimensions of a single ethical task: educating for autonomy, responsibility, and democratic coexistence.

It follows that the future of school education—schooling—will depend less on the amount of technological resources available and more on the human capacity to give them meaning. True innovation arises from the encounter between technique—as an art in principle—and ethics—as the principle for action—between knowledge and commitment, the individual and the collective. In this balance lies the transformative potential of public schools and the possibility of realizing the ideal of a democratic, equitable, and socially relevant education. However, embedded within these components of balance are also the main challenges to pedagogical mediation.

References

BONNIOL, Jean-Jacques; VIAL, Michèle. **Évaluation et formation**. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2001.

BULUT, Okan; BEITING-PARRISH, Maggie; CASABIANCA, Jodi M.; SLATER, Sharon C.; JIAO, Hong; SONG, Dan; ORMEROD, Christopher; FABIYI, Deborah Gbemisola; IVAN, Rodica; WALSH, Cole; RIOS, Oscar; WILSON, Joshua; YILDIRIM-ERBASLI, Seyma N.; WONGVORACHAN, Tarid; LIU, Joyce Xinle; TAN, Bin; MORILOVA, Polina. The rise of artificial intelligence in educational measurement: opportunities and ethical challenges. **Journal of Educational Measurement and Evaluation**, v.5, n. 3, 2024. DOI: 10.59863/MIQL7785.

CANCLINI, Néstor García. **Culturas híbridas: estratégias para entrar e sair da modernidade**. São Paulo: EdUSP, 2008.

CASTELLS, Manuel. **The rise of the network society**. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, 2011.

D'AMBRÓSIO, Ubiratan. **Educação para uma sociedade em transição**. Campinas: Papirus, 2011.

DIAS SOBRINHO, José. **Avaliação da educação superior: democratização, qualidade e autonomia**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2018. Available at: <https://portaliede.org.br/contribuicao/folha-de-s-paulo-desigualdade-entre-escolas-pobres-e-ricas-e-de-4-anos-ao-fim-do-ensino-fundamental/>. Accessed in: 27 Oct. 2025.

DUBET, François. **O que é uma escola justa?** São Paulo: Cortez, 2008.

FERNANDES, Allysson Barbosa; Ernandes, Itamar; MENDES, Mateus Luan de Carvalho; PEREIRA, Paulo Ricardo da Silva; CAMPOS, Eduardo de Castro; ROMÃO, Adriano Alves. IA e gestão educacional: o futuro da tomada de decisão baseada em análise de dados. **Revista ARACÊ**, v. 7, n. 1, p. 4011-4024, 2025. Available at: <https://periodicos.newsciencepubl.com/arace/article/download/3045/3794/11469>. Accessed in: 14 Dec. 2025.

FREIRE, Paulo. **Pedagogia da autonomia: saberes necessários à prática educativa**. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1996.

HABERMAS, Jürgen. **Teoria do agir comunicativo**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1987.

HAN, Byung-Chul. **Hiperculturalidade: cultura e globalização**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2019.

IEDE. INSTITUTO DE ESTUDOS PARA O DESENVOLVIMENTO DA EDUCAÇÃO. **Desigualdade entre escolas pobres e ricas é de 4 anos ao fim do ensino fundamental**. 2024. Available at: <https://portaliede.org.br/contribuicao/folha-de-s-paulo-desigualdade-entre-escolas-pobres-e-ricas-e-de-4-anos-ao-fim-do-ensino-fundamental/>. Accessed in: 27 Oct. 2025.

IRIO, Rafael. Brasil fora da aula: por que ainda não ensinamos Inteligência Artificial nas escolas? **LexLegal**, 7 jul. 2025. Available at: <https://lexlegal.com.br/brasil-fora-da-aula-por-que-ainda-nao-ensinamos-inteligencia-artificial-nas-escolas/>. Accessed in: 27 Oct. 2025.

LEMES, Sebastião de Souza. O caminho da escola democratizada: pistas e perspectivas para o Currículo. In: **GESTÃO das unidades escolares: organização e gestão da escola: gestão curricular**. São Paulo: Cultura Acadêmica UNESP; Pró-Reitoria de Graduação, 2019. p. 170-181.

LEMES, Sebastião de Souza. Os desafios da gestão curricular na perspectiva dos fundamentos de avaliação e dos indicadores educacionais. **Acervo digital da UNESP**, 2025. Available at: https://acervodigital.unesp.br/bitstream/123456789/65513/1/u1_d28_v2_tc03.pdf. Accessed in: 27 Oct. 2025.

- MAINARDES, Jefferson. A pesquisa sobre políticas educacionais no Brasil: estado do conhecimento. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, v. 23, p. 1-20, 2018. DOI: 10.1590/0102-4698173480. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/edur/a/HvzD9vdbHTjX7pbJgzsmQBS/?lang=pt>. Accessed in: 15 Dec. 2025.
- MATUS, Carlos. **Adiós, señor presidente: gobernar es gobernar con otros**. Caracas: ILPES, 1993.
- MENDES, Felipe de Carvalho. O Mediador Pedagógico e a Ética da Pluralidade: Uma Análise da Prática Docente em Tempos de Polarização. **Educação & Sociedade**, v. 41, e230075, 2020.
- NGUYEN, Anh; NGO, Ha Ngan; HONG, Yvonne; DANG, Belle; NGUYEN, Bich-Phuong Thi. Ethical principles for artificial intelligence in education. 2023. **Education and Information Technologies**, v. 28, p. 4221-4241, 2023. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10639-022-11316-w>. Accessed in: 15 Dec. 2025.
- PNAD. PESQUISA NACIONAL POR AMOSTRA DE DOMICÍLIOS CONTÍNUA. **Rendimento de todas as fontes**. 2023. Available at: <https://www.ipeadata.gov.br/ExibeSerieR.aspx?stub=1&serid=2096726935&MINDATA=2012&MAXDATA=2030&TNIVID=1&TPAID=1&module=So>. Accessed in: 8 Nov. 2025.
- PINTO, Álvaro Vieira. **O conceito de tecnologia**. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto, 2005.
- RAHAL, Ahmad; ZAINUBA, Mohamed. Improving students performance in quantitative courses: The case of academic motivation and predictive analytics. **The International Journal of Management Education**, v. 14, n. 1, p. 8-17, 2016. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijme.2015.11.003. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1472811715300021>. Accessed in: 8 Nov. 2025.
- RELEASES. Sete em cada dez alunos do Ensino Médio usam IA generativa em pesquisas escolares, revela TIC Educação. **Cetic.br**, 16 set. 2025. Available at: <https://www.cetic.br/pt/noticia/sete-em-cada-dez-alunos-do-ensino-medio-usam-ia-generativa-em-pesquisas-escolares-revela-tic-educacao/>. Accessed in: 27 Oct. 2025.
- SACRISTÁN, José Gimeno. **A avaliação: regras do jogo**. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, 1994.
- SANTAELLA, Lúcia. **Aprendizagem ubíqua: educação e comunicação em tempos de mobilidade**. São Paulo: Paulus, 2013.
- SANTOS, Boaventura de Sousa. **A gramática do tempo: para uma nova cultura política**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2009.
- SANTOS, Edméa Oliveira dos; ALVES, Lynn Rosalina Gama. **Educação e tecnologias digitais: ética, política e mediação pedagógica**. Salvador: EDUFBA, 2022
- SANTOS, Genessi Borba Gomes Alves; SILVA, Luís Gustavo Alexandre da; LIMA, Daniela da Costa Britto Pereira. Plataformas digitais e inteligência artificial na gestão das redes públicas de ensino e das escolas: conquistas e desafios. **Jornal de Políticas Educacionais**, v.

19, n. 1, 2025. DOI: 10.5380/jpe.v19i1.98302. Available at:
<https://revistas.ufpr.br/jpe/article/view/98302>. Accessed in: 15 Dec. 2025.

VILLAR, Luis Miguel Angulo. **Evaluación de programas de formación del profesorado**. Madrid: Cincel, 1994.

VORST, Tommy van der; JELICIC, Nick. Artificial intelligence in education: a systematic review of the literature. **Educational Research Review**, v. 27, p. 1-19, 2019.

WANG, Yueying. Artificial intelligence in student management systems to enhance educational monitoring. **Scientific Reports**, v. 15, n. 35122, 2025. Available at:
<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-025-19159-4>. Accessed in: 15 Dec. 2025.

WILLIAMSON, Ben; PIATTOEVA, Nelli. **Education governance and datafication: critical perspectives**. New York: Routledge, 2022.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Sebastião de Souza Lemes; Professor Livre Docente na UNESP – Campus de Araraquara (SP), Líder do Grupo de Pesquisa NEAME – Núcleo de Estudos Ampliados em Educação. Author contribution: supervision, methodology, validation, writing – review and editing. Currículo Lattes: <https://lattes.cnpq.br/7536622893794669>

How to cite

LEMES, Sebastião de Souza Lemes. Management, evaluation and artificial intelligence: the possibilities and challenges for pedagogical mediation. **Revista Práxis Educacional**, Vitória da Conquista, v. 21, n. 52, e18509, 202X. DOI: 10.22481/praxisedu.v21i52.18509