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When teachers focus on achieving year level standards and providing additional supports for struggling students, there is little consideration or provision for the high ability students who are capable of working above year level standards, but are languishing in an educational holding pattern. It is not only possible for teachers to differentiate the curriculum to provide appropriate challenge for all learners, including the gifted learners, but it is also imperative in today’s inclusive classrooms if the goals of equity and excellence for all students are to be realised.

Using the guidelines provided in the Australian Curriculum, the principle of appropriate challenge and the addition of depth and complexity to curriculum design will be explained and illustrated. Participants will experience a workshop designed to incorporate varying levels of challenge appropriate to diverse learners.
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Differentiating the curriculum by readiness to learn

Rationale and Purpose:
All students have an entitlement to learn and to make a full year’s progress for each year of schooling. ACARA (v 7.5) states that “all students are entitled to rigorous, relevant and engaging learning programs drawn from a challenging curriculum that addresses their individual learning needs”. In order to learn, students need to be given appropriately challenging learning opportunities with different levels of scaffolding as required.

Students are diverse and there is usually a 6-8 year range of abilities within any year level inclusive classroom (Masters, 2015). This means that there will be a range of different entry levels for students in any learning area.

The Australian Curriculum presents each subject as a continuum of learning, from Foundational studies to Year 10 (and also presents a senior secondary curriculum that is yet to be implemented). Each General Capability is also presented on a learning continuum. Bloom’s Taxonomy is embedded in the achievement standards, and is assumed knowledge for all teachers implementing the curriculum.

Teachers have a responsibility to differentiate learning across the full range of abilities (AITSL, 2011, Standard 1.5). Learning tasks for students at different levels of readiness to learn should look different to enable the correct match between learning needs and provisions.

Teachers explain to their students that learning comes in different ‘sizes’ just like clothing – the teacher’s job is to select the appropriately sized learning task for each student, and the student’s job is to ensure that the ‘fit’ is comfortable – not too hard, not too easy, just right. Differences in levels of readiness are seen as temporary assessments of current learning, not as fixed abilities that do not change. All students can learn and progress, and feel supported to do so (AITSL, 2011, Standard 4).

When a student is assigned a task that is appropriately challenging, their learning entitlement is respected and their mastery of the (achievable) task will be more intrinsically rewarding and motivating. Vygotsky’s (1978) Zone of Proximal Development explains the importance of appropriate challenge. Students should be able to look at the other tasks and see that their task is what they need at this point in time. In this way, there is no sense of being ‘dumb’, just ‘not there yet’ (Dweck, 2014). This helps to foster a growth mindset (Dweck, 2006) that enables students to value their effort invested to achieve positive learning outcomes and gives them permission to take risks with their learning and learn from mistakes.

Harry Passow’s (1988) ‘would, could, should’ strategy helps teachers to determine if the amount of challenge is appropriate for advanced learners. For example, if the most advanced task is something that all students would want to do, are capable of doing and should have the opportunity to do, then the task is not challenging enough for the advanced students.

Teachers may develop any number of versions of a learning task, depending on the context and students. Typically they might develop a year level task, an advanced level task and a simplified version of the task. All versions of the task should be “equally active, engaging and interesting” (Heacox, 2009, p. 87), should require similar time commitments and aim to enable students to achieve the same learning objectives – they just provide different roads towards the goal and may enable students to achieve the goal at differing levels of depth and complexity of understanding (AITSL, 2011, Standard 3). What is important to note is that the task itself needs to represent quality curriculum – it needs to be a task worth differentiating.

Knowing your students and how they learn (AITSL, 2011, Standard 1) is of critical importance and teachers need to use assessment (including pre-assessment) to determine students’ levels of readiness to learn prior to designing the learning activities (AITSL, 2011, Standard 5).
Tomlinson’s Model of Differentiation

It is essential for teachers to have a clear understanding of the philosophy, principles and practices of differentiation, and Tomlinson’s (2009) model below provides a comprehensive set of guidelines to support teachers’ professional learning and practice. There are many useful books and articles written about differentiation, by a range of authors, but having a clear overview helps to align new details into the framework in a meaningful and connected manner. Further elaboration of each element in the model, and examples of practice can be found on the University of Virginia Differentiation Central website at http://differentiationcentral.com/

### Differentiation

- **is a teacher’s proactive response to learner needs**
- shaped by mindset
- and guided by general principles of differentiation

**An environment that encourages and supports learning**
- Quality curriculum
- Assessment that informs teaching and learning
- Instruction that responds to student variance
- Leading students and managing routines

**Teachers can differentiate through**

- **Content**
  - The information and ideas students grapple with to reach the learning goals
- **Process**
  - How students take in and make sense of the content
- **Product**
  - How students show what they know, understand, and can do
- **Affect/Environment**
  - The climate or tone of the classroom

**according to the student’s**

- **Readiness**
  - A student’s proximity to specified learning goals
- **Interests**
  - Passions, affinities, kinships that motivate learning
- **Learning Profile**
  - Preferred approaches to learning

through a variety of instructional strategies, such as

- Learning/Interest Centers
- RAFTs
- Graphic Organizers
- Scaffolded Reading/Writing
- Intelligence Preferences
- Tiered Assignments
- Learning Contracts
- Menus
- Tic-Tac-Toe
- Complex Instruction
- Independent Projects
- Expression Options
- Small-Group Instruction
Australian Curriculum advice for differentiation

The flexible design of the Australian Curriculum enables teachers to have access to the entire learning continuum for each area of learning in order to plan appropriately challenging tasks for diverse students. ACARA uses the terms ‘personalised learning’ and ‘adjustments’ to refer to designing a differentiated curriculum and its implementation that is responsive to students’ needs. The stated intention is to “promote personalised learning that aims to fulfil the diverse capabilities of each young Australian” (MCEETYA, 2008, p.7). It is every student’s “entitlement” and every teacher’s “obligation”.

The advice provided on the ACARA website includes a flow-chart which can be summarised below:

This advice assumes that teachers apply the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers (AITSL, 2011) including:

- Know students and how they learn (standard 1)
- Differentiate teaching to meet the specific learning needs of students across the full range of abilities (standard 1.5)
- Know the content and how to teach it (standard 2)
- Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning (standard 3)
- Establish challenging learning goals (standard 3.1)
- Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning (standard 5)

Gifted and talented students are not a homogeneous group. They will have diverse profiles and patterns of achievement, motivation and interest which may be inconsistent across the learning areas. Gifted students may have outstanding natural ability but be underachieving, while talented students are those who are performing at an outstanding level for their age (Gagné, 2009). When considering the learning needs of gifted and talented students within the Australian Curriculum, teachers may accelerate students, extend and enrich their learning opportunities as appropriate. This matches gifted students’ capability of learning at a faster pace, to a greater depth of complexity and breadth of understanding in their area or areas of strength and passion.

When tiering learning tasks for gifted students for example, teachers may draw from the skills required by higher levels and challenge the advanced students who have already mastered year level skills, while working with the same year level content. Or, they could incorporate a task which examines the ethical dimension of the content suggested by the Ethical Understanding capability, or a task that applies higher order thinking skills from the Thinking capability. Other suggestions for and examples of personalised learning may be viewed on the AC website under the “Student Diversity” tab.
Tiered Assignments

Tiered learning tasks are used when teachers require students to work at an appropriate level of intellectual challenge and to build on and extend existing knowledge, skills and understanding. Based on a specific set of learning objectives, students are assigned one of several alternate versions of a task (tiers) that matches their current level of readiness. While it is possible to design alternative tasks in response to students’ differences in interests or learning preferences, these are often appropriate for students at any readiness level, so there is no necessary difference in challenge and students may often self-select these options. However, tiered tasks are designed to match students’ levels of readiness, so are stepped up in terms of difficulty and it is usually the teacher who determines which task is appropriate for which student.

It is important for teachers to be familiar with the concept of Ascending Intellectual Demand (Tomlinson et al, 2009) as it relates to their specific area of learning/discipline, and as it is represented in the Australian Curriculum, in order to identify students’ current level of readiness and to have a clear vision of what to provide in order for them to progress along the continuum.

An example of tiered learning tasks can be seen in the common classroom practice of establishing reading groups where teachers have a clear idea of reading progressions, have identified each student’s reading level, grouped them into reading groups according to their reading level and then provided appropriately challenging reading materials and scaffolding in order for students to progress as readers.

Just a note to remember is that not all tasks should be tiered – there are times when it is appropriate for all students to engage in whole group teaching and learning activities, so tiering relates specifically to levels of readiness and levels of challenge for learning.
Design options for tiered learning tasks

Building on the advice from ACARA, and relating this specifically to the design of tiered learning tasks (ie tasks with progressive levels of challenge), the following suggestions are made to prompt your own ideas about what is appropriate for your own students in your own context and learning area, and in relation to your specific learning objectives.

1. Tiering by Reduction and Amplification
   Start with the typical year-level task that you might set. Evaluate this “baseline assignment” and anticipate:
   - elements that lower-achieving students find difficult and frustrating → reduce the level of difficulty to increase students’ success and sense of achievement;
   - elements that high-achieving students find too easy and boring → amplify them to increase the level of challenge and enthusiasm.
   A useful tool here is Tomlinson’s “Equaliser” which suggests ways in which you can adjust these elements of a task to ‘reduce’ or ‘amplify’ the degree of challenge.

2. Tiering by Reading / literacy capability
   Content can be differentiated according to the reading levels of the students by providing resources at a variety of reading levels. You can check the reading level of any materials with a Lexile score. To measure the reading level, you may use the free Lexile Analyzer from MetaMetrics available at [https://www.lexile.com/tools/lexile-analyzer/using-the-professional-analyzer/](https://www.lexile.com/tools/lexile-analyzer/using-the-professional-analyzer/)
   Tiered tasks may then be devised that provide reading materials and worksheets at appropriate levels of ‘readability’ for students, who can all be working on the same topic/learning objectives, but reading at different levels of complexity – some students with ‘easier’ readings, some at year level and some with advanced, even potentially university level texts.

3. Tiering by Bloom’s Taxonomy
   The Australian Curriculum frames its achievement standards using Bloom’s (revised 2001) Cognitive Taxonomy, so understanding how to use these verbs as question starters, assignment tasks and learning activities is essential. All students benefit from the use of higher order thinking, suggested by the Bloom’s ‘analyse’, ‘evaluate’ and ‘create’ levels, but for gifted and talented students these are essential. Diane Heacox (2009) suggests that Bloom’s Taxonomy can be applied to create “challenge levels” with learning tasks tiered according to the level of thinking required.
For example

- a tier that requires the student to reveal knowledge or comprehension
- a tier that requires analysis and application
- a tier that requires evaluation or creative thinking

An essential resource is provided within the Critical and Creative thinking general capability advice within the Australian Curriculum – look in particular at the learning continuum at [http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/generalcapabilities/critical-and-creative-thinking/continuum#layout=columns](http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/generalcapabilities/critical-and-creative-thinking/continuum#layout=columns) for ideas about how to design tiered activities that require different levels of challenge in the thinking involved. You can also use this to evaluate where students’ current thinking is situated. You might also like to look at Kathie Nunley’s (2014) ideas about a “layered curriculum” explained at [http://help4teachers.com/how.htm](http://help4teachers.com/how.htm)

If you have mastered Bloom’s and are looking for more complexity, you might be interested to look at Karin Hess’ (2009) matrix that applies Bloom’s Taxonomy to Webb’s depth of knowledge levels. You can find the article and matrix at [http://www.nckie.org/publication_PDFs/cognitiverigorpaper_KH12.pdf](http://www.nckie.org/publication_PDFs/cognitiverigorpaper_KH12.pdf)

Another application of Bloom’s Taxonomy can be found in the Curry Samara Model which enables teachers to tier activities using differentiated content and thinking skills based on the 4 quadrants shown below (details at [http://www.curriculumproject.com/](http://www.curriculumproject.com/))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Critical thinking</th>
<th>Creative thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factual content (concrete ideas)</td>
<td>Quadrant 1: Factual/local content with basic thinking</td>
<td>Quadrant 2: Factual/local content with abstract thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract content (big picture ideas)</td>
<td>Quadrant 3: Abstract content with basic thinking</td>
<td>Quadrant 4: Abstract content with abstract thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robert Marzano (2007) has also proposed a taxonomy of educational objectives that updates Bloom’s based on advances in understanding human cognition that have occurred since the 1950s. Interestingly it “posits three systems of thought that have a hierarchical relationship in terms of flow of processing: the self-system, the metacognitive system and the cognitive system” (Marzano & Kendall, 2007 p. 19). A graphic representation of this taxonomy can be found at [http://www.maine.gov/doe/cbp/taxonomy-image.png](http://www.maine.gov/doe/cbp/taxonomy-image.png)

4. **Tiering using a range of thinking skills to add depth and complexity**

There is a proliferation of thinking skills and strategies that can be applied to lesson design that provides tiered activities. Thinking skills apply to every learning area and are highly transferable, once taught, practised and prompted. Learning activities can be tiered by identifying higher order strategies that provide extended challenge, but thinking strategies may also be taught explicitly to all students. Recommendations include:

Visible thinking routines from the Harvard ‘Project Zero’ work and available on their website at [http://www.visiblethinkingpz.org/VisibleThinking_html_files/03_ThinkingRoutines/03a_ThinkingRoutines.html](http://www.visiblethinkingpz.org/VisibleThinking_html_files/03_ThinkingRoutines/03a_ThinkingRoutines.html)
Sandra Kaplan’s Depth and Complexity model is worth elaboration, as the icons (see attached sheet) suggest ways in which students could explore year level content in more challenging ways – this meets the needs of gifted and talented students for added depth and complexity in their learning. A detailed explanation can be found in chapter 28 of Callahan & Hertberg-Davis’s (2013) book *Fundamentals of gifted education*.


### 5. Tiering using the skills of the discipline

Using the Australian Curriculum learning continuum for each area of learning provides a range of ideas for tiering activities based on levels of challenge. You can download and print several levels of a learning area from the AC website at [http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/download/f10](http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/download/f10) or you can go to the AISSA website where Janet Farrall has included them as auditing tools [http://www.ais.sa.edu.au/teaching-learning/learning-areas](http://www.ais.sa.edu.au/teaching-learning/learning-areas). This enables you to see the levels of challenge at a glance, particularly in relation to the skills sections.

It is possible for all students in the class to be working on year-level content while processing that content using different skills at different levels of challenge. By examining the skills of the discipline, and assessing students’ existing skills, teachers may find that some students’ skills are way behind year level expectations, while others are already capable of working at more advanced levels. For example, in Year 3 History, students study “Days and weeks celebrated or commemorated in Australia (including Australia Day, ANZAC Day, Harmony Week, National Reconciliation Week, NAIDOC week and National Sorry Day) and the importance of symbols and emblems. *(ACHHK063)*”. The historical skills required at year 3 include sequencing and describing events, identifying aspects of change and significance and posing questions and locating answers in texts. By borrowing from the year 6 historical skill of comparing and contrasting perspectives, some more challenging tasks could be presented to students who are already adept at the year 3 skills. For example, if the class was studying ANZAC Day and looking at the facts of what happened and why it is significant (describing and sequencing events), a more challenging task might be to compare and contrast the experiences of the soldiers and the nurses who were at Gallipoli, and explain how the ANZAC celebration is significant from different perspectives.

Understanding the novice to expert continuum enables teachers to look to the skills of the experts working in the discipline for additional extension ideas.

### Process of tiering:

Refer to the planning proforma at the end of this document. Although presented below as a linear sequence, the process of planning is far more circular and iterative as teachers continue to check their tasks against the learning objectives and keep in mind their rationale and the summative assessment for which this task is preparing students, so the planning process should involve teachers moving back and forth between the steps.

1. Select the unit of work to be studied and be clear why your students should learn this – what is significant/relevant to them and to the discipline?
2. Determine the learning objectives and write these clearly as KDUs.
3. Develop a pre-assessment to establish students’ levels of readiness.
4. Consider also students’ interests, learning profiles, English language capability.
5. Design a quality learning task at grade level that addresses the learning objectives.
6. Modify the task for students who may struggle with the demands of the task.
7. Modify the task for students who would find this task too easy.
8. How many versions of the task will depend on the students’ needs. Two versions may suffice, or four versions may be required (eg there may be a student with an IEP who requires specific adjustments in their own version of the task, and there may be one student who is so far advanced as to need even more challenge than would be appropriate for anyone else).
9. Determine how the instructions for the tasks are to be communicated (eg laminated cards, audio-instructions, printed worksheets, On-line learning spaces).
10. Design an interesting introduction for the task that relates to the purpose and explains the task.
11. Based on the pre-assessment, match students to the task with an appropriate level of challenge to give them their best fit for learning.
12. Students work in small groups or as individuals to complete the task.
13. The teacher may move between the individuals/groups, or may choose to rotate between the groups, with the belief that all students are experiencing challenge and will need scaffolding and feedback in different ways as appropriate.
14. Plan a plenary session to conclude where students can share their findings and revisit the stated learning intention(s) from the start of the lesson.
15. Devise an exit card to indicate each student’s progress towards achieving the learning objectives and to determine where to next.

Final thoughts

Tiering learning tasks may be something that you have already mastered, and if so, this advice should be very affirming for you, but hopefully it has also shown you some new things to try to continue to develop expertise. You may feel confident about differentiating curriculum for interests and learning profile, but less confident about differentiating by readiness levels, so this information may prompt you to expand your versatility. This information may seem overwhelming if you are new to differentiation, so a few suggestions on how to proceed to develop these skills:

- Read some more about tiered instruction, readiness levels and developing expertise within a specific area of learning. You might like to start with some of the references and resources listed on the final page of this document.
- Watch some videos that provide exemplary models of tiered methodology
- Find some professional learning friends to share your ideas
- Try tiering an activity in a unit of work that you are most confident and comfortable with and use it - evaluate students’ learning and engagement to see if it made a difference

Designing and implementing tiered tasks requires a focused student-centred approach to teaching and learning, with a flexible interpretation of content, processes and products to suit the specific (and developing) needs of the students over time within a specific learning area and context. I hope you enjoy the challenge of developing expertise in this aspect of differentiation and enjoy the rewards that come from making a difference for student learning, achievement and well-being.
### Planning a tiered task (Henderson, 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content &amp; achievement standards:</th>
<th>Purpose:</th>
<th>Learning Objectives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(what is the AC content to be addressed, and how does this relate to the year-level achievement standards?)</em></td>
<td><em>(Why is this significant for these students? How does it relate to the discipline?)</em></td>
<td>As a result of completing this task, all students will:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNOW</strong> <em>(facts, dates, names, rules, vocabulary, definitions – key factual information)</em></td>
<td><strong>BE ABLE TO</strong> <em>(skills relating to literacy, numeracy, thinking strategies, achievement standards – start with a verb &amp; relate to Bloom’s Taxonomy)</em></td>
<td><strong>UNDERSTAND THAT</strong> <em>(big ideas, principles, relationships, generalisations, the ‘point’ of knowing &amp; being able to do this)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Assessment</strong>: <em>(What knowledge, skills &amp; understandings relating to these objectives do students already have? What do you need to know to determine the appropriate level of challenge for the tasks?)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year level task</strong>: <em>(Students at or near grade level should find this a stretch and should be able to do this successfully with appropriate scaffolding)</em></td>
<td><strong>Basic level task</strong>: <em>(What might some students find too hard about this task? What is a simpler version of the task, and/or what additional scaffolding could be applied so that students who may struggle can be successful?)</em></td>
<td><strong>Advanced level task</strong>: <em>(What might some students find too easy about the year level task? What is a more complex version of this task that will stretch these students?)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task introduction</strong> <em>(whole group)</em>: <em>(Communicate to students the learning intentions. How will you hook their interest? How will you explain the tiered task? How will students know which task they are to complete?)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task completion</strong> <em>(whole group)</em>: <em>(All students have been working towards the same learning objectives, so a plenary session to conclude can re-visit the learning intentions and share insights gained. It may involve some form of presentation, or jigsaw sharing to honour all students’ work.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exit card</strong>: <em>(How will you know what progress each student made towards the learning objectives?)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Depth & Complexity Icon Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Icon</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language of the Discipline</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td>What vocabulary terms are specific to the content or discipline?</td>
<td>Tools, Jargon Icons, Acronyms, Special phrases, Terms, Slang, Abbreviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td>What are the defining features or characteristics? Find examples and evidence to support opinions and ideas.</td>
<td>Parts, Factors, Attributes, Variables, Distinguishing Traits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterns</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td>What elements reoccur? What is the sequence or order of events? Make predictions based on past events.</td>
<td>Predictability, Repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unanswered Questions</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td>What information is unclear, missing, or unavailable? What evidence do you need? What has not yet been proven?</td>
<td>Missing Parts, Incomplete Ideas, Discrepancies, Unresolved issues, Ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td>What structure underlies this subject? What guidelines or regulations affect it? What hierarchy or ordering principle is at work?</td>
<td>Structure, Order, Reasons, Organization, Explanation, Classification, “Because…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td>Note factors (Social Economic, Political, Geographic) that cause events to occur. Identify patterns of change over time</td>
<td>Influence, Forces, Direction, Course of Action, Compare, Contrast, and Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td>What moral principles are involved in this subject? What controversies exist? What arguments could emerge from a study of this topic?</td>
<td>Values, Morals, Pro and Con, Bias, Discrimination, Prejudice, Judging, Differing Opinions, Point of View, Right and Wrong, Wisdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Ideas</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td>What theory or general statement applies to these ideas? How do these ideas relate to broad concepts such as change, systems, chaos vs. order, etc? What is the main idea?</td>
<td>Draw conclusions based on evidence, Make generalizations, Summarize, Theory, Principle, Main Idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Across the Disciplines</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td>Relate the area of study to other subjects within, between, and across disciplines.</td>
<td>Connect, Associate, Integrate, Live Ideas, Cross-Curricular study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes over Time</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td>How are elements related in terms of the past, present, and future? How and why do things change? What doesn’t change?</td>
<td>Connecting points in time, Examining a time period, Compare and Contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Perspectives</td>
<td>![Icon]</td>
<td>How would others see the situation differently?</td>
<td>Different roles and knowledge, Opposing viewpoints</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon the work of Sandra Kaplan
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