

# Differentiated Instruction for Today's Classroom® Online

## Course Description

*Differentiated Instruction for Today's Classroom*® Online equips experienced and beginning educators with the essential knowledge and skills they need to implement differentiated instruction (DI) successfully in their own classrooms. As a widely respected, research-based instructional approach, DI provides teachers with effective, manageable strategies for meeting the needs of an increasingly diverse student population within the context of today's challenging standards-based curriculum. In a highly interactive learning environment that models the DI principles and processes, class members will gain expertise in understanding and implementing a broad range of strategies associated with three essential, distinguishing components of DI: first, the teacher's role as guide and facilitator in a classroom environment specifically designed to support self-directed student learning and teacher-student collaboration; second, the interdependent nature of assessment and instruction in a DI classroom; and third, the implementation of specific instructional strategies to adapt the curriculum content, processes (activities), and products to provide students with entry points to learning that match their readiness, interests, and/or learning profiles.

## Course Alignments

This PLS 3rd Learning course is aligned to Charlotte Danielson's **Framework for Teaching**:

Domain 1 – 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 1E, and 1F

Domain 2 – 2A, 2B, and 2D

Domain 3 – 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D, and 3E

Domain 4 – 4A, 4B, 4C, 4E, and 4F

## Course Outcomes

Upon completion of this class, the learner will be able to:

1. Discuss and apply current, validated research underlying the theory, principles, and practices of differentiated instruction (DI).
2. Discuss the spectrum of learner variance that teachers in today's classrooms must address.
3. Identify and explain the core principles of DI and the ways in which these principles inform and guide all aspects of DI implementation.

4. Identify and explain the role of a DI teacher as facilitator and guide in the learner-centered environment of a differentiated classroom.
5. Evaluate personal growth in the skills associated with effective DI teachers.
6. Identify, explain, implement, and evaluate DI classroom management strategies and procedures that increase student success in a DI learning environment.
7. Identify, explain, and implement plans to support the development of the 13 skills of self-directed learners in his or her classroom.
8. Analyze the ways in which the FRAME-CAB principles, the DI teacher's role, DI classroom management basics, and student self-directed learning work together to create the essential elements of the DI learning environment.
9. Discuss the interdependent relationship between assessment and instruction in a DI learning environment.
10. Explain how assessment in a DI classroom is assessment *for* learning.
11. Use formal and informal assessment tools to collect data on the readiness, interests, and learning profiles of his or her students as the basis for differentiation before and during instruction.
12. Use the Model for Differentiated Instruction to create units of study based on standards and major assessment K-U-Dos (what a student *knows*, *understands*, and *can do*).
13. Create lessons that focus on the core knowledge and skills identified through the planning process outlined in the Model for Differentiated Instruction.
14. Experience, evaluate, and apply a range of DI instructional strategies designed to support DI lesson content, processes, and/or products, based on the readiness, interests, and/or learning profiles of specific students in his or her classroom.
15. Use specific DI instructional strategies to balance choice and self-directedness; flexibly differentiate before and during implementation of DI lessons; support the development of self-directedness in students; orchestrate fully differentiated lessons for two or more groups of students at the same time; provide individualized instruction for specific students in the context of the DI learning environment.
16. Experience, evaluate, and apply a range of flexible DI grouping strategies for whole-class, small-group, and individualized learning experiences during a DI lesson in his or her classroom.
17. Generalize course content to reflect how the multicultural, special needs and gifted, and other diverse populations within classrooms have their needs met by the application of the skills, strategies, and knowledge gained in this course.
18. Reflect continuously on personal expertise, using the knowledge and skills associated with this course, and use these insights actively as the basis for ongoing professional growth.
19. Work collaboratively to share knowledge, skills, and experiences; refine understanding of content; give and receive feedback; and improve expertise.

## Required Text

Tomlinson, C. A. (2017). *How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms* (3rd ed). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Instructors and learners will also use instructor-generated materials, learner-generated materials, and Web-based resources to facilitate learning.

## Topical Outline

## List of Concepts

### **Introduction to Differentiated Instruction**

How differentiated instruction (DI) is a means of meeting the learning needs of today's diverse student population; what DI is and is not; initial self-assessment on the proficiencies participants will achieve in the course; the Course Conceptual Framework; eight principles of differentiated instruction (FRAME-CAB); DI classroom scenarios demonstrating the FRAME-CAB principles in action; the learner-centered classroom; the collaborative nature of the teacher-student relationship in a DI classroom; characteristics of a DI teacher as facilitator and collaborator; the Agenda and Anchor strategies as tools for effective classroom management in a DI classroom

### **Connecting Assessment in Instruction**

The interconnected nature of assessment and instruction in a DI classroom; the difference between assessment of learning and assessment for learning; three kinds of information DI teachers need to know about their students: readiness, interests, and learning-profile preferences; assessments DI teachers can use to obtain these three types of student data; combining questioning skills based on Bloom's Taxonomy with a range of quick assessment tools

### **A Standards-Based Model for Differentiating Instruction**

The K-U-Dos acronym (Know, Understand, Do) and its relationship to standards-based instruction; how differentiation is connected to essential knowledge; a model for connecting K-U-Dos from standards and major assessments to create K-U-Dos-based units as the basis for differentiation of content, processes, and products of the teacher's curriculum; Zone of Proximal Development and scaffolding as tools for providing appropriate challenge

**Differentiated-  
Instruction  
Learning  
Environment**

A closer look at the eight FRAME-CAB principles in action; how FRAME-CAB principles inform implementation of DI; uses of DI strategies for specific purposes of differentiating content, processes, and products of instruction based on students' readiness, interests, and learning-profile preferences (the DI<sup>3</sup> model); the relationship between choice, responsibility, and motivation; a framework for understanding DI instructional strategies, using variables of choice and self-directedness (the Success Ladder); DI instructional strategies with moderate levels of choice and moderate requirements for self-directedness (Agendas, Choice Boards, Tic-Tac-Toe Boards, and Jigsaws); how instructional design, such as using choice-based strategies, can be used to motivate student learning; addressing the needs of diverse student subgroups (Part 1): challenges of English language learners in a traditional classroom; research-based guidelines DI teachers can use to meet their needs in a mixed-ability classroom

**Creating  
Instructional  
Flexibility Using  
Differentiated  
Instruction  
Strategies**

DI strategies with high instructional flexibility; distinguishing characteristics of and differences between two flexible DI strategies for differentiating content and processes (centers and stations); Problem-Based Learning applications of the centers and stations strategies for the purposes of differentiation; strategies for individualized learning; addressing the needs of diverse student subgroups (Part 2): techniques for scaffolding differentiated-learning materials and activities for students with learning disabilities

**Reinforcing  
Student Self-  
Directedness**

DI strategies to reinforce student self-directedness; role-based DI instructional strategies that support the development of student self-directedness (RAFT); DI instructional strategies for investigation and discovery that support the development of student self-directedness (Group Investigation, I-Search); myths and truths about gifted learners; how to reach and teach gifted learners in a mixed-ability classroom; a DI strategy to accommodate the needs and abilities of gifted or high-ability learners (Curriculum Compacting); using the Learning Contract strategy to orchestrate individualized learning

**Tiered  
Instruction**

The Tiered Instruction strategy and its essential nature as the “meat and potatoes” of DI strategies; criteria for creating tiered lessons; analysis of prepared DI tiered lessons using specific criteria; a planning process that helps DI teachers build tiered lessons (Decision Points); building a tiered lesson based on specific K-U-Dos and pre-assessed student needs; refining tiered lessons

**Preparing for  
DI  
Implementation**

Preparing for full implementation; possible issues DI teachers will confront when they begin to implement DI in their own classrooms; how to prepare students for full implementation of DI; distinguishing between what is *fair* and what is *equal*; grading *for* learning in a DI classroom; grading issues in a DI classroom; recommendations and resources from experienced DI teachers; major issues that parents may have with the implementation of DI; position statements in response to major issues

### Course Assessments and Links to Institutional Outcomes and Course Outcomes

Throughout the course, the learner will be assessed and evaluated on the completion of the following assessments. Participants will complete a course project designed to strengthen professional practice and extend knowledge related to the specific content of the course. This project is divided into multiple grade activities to be completed throughout the term. Additional learning activities include whole-group and small-group discussions and assessments for a total of 1118 points.

<b>Modules</b>	<b>Topics of Modules</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Correlations With Course Outcomes</b>
Module 1:	Introduction to Differentiated Instruction	117	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 17, 18, 19
Module 2:	Connecting Assessment in Instruction	100	1, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 18, 19
Module 3:	A Standards-Based Model for Differentiated Instruction	119	1, 3, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19
Module 4:	DI Learning Environment	123	1, 3, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19
Module 5:	Creating Instructional Flexibility Using DI Strategies	103	1, 3, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19
Module 6:	Reinforcing Student Self-Directedness	139	1, 3, 7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19
Module 7:	Tiered Instruction	59	1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19
Module 8:	Preparing for DI Implementation	173	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19
All:	Course Project	185	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 17, 18, 19
		<b>Total</b>	<b>1118</b>

Criteria specific to each assessment will be explained in conjunction with the instructional activities.

### Instructional Methodology

The instructional methodology of this course focuses on developing, enhancing, and improving the instructional expertise and pedagogical knowledge base of practicing educators. Strategies include presentation of new content through online readings, active construction of knowledge through practice and problem solving, collaborative group work, personal reflection, structured small-group or whole-class discussion, analysis of assigned reading, and the application of course content and skills to participant's individual grade level, subject area(s), and classroom.

### Grading Scale

The course facilitator will post the college-specific grading scale.

### PLS 3rd Learning's Late Policy

There will be a 10% deduction of points per day for all posts and submitted assignments that are late. Replies posted after the due date will earn no points. In

rare cases, partially or poorly completed assignments may be resubmitted for partial credit at the discretion of the instructor. The following exceptions apply:

- If a participant is sick/hospitalized or has a death in the family, the timing of makeup work may be arranged with the course facilitator. No points will be deducted if the work is completed according to the agreement.
- If a participant is on vacation/traveling/etc., the participant must contact the course facilitator ahead of time to avoid a penalty. This type of absence may occur only once during a course. All posts should be submitted for the missed module before leaving.
- If a participant has difficulty completing everything in a week, an extension can be granted if the participant contacts the facilitator during the week (not at the last minute).

### **PLS 3rd Learning's Participant Drop Policy**

- Participants are eligible to receive a refund if they attend class for one week or less. This means participants must withdraw by the end of Module 1 to receive a refund.
- Refunds of the balance of tuition paid will be given, minus the \$50 deposit.

### **PLS 3rd Learning's Academic Integrity Policy**

PLS 3rd Learning expects absolute academic honesty and integrity from every course participant. The specific Academic Integrity and Honor Code Policies of our partner colleges and universities are embraced and enforced by PLS 3rd Learning instructors. The following are considered to be serious violations:

- Plagiarism: the use of another's ideas, data, or words without proper acknowledgement.
- Fabrication: the use of invented information or the falsification of research or other findings with the intent to deceive.
- Collusion: improper collaboration with another in preparing assignments or projects.
- Cheating: an act of deception by which a student misrepresents that he or she has mastered information on an academic exercise that he or she has not mastered.
- Academic Misconduct: tampering with grades, or taking part in obtaining or distributing any part of student work that is not his or her own.

Violation or suspected violation will be investigated and pursued according to specific college/university procedures.

### **Identity Authentication**

The college/university, PLS 3rd Learning, and students share a joint responsibility to ensure that each student's contribution in an online course activity comes from that student alone. For the student, this responsibility has two parts:

1. Students are responsible for positively ensuring that every contribution to an online course created with the student's computer account is made by the student alone. Contributions covered under this policy include: written assignments; quiz and exam submissions; discussion forum postings; live

participation in text-based chat sessions, phone conferences, and videoconferences. If a student allows another person to write or make any kind of submission to an online activity in the student's name, then this constitutes cheating and will be treated as a violation of academic honesty.

2. Students are responsible for ensuring the integrity of their computer account security by following the actions required of them by the PLS 3rd Learning Acceptable Use Policy. These actions include keeping passcodes private, updating passcodes when required by PLS 3rd Learning, and reporting breaches of the security policy to the IT Helpdesk.

### **Course Evaluation**

The evaluation of learner work will be based on the defined criteria for learner assessments. The criteria for learner assessments will be outlined for students prior to instructional activities and engagement with student learning targets (outcomes). Grading is based solely on the evaluation of student learning targets and defined criteria for learner assessments.

Formative assessment of learning outcomes is conducted throughout the course, using a variety of means that include the following: completion of assessments; constructive contributions to class discussions (whole-class as well as small-group); sharing of valuable, pertinent, and/or applicable ideas and experiences; and active participation in online interactions. It is expected that each participant will contribute to the academic quality of the course.

Summative assessment includes the completion of weekly learning activities and assignments for which the participant will need to synthesize class content, apply it to his or her own practice, and complete a plan for implementing the major components of content and skill acquired during the course.



## **Alignments to Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching**

Each PLS 3rd Learning course is aligned to the components in Charlotte Danielson's **Framework for Teaching**. The alignments for this course are listed below.

### **DOMAIN 1: PLANNING AND PREPARATION**

- 1A. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy
- 1B. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students
- 1C. Setting Instructional Outcomes
- 1D. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources
- 1E. Designing Coherent Instruction
- 1F. Designing Student Assessments

### **DOMAIN 2: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT**

- 2A. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport
- 2B. Establishing a Culture for Learning
- 2D. Managing Student Behavior

### **DOMAIN 3: INSTRUCTION**

- 3A. Communicating with Students
- 3B. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques
- 3C. Engaging Students in Learning
- 3D. Using Assessment in Instruction
- 3E. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness

### **DOMAIN 4: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES**

- 4A. Reflecting on Teaching
- 4B. Maintaining Accurate Records
- 4C. Communicating with Families
- 4E. Growing and Developing Professionally
- 4F. Showing Professionalism

## Course Outcome Correlations With Model Core Teaching Standards (InTASC)

### Course Outcomes

#### Standard 1: Learner Development

The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.

**1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7,  
8, 9, 10, 11, 12,  
13, 14, 15, 16, 17,  
18, 19**

#### Standard 2: Learning Differences

The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.

**1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7,  
8, 9, 10, 11, 12,  
13, 14, 15, 16, 17,  
18, 19**

#### Standard 3: Learning Environments

The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

**1, 2, 3, 9, 19**

#### Standard 4: Content Knowledge

The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.

**1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8,  
9, 11, 12, 13, 14,  
15, 16, 17**

#### Standard 5: Application of Content

The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.

**1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10,  
11, 12, 13, 14, 15,  
16, 17**

#### Standard 6: Assessment

The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.

**1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 12,  
13, 14, 15**

**Standard 7: Planning for Instruction**

The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.

**1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10,  
11, 12, 13, 14, 15,**

**Standard 8: Instructional Strategies**

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.

**6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,  
12, 13, 14, 15**

**Standard 9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice**

The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.

**1, 2, 5, 18, 19**

**Standard 10: Leadership and Collaboration**

The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.

**1, 2, 5, 14, 15, 17,  
18, 19**

The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards were developed by the Council of the Chief State School Officers and member states. Copies may be downloaded from the Council's website at <http://www.ccsso.org/intasc>

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2011, April). Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Model Core Teaching Standards: A Resource for State Dialogue. Washington, DC: Author.

[http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2011/InTASC\\_Model\\_Core\\_Teaching\\_Standards\\_2011.pdf](http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2011/InTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_2011.pdf)

## Course Outcome Correlations With National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) Five Core Propositions

### **Proposition 1: Teachers are Committed to Students and Their Learning.**

#### **Course Outcomes**

NBCTs are dedicated to making knowledge accessible to all students. They believe all students can learn.

**1, 2, 3, 4**

They treat students equitably. They recognize the individual differences that distinguish their students from one another and they take account for these differences in their practice.

**1, 2, 3, 4, 17**

NBCTs understand how students develop and learn.

**1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7**

They respect the cultural and family differences students bring to their classroom.

**17**

They are concerned with their students' self-concept, their motivation and the effects of learning on peer relationships.

**1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7**

NBCTs are also concerned with the development of character and civic responsibility.

**18, 19**

### **Proposition 2: Teachers Know the Subjects They Teach and How to Teach Those Subjects to Students.**

NBCTs have mastery over the subject(s) they teach. They have a deep understanding of the history, structure and real-world applications of the subject.

**1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 18, 19**

They have skill and experience in teaching it, and they are very familiar with the skills gaps and preconceptions students may bring to the subject.

**8, 14, 15, 16**

They are able to use diverse instructional strategies to teach for understanding.

**9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19**

### **Proposition 3: Teachers are Responsible for Managing and Monitoring Student Learning.**

NBCTs deliver effective instruction. They move fluently through a range of instructional techniques, keeping students motivated, engaged and focused.

**11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16**

They know how to engage students to ensure a disciplined learning environment, and how to organize instruction to meet instructional goals. **1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 17**

NBCTs know how to assess the progress of individual students as well as the class as a whole. **9, 10, 11, 12**

They use multiple methods for measuring student growth and understanding, and they can clearly explain student performance to parents. **9, 10, 11, 12**

**Proposition 4: Teachers Think Systematically about Their Practice and Learn from Experience.**

NBCTs model what it means to be an educated person – they read, they question, they create and they are willing to try new things. **1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 18, 19**

They are familiar with learning theories and instructional strategies and stay abreast of current issues in American education. **1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9**

They critically examine their practice on a regular basis to deepen knowledge, expand their repertoire of skills, and incorporate new findings into their practice. **5, 18**

**Proposition 5: Teachers are Members of Learning Communities.**

NBCTs collaborate with others to improve student learning. **18, 19**

They are leaders and actively know how to seek and build partnerships with community groups and businesses. **18, 19**

They work with other professionals on instructional policy, curriculum development and staff development. **18, 19**

They can evaluate school progress and the allocation of resources in order to meet state and local education objectives. **18, 19**

They know how to work collaboratively with parents to engage them productively in the work of the school. **18, 19**

Reprinted with permission from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, [www.nbpts.org](http://www.nbpts.org)  
All rights reserved.

## Bibliography

- Adams, C. M., & Pierce, R. L. (2006). *Differentiating instruction: A practical guide to tiered lessons in the elementary grades*. Waco, TX: Prufrock.
- Anderson, A., Hamilton, R. J., & Hattie, J. (2004). Classroom climate and motivated behavior in secondary schools. *Learning Environments Research, 7*, 211–225.
- Anderson, M., & Dousis, A. (2006). *The research-ready classroom: Differentiating instruction across content areas*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- APA Work Group of the Board of Educational Affairs. (1997). *Learner-centered psychological principles: A framework for school reform and redesign*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Applebee, A., Langer, J., Nystrand, M., & Gamoran, A. (2003). Discussion-based approaches to developing understanding: Classroom instruction and student performance in middle and high school English. *American Educational Research Journal, 40*, 685–730.
- Aronson, E. (2001). *Nobody left to hate: Teaching compassion after Columbine*. New York: W.H. Freeman/Owl Book.
- Aronson, E. (2002). Building empathy, compassion, and achievement in the jigsaw classroom. In J. Aronson (Ed.), *Improving academic achievement: Impact of psychological factors on education* (pp. 209–225). San Diego, CA: Academic.
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (2014). Differentiated with technology for ELLs. *Technology and Differentiation Instruction, 9*(18). Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/ascd-express/vol9/918-video.aspx>
- Auld, C., Brown, J., Duffy, M., et al. (2000). *Promising curriculum and instructional practices for high-ability learners manual*. Lincoln, NE: Nebraska State Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.ED448562)
- Baglieri, S., & Knopf, J. H. (2004). Normalizing difference in inclusive teaching. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 37*, 525–529.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Bender, W. N. (2005). *Differentiating math instruction: Strategies that work for K–8 classrooms!* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Berryman, S. E. (1993). Learning for the workplace. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (pp. 343–401). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., et al. (2004). Working inside the black box: Assessment for learning in the classroom. *Phi Delta Kappan, 86*(1), 139–148. Retrieved July 15, 2010, from [http://www.ccsso.org/projects/SCASS/Projects/Formative\\_Assessment\\_for\\_Students\\_and\\_Teachers/Meetings/Oct06/webpages/documents/resources/Reading-Black-Working%20Inside%20the%20Black%20Box-2004.pdf](http://www.ccsso.org/projects/SCASS/Projects/Formative_Assessment_for_Students_and_Teachers/Meetings/Oct06/webpages/documents/resources/Reading-Black-Working%20Inside%20the%20Black%20Box-2004.pdf)
- Boaler, J. (1993). The role of contexts in the mathematics classroom: Do they make mathematics more “real”? *For the Learning of Mathematics, 13*(2), 12–17.
- Bollinger, D. U. (2004). *Investigating student learning in a constructivist multimedia-rich learning environment*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED485028)

- Boon, R. T., Fore, C., Ayres, K., & Spencer, V. G. (2005). The effects of cognitive organizers to facilitate content-area learning for students with mild disabilities: A pilot study. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 32*(2), 101–117.
- Broderick, A., Mehta-Parekh, H., & Reid, D. K. (2005). Differentiating instruction for disabled students in inclusive classrooms. *Theory Into Practice, 44*(3), 194–203.
- Brooks, J. G., & Brooks, M. G. (1993). *In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Brooks, J. G., & Thompson, E. G. (2005). Social justice in the classroom. *Educational Leadership, 63*(1), 48–52.
- Brown, M. R., Higgins, K., Pierce, T., et al. (2003). Secondary students' perceptions of school life with regard to alienation: The effects of disability, gender, and race. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 26*, 227–238.
- Burns, R., & Mason, D. (2002). Class composition and student achievement in elementary schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 39*, 207–233.
- Burns-Casey, J. A. (2005). The relationship between learner-centered techniques and student motivation in an extended-time schedule. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65*(9), 3274A. (UMI Document No. AAT 3146139)
- Carney, R. N., & Levin, J. R. (2000). Mnemonic instruction, with a focus on transfer. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92*, 783–790.
- Carter, P. (2005). The modern multi-age classroom. *Educational Leadership, 63*(1), 54–58.
- Cavanagh, R. (2001). *Secondary school culture and improvement: Teacher, student and parent perspectives*. Paper presented at the 2001 Annual Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education. Retrieved July 15, 2005, from <http://www.aare.edu.au/01pap/cav01138.htm>
- Chapman, C., & King, R. (2005). *Differentiated assessment strategies: One tool doesn't fit all*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Chung, J., & Chow, S. (2004). Promoting student learning through a student-centered problem-based learning subject curriculum. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 41*(2), 157–168.
- Clark, K. F., & Graves, M. F. (2005). Scaffolding students' comprehension of text. *Reading Teacher, 58*(6), 570–580.
- Coil, C. (2004). *Standards-based activities and assessments for the differentiated classroom*. Marion, IL: Pieces of Learning.
- Cordova, D. I., & Lepper, M. R. (1996). Intrinsic motivation and the process of learning: Beneficial effects of contextualization, personalization, and choice. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 88*, 715–730.
- Deci, E. L. (1992). The relation of interest to the motivation of behavior. In K. A. Renninger, S. Hidi, & A. Knapp (Eds.), *The role of interest in learning and development* (pp. 43–70). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Delpit, L. (2003). Educators as "seed people" growing a new future. *Educational Researcher, 32*(7), 14–21.
- Demmert, W. G. (2005). The influences of culture on learning and assessment among Native American students. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 20*(1), 16–23.

- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- DiCintio, M. J., & Gee, S. (1999). Control is the key: Unlocking the motivation of at-risk students. *Psychology in the Schools, 36*, 231–271.
- DiMartino, J., Clarke, J., & Wolk, D. (Eds.). (2003). *Personalized learning: Preparing high school students to create their futures*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow.
- Dobbertin, C. B. (2012). Just how I need to learn it. *Educational Leadership, 69*(5), 66–70. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?q=standards-based+differentiation&id=EJ982177>
- Donohue, K. M., Perry, K. E., & Weinstein, R. S. (2003). Teachers' classroom practices and children's rejection by their peers. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 24*(1), 91–118.
- Eickholdt, L. A. (2004). Scaffolding in the writing workshop. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65A*(6), 2137.
- Erbe, B. M. (2000). *Correlates of school achievement in Chicago elementary schools*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED441 832)
- Fetsco, T., & McClure, J. (2005). *Educational psychology: An integrated approach to classroom decisions*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Fletcher, A. (2003). *Meaningful student involvement: Guide to inclusive school change*. Olympia, WA: The Freechild Project.
- Flowerday, T. (2000). The role of choice and interest in reader engagement. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61*(4), 1289A. (UMI Document No. AAT 9967369)
- Forman, S. L., & Steen, L. A. (2000). Making authentic mathematics work for all students. In A. Bessot & J. Ridgway (Eds.), *Education for mathematics in the workplace* (pp. 115–126). Boston: Kluwer Academic.
- Fox, R. (2005). *Teaching and learning: Lessons from psychology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Gaskill, P. J., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2002). Self-efficacy and self-regulated learning: The dynamic duo in school performance. In J. Aronson & D. Cordova (Eds.), *Improving education: Classic and contemporary lessons from psychology* (pp. 183–206). New York: Academic.
- Gentile, J. R., & Lalley, J. P. (2003). *Standards and mastery learning: Aligning teaching and assessment so all children can learn*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- George, P. S. (2005). A rationale for differentiating instruction in the regular classroom. *Theory Into Practice, 44*(3), 185–194.
- Ginsberg, M. B. (2005). Cultural diversity, motivation, and differentiation. *Theory Into Practice, 44*(3), 218–225.
- Greenwood, C. R., Horton, B. T., & Utley, C. A. (2002). Academic engagement: Current perspectives on research and practice. *School Psychology Review, 31*, 328–349.
- Gregory, G. (2005). *Differentiating instruction with style: Aligning teacher and learner intelligences for maximum achievement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Gregory, G., & Kuzmich, L. (2004). *Data driven differentiation in the standards-based classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Gregory, G., & Kuzmich, L. (2005). *Differentiated literacy strategies for student growth and achievement in grades K–6*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.



- Hall, T. (2002). *Differentiated instruction*. Wakefield, MA: National Center on Accessing the General Curriculum. Retrieved July 15, 2010, from [www.cast.org/publications/ncac/ncac\\_diffinstruc.html](http://www.cast.org/publications/ncac/ncac_diffinstruc.html)
- Hartman, H. (2002). *Human learning and instruction*. New York: City College of New York.
- Hausfather, S. J. (1996). Vygotsky and schooling: Creating a social contest for learning. *Action in Teacher Education, 18*, 1–10.
- Heacox, D. (2002). *Differentiated instruction for instruction in the regular classroom: How to reach and teach all learners, grades 3–12*. Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit.
- Helm, J. H. (2004). Projects that power young minds. *Educational Leadership, 62*(1), 58–62.
- Herrera, S. G., & Murry, K. G. (2005). *Mastering ESL and bilingual methods: Differentiated instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hertzog, N. B. (2004). Open-ended activities: Differentiation through learner responses. In C. A. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Differentiation for gifted and talented students* (pp. 77–103). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Hoffman, D., & Levak, B. A. (2003). Personalizing schools: Building classroom relationships. *Educational Leadership, 61*(2), 30–34.
- Holloway, J. H. (2003). Research link: Grouping gifted students. *Educational Leadership, 61*(2), 89–91.
- Jarvis, S., & Seifert, T. (2002). Work avoidance as a manifestation of hostility, helplessness, and boredom. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 48*(2), 174–187.
- Jussim, L., Smith, A., Madon, S., & Palumbo, P. (1998). Teacher expectations. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in research on teaching: Expectations in the classroom* (Vol. 7, pp. 1–48). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Kanevsky, L., & Keighley, T. (2003). To produce or not to produce? Understanding boredom and the honor in underachievement. *Roeper Review, 26*(1), 20–28.
- Keefe, J. W., & Jenkins, J. M. (2005). *Personalized instruction*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Koplow, L. (2002). *Creating schools that heal: Real-life solutions*. Williston, VT: Teachers College Press.
- Koretz, D., & Barton, K. (2004). Assessing students with disabilities: Issues and evidence. *Educational Assessment, 9*, 29–60.
- Lambros, A. (2004). *Problem-based learning in middle and high school classrooms: A teacher's guide to implementation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Langa, M. A., & Yost, J. L. (2007). *Curriculum mapping for differentiated instruction, K–8*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Langer, J. A. (2004). *Getting to excellent: How to create better schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Larkin, M. (2002). *Using scaffolded instruction to optimize learning*. ERIC Digest. Arlington, VA: ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED474301)

- Lawrence-Brown, C. (2004). Differentiated instruction: Inclusive strategies for standards-based learning that benefit the whole class. *American Secondary Education, 32*(3), 34–62.
- Lee, Y., & Nelson, D. W. (2005). Viewing or visualizing: Which concept map strategy works best on problem-solving performance? *British Journal of Educational Technology, 36*, 193–203.
- LeTendre, G. K., Hofer, B. K., & Shimizu, H. (2003). What is tracking? Cultural expectations in the United States, Germany, and Japan. *American Educational Research Journal, 40*(1), 43–89.
- Levine, M. (2003). Celebrating diverse minds. *Educational Leadership, 61*(2), 12–18.
- Mahony, J. B. (2004). A look at multiage classes. *Dissertation Abstracts International 64*(11), 3957A. (UMI Document No. AAT 3111241)
- Marsh, H. W. (1987). The big-fish-little-pond effect of academic self-concept. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 79*, 280–295.
- Martin, D. J. (2006). *Elementary science methods: A constructivist approach* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.
- Marzano, R. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). The key to classroom management. *Educational Leadership, 61*(1), 6–13.
- Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D. J., & Pollock, J. E. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- McCain, T. (2005). *Teaching for tomorrow: Teaching content and problem-solving skills*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- McCarthy, J. (2014). Technology strengthens a simple writing revision strategy. *Technology and Differentiation Instruction, 9*(18). Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/ascd-express/vol9/918-mccarthy.aspx>
- McCoach, D. E. (2003). Does grouping matter? A cross-classified random effects model of children's reading growth during the first two years of school. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65*(5), 1527A.
- McKinley, J. (2004). Enhanced pedagogy: Effective teaching strategies for high-performing African American students in an urban school district. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65*(7), 2465A. (UMI Document No. AAT 3139007)
- McTighe, J., & Brown, J. L. (2005). Differentiated instruction and educational standards: Is détente possible? *Theory Into Practice, 44*, 234–244.
- Meichenbaum, D., & Biemiller, A. (1998). *Nurturing independent learners: Helping students take charge of their learning*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.
- Mickelson, R. A. (2005). How tracking undermines race equity in desegregated schools. In J. Petrovich & A. S. Wells (Eds.), *Bringing equity back: Research for a new era in American educational policy* (pp. 16–48). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Monsen, J. J., & Frederickson, N. (2004). Teachers' attitudes towards mainstreaming and their pupils' perceptions of their classroom learning environment. *Learning Environments Research, 7*(2), 129–142.
- Moon, J. A. (2004). *A handbook of reflective and experiential learning: Theory and practice*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

- Moore, M. K. (2003). The relationships between learner-centeredness and self-esteem in two middle schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63(7-A), 2458.
- Mulkey, L. M., Catsambis, S., Steelman, L. C., & Crain, R. L. (2005). The long-term effects of ability grouping in mathematics: A national investigation. *Social Psychology of Education*, 8(2), 137–177.
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2003). *Nation's report card: Reading 2002*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing. Retrieved July 15, 2010, from <http://nces.ed.gov>
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2004). *Digest of education statistics*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved July 15, 2010, from <http://nces.ed.gov>
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2005). *The condition of education 2005*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved July 15, 2010 from <http://nces.ed.gov>
- National Research Council. (2004). *Engaging schools: Fostering high school students' motivation to learn*. Committee on Increasing High School Students' Engagement and Motivation to Learn. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Newell, R. J. (2003). *Passion for learning: How project-based learning meets the needs of 21st century students*. Lanham, MD: ScarecrowEducation.
- Northey, S. (2005). *Handbook on differentiated instruction for middle and high schools*. Larchmont, NY: Eye On Education.
- Nussbaum, E. M. (2002). How introverts versus extroverts approach small-group argumentative discussions. *Elementary School Journal*, 102(3), 183–197.
- Olino, T. M., Klein, D. N., Durbin, C. E., et al. (2005). The structure of extroversion in preschool aged children. *Personality & Individual Differences*, 39, 481–492.
- Owocki, G. (2005). *Time for literacy centers: How to organize and differentiate instruction*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Patrick, H., Turner, J. C., Meyer, D. K., & Midgley, C. (2003). How teachers establish psychological environments during the first days of school: Associations with avoidance in mathematics. *Teachers College Record*, 105, 1521–1558.
- Pettigrew, D., & Dolan, J. (2003). Excellence and equity: A regional consortium for reforming science education. In N. M. Haynes, M. Ben-Avie, & J. Ensign (Eds.), *How social and emotional development add up* (pp. 120–136). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Posnick-Goodwin, S. (2002). Raising expectations. *California Educator*, 7(2), 7–10.
- Protheroe, N., Shellard, E., & Turner, J. (2004). *Helping struggling learners in the elementary and middle grades*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Puntambekar, S., & Kolodner, J. L. (2005). Toward implementing distributed scaffolding: Helping students learn science from design. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 42(2), 185–217.
- Reeves, T. C., Herrington, J., & Oliver, R. (2002). Authentic activities and online learning, *Quality Conversations* (pp. 562–567). Proceedings HERDSA Conference. Retrieved on March 3, 2005, from <http://www.ecu.edu.au/conferences/herdsa/main/papers/ref/pdf/Reeves.pdf>

- Reis, S. M., Westberg, K. L., Kulikowich, J. M., & Purcell, J. H. (2004). Curriculum compacting and achievement test scores: What does the research say? In C. A. Tomlinson (ed.), *Differentiation for gifted and talented students* (pp. 105–116). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Ritchie, D., & Volkl, C. (2000). Effectiveness of two generative learning strategies in the science classroom. *School Science and Mathematics, 100*(2), 83–89.
- Roberts, J. L., & Inman, T. F. (2007). *Strategies for differentiating instruction: Best practices for the classroom*. Waco, TX: Prufrock.
- Roberts, J. L., & Roberts, R. A. (2001). Writing units that remove the learning ceiling. In F. A. Karnes & S. M. Bean (Eds.), *Methods and materials for teaching the gifted* (pp. 213–252). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Rodgers, C. (2002). Defining reflection: Another look at John Dewey and reflective thinking. *Teachers College Record, 104*, 842–866.
- Roehler, L. R., & Cantlon, D. J. (1997). Scaffolding: A powerful tool in social constructivist classrooms. In M. Pressley (Ed.), *Scaffolding student learning* (pp. 6–42). Cambridge, MA: Brookline.
- Rogers, S., & Renard, L. (1999). Relationship driven teaching. *Educational Leadership, 57*(1), 34–37.
- Rothstein, J. (2014). Using technology to differentiate the learning process and product. *Technology and Differentiation Instruction, 9*(18). Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/ascd-express/vol9/918-rothstein.aspx>
- Rubie, C. M. (2004). Expecting the best: Instructional practices, teacher beliefs and student outcomes. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65*(4), 1254A. (UMI Document No. AAT 3129406)
- Sak, U. (2004). A synthesis of research on psychological types of gifted adolescents. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 15*(2), 70–79.
- Sansone, C. and J. L. Smith (2000). Interest and self-regulation: The relation between having to and wanting to. In C. Sansone and J. M. Harackiewicz (Eds.), *Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation: The Search for Optimal Motivation and Performance* (pp. 341–372). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Shernoff, D. J., Csikszentmihalyi, M., Schneider, B., & Shernoff, E. S. (2003). Student engagement in high school classrooms from the perspective of Flow Theory. *School Psychology Quarterly, 18*(2), 158–176.
- Silverman, S. L., & Casazza, M. E. (2000). *Learning and development: Making connections to enhance teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Simons, K., Klein, J., & Brush, T. (2004). Instructional strategies utilized during implementation of a hypermedia, problem-based learning environment: A case study. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research, 15*, 213–233.
- Sinclair, B. B., & Fraser, B. J. (2002). Changing classroom environments in urban middle schools. *Learning Environments Research: An International Journal, 5*, 301–328.
- Slavkin, M. L. (2004). *Authentic learning: How learning about the brain can shape the development of students*. Lanham, MD: ScarecrowEducation.
- Smutny, J. F., & von Fremd, S. E. (2004). *Differentiating for the young child: Teaching strategies across the content areas (K–3)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

- Snow, C. E., & Biancarosa, G. (2003). *Adolescent literacy and the achievement gap: What do we know and where do we go from here?* New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.
- Somersalo, H., Solantaus, T., & Almqvist, F. (2002). Classroom climate and the mental health of primary school children. *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry, 56*, 285–290.
- Song, H., Grabowski, B., & Koszalka, T. (2002). *Instructional design factors that prompt reflective thinking in a problem based learning environment*. State College, PA: Faculty Academy 2002.
- Sota, M., Clarke, B., Nelson, N., Doabler, C., & Fien, H. (2014). Identifying technology to support differentiation. *Technology and Differentiation Instruction, 9*(18). Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/ascd-express/vol9/918-sota.aspx>
- Strong, R., Thomas, E., Perini, M., & Silver, H. (2004). Creating a differentiated mathematics classroom. *Educational Leadership, 61*(5), 73–78.
- Stronge, J. H. (2007). *Qualities of effective teachers* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Tan, A. (2005). A review of the effectiveness of problem-based learning. *Korean Journal of Thinking & Problem Solving, 15*(1), 29–46.
- Tieso, C. (2003). Ability grouping is not just tracking anymore. *Roeper Review, 26*(1), 29–36.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (1999). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2003). *Fulfilling the promise of the differentiated classroom*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2004). The Möbius effect: Addressing learner variance in schools. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 37*, 516–524.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2005). Grading and differentiation: Paradox or good practice? *Theory Into Practice, 44*, 262–269.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2006). *An educator's guide to differentiating instruction*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2017). *How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms* (3rd ed). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Tomlinson, C. A., Brighton, C., Hertberg, H., et al. (2003). Differentiating instruction in response to student readiness, interest, and learning profile in academically diverse classrooms: A review of literature. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 27*, 119–145.
- Tomlinson, C. A., & Demirsky Allan, S. (2000). *Leadership for differentiating schools and classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Villa, R. A., & Thousand, J. S. (2003). Making inclusive education work. *Educational Leadership, 61*(2), 19–23.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Waldrip, B. G., & Fisher, D. L. (2003). Identifying exemplary science teachers through their classroom interactions with students. *Learning Environments Research, 6*(2), 157–174.

- Ward, J. D., & Lee, C. L. (2002). A review of problem-based learning. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences Education, 20*(1), 16–26.
- Webster, B. J., & Fisher, D. L. (2003). School-level environment and student outcomes in mathematics. *Learning Environments Research, 6*, 309–326.
- Weinstein, R. S. (2002). *Reaching higher: The power of expectations in schooling*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wenglinsky, H. (2000). How schools matter: The link between teacher classroom practices and student academic achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 10*(12). Retrieved August 29, 2005, from [www.epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n12/](http://www.epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n12/)
- Wentzel, K. R. (2002). The contribution of social goal setting to children's school adjustment. In A. Wigfield & J. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation* (pp. 221–246). Academic Press.
- Westberg, K. L., & Archambault, F. X. (2004). A multi-site case study of successful classroom practices for high ability students. In C. A. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Differentiation for gifted and talented students* (pp. 59–76). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Wigfield, A., & Harold, R. D. (1992). Teacher beliefs and children's achievement self-perceptions: A developmental perspective. In D. H. Schunk & J. L. Meece (Eds.), *Student perceptions in the classroom* (pp. 95–121). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Witt, P. L., Wheelless, L. R., & Allen, M. (2004). A meta-analytical review of the relationship between teacher immediacy and student learning. *Communication Monographs, 71*(2), 184–207.
- Yatvin, J. (2004). *A room with a differentiated view: How to serve all children as individual learners*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Zydney, J. M. (2005). Eighth-grade students defining complex problems: The effectiveness of scaffolding in a multimedia program. *Journal of Educational Multimedia & Hypermedia, 14*(1), 61–90.