**Questioning**

**What it is:** There are a variety of frameworks for questioning strategies, with the most familiar probably being Bloom’s Taxonomy. No matter what model you use, the basic purpose behind questioning is to provide a way to adjust the complexity of questions or products in order to meet the diverse needs of learners. All students should be exposed to tasks that stretch their thinking and challenge their perspectives, but providing students with gifts and talents these opportunities is particularly crucial for nurturing potential. By paying attention to the kinds of questions that you ask students and the types of tasks you provide them, you can ensure that your lessons engage all students and provide them ways to develop “flow.” Students with gifts and talents generally learn basic information and skills at a faster rate than their peers, so providing them questions and tasks that are more complex, more abstract, or go into more depth responds to their needs.

**Benefits:**

* Low-prep
* Easily adaptable
* Can adjust question type or product to challenge a diverse range of students and promote their success and growth

**Situations where the strategy is useful:**

* Class discussions
* End-of-the chapter or unit assessments
* Small group work
* Projects
* Differentiating for readiness

**Examples:**

* Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001)
* Provocative Questioning
* Socratic Questioning
* Applications:
  + Tic-Tac-Toe (Winebrenner, 1992; Roberts & Inman, 2009)
  + Cubes (Gregory & Chapman, 2002)
  + Think-Dots (Brimijoin, 2005)
  + Tiered Assignments (Tomlinson, 1999)

**Pointers:**

* Provide sufficient “wait time” (3-5 seconds) for student response to questions
* Have a system/systems for ensuring you call on all students equally during discussions
* Support students that may not have had a lot of exposure to higher level questions or tasks
* Be prepared: Students with gifts and talents may opt out of more complex work when given choice
* Be prepared: Students may notice there are different assignments
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