

УДК 372.881.111.1

*Ирина Анатольевна КАЗАЧИХИНА, доцент кафедры иностранных языков гуманитарного факультета Новосибирского государственного технического университета; доцент кафедры иноязычного образования Новосибирского института повышения квалификации и переподготовки работников образования, г. Новосибирск; e-mail: kazachixina@corp.nstu.ru*

## Адаптация учебного материала с применением дифференцированного подхода к обучению иностранному языку

Среди современных подходов к обучению иностранным языкам именно дифференцированный подход основан на учете индивидуальных особенностей, потребностей, интересов и способностей обучающихся. Влияя на их мотивацию, обеспечивая соответствующие условия для достижения успеха на уроках иностранного языка, этот подход оснащает учителей инструментами для поощрения самостоятельности и автономности обучающихся, придания им уверенности в собственных силах, которые появляются благодаря успешно выполненным заданиям и формирующимся иноязычным навыкам и умениям. Целью исследования является изучение уровня сформированности профессиональной компетенции студентов в адаптации учебного материала для дифференцированного обучения иностранному языку. Метод оценки выполненных студентами работ позволил определить степень сформированности умений оценивать и адаптировать учебный материал у 32 студентов — будущих учителей программы бакалавриата в конце курса «Методика преподавания иностранных языков» в Новосибирском государственном техническом университете. Результаты исследования показывают, что они испытывают сложности с определением потенциала дифференциации в материале учебников, что приводит к трудностям с адаптацией учебного материала. Следующие виды дифференциации применяются студентами для адаптации учебного материала чаще всего: предоставление вариантов выполнения заданий, предоставление большего/меньшего времени и условий для подготовки заданий/выполнения учебных задач, смешивание пар (более слабый студент с более сильным), изменение организационных форм работы, предоставление дополнительной помощи, усложнение заданий для более сильных студентов, учет стилей обучения.

**Ключевые слова:** педагогическое образование; студенты — будущие учителя; обучение иностранным языкам; дифференцированный подход; разработка учебного материала; адаптация учебного материала.

*Irina A. KAZACHKHINA, Candidate of Sciences (Philology), Associate Professor of the Foreign Languages Department of the Humanities, Novosibirsk State Technical University, Associate Professor of the Department for Foreign Language Education, Novosibirsk Teachers' Upgrading and Retraining Institute, Novosibirsk; e-mail: kazachixina@corp.nstu.ru*

## Material Adaptation Applying Differentiated Approach to Teaching Foreign Languages

Among modern approaches to teaching foreign languages differentiation is capable of taking into account individual characteristics, needs, interests and abilities of foreign language learners. Influencing learner motivation and providing appropriate conditions for being successful in the foreign language classroom the approach equips teachers with tools to encourage learner autonomy and independence, and to increase their sense of achievement, which appear due to successfully completed tasks and developed foreign language and communication skills. The aim of the study was to examine levels of students' professional skills in adapting teaching materials for differentiated FL classroom. The evaluation of the assignments allowed to examine material evaluation and adaptation skills of 32 bachelor program students in the teaching profession at the end of the FL teaching course at Novosibirsk State Technical University. The results of the study show that the students struggle difficulties with identifying differentiation laid down by the textbook writers as well as with deducing the capacity of the content and procedures in terms of differentiation. It leads to the difficulties with teaching material adaptation. Among the frequent types of differentiation implemented into adapted materials are the following: providing options, giving more/less time and space for preparation/task fulfillment, mixing pairing (a weaker learner with a stronger one), changing grouping, giving extra support or challenging stronger learners, catering for learning styles.

**Keywords:** Teacher Education; students in the teaching profession; foreign language teaching; differentiation approach; teaching material development; teaching material adaptation.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Despite the fact that the Federal List of Prescribed Textbooks supports teaching process, the need to develop or adapt didactic materials for foreign language (FL) learners on the regular basis still remains, and does not seem to be decreasing. The reason is that there are some cases when FL teachers have to provide some learners with something different from the material in the textbook. «Different» is the keyword that can serve as a characteristic of the learners and the teaching-learning material used for these particular learners. To highlight this characteristic we refer to one of the main approaches put by V. V. Kraevskiy and A. V. Khutorskoy in the first place in didactic material development, which is a learner-centered approach. [12] To double the importance of considering all learners' differences in FL teaching we would add a differentiated approach.

No one doubts that learners even of the same age differ in their physiological and psychological peculiarities as well as their learning and personal needs, learning styles, interests, and behaviour caused by different family upbringing environments. All the differences have been studying as research problems in medicine, psychology and pedagogy. However, learners' differences turn out to be everyday teaching practitioner's concern, and addressing it can make learners want to and continue to want to study or become demotivated to do anything. Thus, differentiation can be considered as a tool to create the conditions initiating learners' actions, which is the key pedagogical objective of the updated versions of the Federal State Educational Standard (FSES). Teachers along with the staff such as «teacher-psychologists, teacher-speech therapists, teacher-defectologists, tutors, social pedagogues» are able to develop learners' different cognitive, learning and communication skills applying a range of differentiated strategies for textbook material adaptation and development [17].

The problems of material development were actively studied in Russia in the last four decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in the didactic aspect of the theory of the textbook development and a place of the textbook in teaching (N. F. Talyzina, 1978 [22]; V. P. Bepalko, 1988 [2]; I. Ya. Lerner and N. M. Shakhmaeva, 1999 [11]), and the research interest to the place of the textbook in the teaching/learning system and practical aspects of textbook publishing remains quite steady (A. V. Khutorskoy, 2005 [9]; V. V. Belyaev, 2006 [1]). From the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century the theory of the interactive learning material and an electronic textbook development have been focuses of research (I. M. Osmolovskaya, 2014 [14]; Ya. G. Martyushova, 2017 [14]; V. S. Zarubina, 2021 [26]; etc.), as well as principles of textbook development, textbook components and types,

and its quality assessment (P. Monastyrev, E. Alenicheva, 2001 [15]; N. I. Lygina, 2006 [13]; etc.).

Based on the results of the past research carried out in the theory of textbook development we also refers to the problems of development of teaching and learning process (G. B. Skok, 2003 [21]), material development in FL teaching (B. Tomlinson, 1998 [24]) and development of the professional competencies of the students in the FL teaching profession (T. E. Isaeva, 2010 [7], 2021 [6]). However, significant changes occurred for a fairly short period of one year COVID-2019 pandemic have affected teachers' personal and professional skills. Difficulties in the use of the textbooks happened to be limited by their nature in the situation of distant teaching on the one side, and «the boundless Internet resources with the danger to simplify learning or even replace it with the «illusion of teaching and learning» [6, p. 90] on the other, require improving pre-service teacher training and equipping students with the skills to adapt and develop didactic material in a changing environment for learners whose features have become even more different for the pandemic period of time.

## 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The value of textbook material is high because it provides support with content input, practice and assessment activities created to achieve learning objectives with the help of a particular teaching approach. Along with many other teaching aids «they help learners to learn» [24]. Evidently, becoming a good FL textbook writer requires a high level of the foreign language proficiency, a comprehensive professional competence and a specific teacher training in this field. With full respect for a novice textbook writer and leaving room for new professional experiences, D. Jolly and R. Bolitho describes «a simple sequence of activities that a teacher may have to perform in order to produce any piece of new material.: <...>

1) IDENTIFICATION by teacher or learner(s) of a need to fulfill or a problem to solve by the creation of materials

2) EXPLORATION of the area of need/problem in terms of what language, what meanings, what functions, what skills, etc.

3) CONTEXTUAL REALISATION of the proposed new materials by the finding of suitable ideas, contexts or texts with which to work

4) PEDAGOGICAL REALISATION of materials by the finding of appropriate exercises and activities AND the writing of appropriate instructions for use

5) PHYSICAL PRODUCTION of materials, involving consideration of layout, type size, visuals, reproduction, tape length, etc» [8, p. 112].

To distinguish the concept of materials adaptation from development we refer to B. Tomlinson's definition: «Making changes to materials in order to improve them

or to make them more suitable for a particular type of learner. Adaptation can include reducing, adding, omitting, modifying and supplementing. Most teachers adapt materials every time they use a textbook in order to maximise the value of the book for their particular learners» [24, p. XIV]. V. Hatami et al suggest also distinguishing between ad hoc adaptation and principled adaptation, and cite F. Mishan (2005), a researcher who puts forward an authenticity-centred approach to the design of materials for language learning: «Ad hoc adaptation is clearly a common activity: in many (well-resourced) ELT classrooms, you will find, for example, teachers looking through resource books for a particular kind of activity, photocopying newspaper articles or asking questions .... While such adaptations may be successful, the danger is that they are driven by teachers' preferences .... Ideally, principled adaptation will be informed by prior evaluation of the existing materials» [5]. Both types of adaptation can be made if they are considered as appropriate by the teacher.

The objectives for materials adaptation as long it is driven by the particular needs of the language learners can be naturally in line with types of differentiated learning. We define differentiated instruction in the FL classroom as giving every language learner the best opportunity for achieving their learning objectives and improving their command of a foreign language.

In Russia the first type of differentiation which is an external one applied at the state level from the 19<sup>th</sup> century in the educational institutions. The external differentiation is realized by creating homogeneous groups of student-oriented environments. Russia's experience of the external differentiation, analysed by A. A. Temerbekova [23], can be illustrated by two types of gymnasiums in the 70-s of 19<sup>th</sup> century — classical and real ones; so called labour (professional) learning from the age of 14 in the 20-s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century; types of school programs of the maximum and minimum levels in the 30-s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century; types of school subjects with different scientific bias in the 50-s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century; types of classes and schools provided conditions for developing abilities and talents to the maximum level in the 70-s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century; types of general secondary educational institutions different from schools in the late 80-s and early 90th of the 20<sup>th</sup> century — gymnasiums and lyceums with different curriculums for the students who are planning to continue further education; elective and optional subjects in senior classes, and offering students different school curriculum options within the same level of education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and currently.

The second type of differentiation which is an internal one did not have such a long history in the FLT in Russia as in teaching mathematics and physics. The internal differentiation is realized in mixed groups, where individual features of learners are considered within the smaller groups divided explicitly or implicitly, and group participants can vary for different learning tasks [4].

Summarizing the experience gained by practitioners in ELT and researchers of differentiation, we can assume that most of them tend to consider differentiation as providing different options for different learners when appropriate. In the words of C. A. Tomlinson «At its most basic level, differentiating instruction means "shaking up" what goes on in the classroom so that students have multiple options for taking in information, making sense of ideas, and expressing what they learn. In other words, a differentiated classroom provides different avenues to acquiring content, to processing or making sense of ideas, and to developing products so that each student can learn effectively» [25]. It means that the teachers know their learners from careful observation and are aware of their similarities and differences, and use them for planning and delivering classes.

Thus, to merge differentiation with teaching-learning material adaptation students in the teaching profession are to develop professional skills to consider the content studied, language levels, learning paces, learners' interests, teacher's time allocated to learners, types of input, etc. We would identify the need for material adaption when we have to differentiate, as suggested by R. Roberts, by one of these — learning outcome, task or teaching method [20].

### 3. AIMS AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The aim of this study is to examine levels of students' professional skills in adapting teaching materials for differentiated FL classroom.

This study addresses two research questions in this paper:

R1: What is the degree of students' readiness to adapt FL textbook material?

R2: What types of differentiation do they use for adapting textbook materials?

### 4. METHODOLOGY

The participants of the study were the third- and fourth-year students of Bachelor program in 45.03.02 Linguistics majoring in Foreign Language and Culture Teaching at Novosibirsk State Technical University. The study took place during two out of four semesters allocated for Foreign Language Teaching course; the first semester was excluded because it contains mainly the theoretical input, and in the fourth semester students demonstrate their readiness to work because of their experience of academic and industrial internships. According to the Curriculum based on Federal State Educational Standard for Higher Education for Linguistics [19] by the end of the course students are expected to form the professional competencies of our research interest: «to know potential value of the modern approaches, methods and technologies in teaching foreign languages and cultures <...>» (Prof. Comp. 24/2); «to possess skills of critical analysis of the teaching-learning process and materials in terms of their effectiveness» (Prof. Comp. 25/3); «to possess skills of selecting and developing teaching-learning materials in order to achieve learning objectives in the foreign language

classroom» (Prof. Comp. 26/3) [18]. The learning outcomes are expected to reveal themselves in the final assessment tasks: textbook material evaluation, material adaptation and material development applying teaching approaches studied.

The study participants (N=32) were two cohorts in 2020 (N = 14) and 2021 (N = 18); the age ranged from 19 to 21. To examine students' material evaluation and adaptation skills applying a differentiated approach we conducted a qualitative research using evaluation of students' final assignments. The data were collected at the end of each semester, i.e. twice from each cohort. Firstly, the students were supposed to analyse FL textbook material for a lesson from the point of its effectiveness. As all learners are de facto different, the students were expected to come up with ideas of differentiation giving good reasoning for them. Secondly, they adapted or/and developed teaching-learning materials to improve the textbook material analysed. The analysis was made in a form of an oral report, whereas material adaptation/development task was submitted in a written form.

For data analysis, we used a general framework for analysing materials of A. Littlejohn adapting some aspects to our research. We excluded suggested by the author aspect of 'publication' («place of the learner's materials in any wider set of materials; published form of the learner's materials; subdivision of the learner's materials into sections; subdivision of sections into sub-sections; continuity; route; access») because the students have to analyse the material for one lesson only. For this reason we apply only «design» aspect which «relates to the thinking underlying the materials» [12]. The design was adapted in terms of the requirements to the delivery of a modern FL lesson in the context of the introduction of the updated versions of the Federal State Educational Standards for primary and basic general education. The framework allows to monitor how deep and comprehensive the analysis made by the students from a pedagogic viewpoint.

## 5. RESULTS

It is a common procedure to use a checklist for analysing materials, and it can be helpful for guidance at the beginning of the pre-service teacher training. Usually it contains a list of questions, which need either 'yes'/'no'-answers or ranks within a range of answers/points. For a research analysis it would be very convenient to collect and analyse data with such a framework. However, for learning purposes and for equipping future teachers with high order thinking skills we had to leave an initiative for the students asking them only some qualifying questions. The reason for not using checklists especially for the final assessment is that as Andrew Littlejohn points out: «Typically, they also contain implicit assumptions about what 'desirable' materials should look like» [12, p. 181]. In other words, checklists guide students in the definite direction (the only right one according to the opinion of its designer) and does not teach them how to think autonomously.

Nevertheless, the students used a plan as a guide to present their viewpoint on the following aspects of an EL textbook material for a lesson:

- learning outcomes;
- adequacy of the material for the achievement of the learning outcomes;
- adequacy of the set of exercises/activities for the achievement of the learning outcomes;
- appropriateness of the sequence of the learning tasks through the lesson;
- types of grouping through all stages of the lesson;
- differentiation laid down by the textbook writers;
- capacity of differentiation in the textbook material.

At the end of each semester we evaluated student performance. The focus of the textbook material evaluation varied each semester: teaching language aspects and skills in semester 6; teaching language skills and language teaching and learning in semester 7.

To answer the research question 1 «What is the degree of students' readiness to adapt FL textbook material?» we collected the data with adapted A. Littlejohn's material evaluation framework [12], where aspects of materials examined are the seven points taken by the students as a guide for their analysis (see above). The student performance was evaluated in the range from 1 to 3 according to the levels of analysis of language teaching materials designed by A. Littlejohn for teacher professionals [12] and adapted by us for the students in teaching:

*Level 1. «What is there?» (identification and objective description based on the knowledge of the methodology):*

- identification of physical aspects of the materials,
- making statements of description.

*Level 2. «What is required of users?» (subjective interpretation and analysis based on the knowledge of the methodology and awareness of the main principles of teaching and learning):*

- interpretive subdivision into constituent stages of the lesson and learning tasks,
- analysis of the learning tasks, activities and types of grouping,
- analysis of the differentiated materials.

*Level 3. «What is implied?» (subjective inference based on the knowledge of the methodology, awareness of the main principles of teaching and learning and ability to apply teaching concepts to new contexts):*

- deducing learning outcomes,
- analysis of the content and procedures in terms of learning outcomes,
- deducing the capacity of the content and procedures in terms of differentiation.

For the research purposes we counted the number of students with a high (Level 3), medium (Level 2) and low level of professional potential (Level 1) separately. The simple average of the sum for each level was rounded to whole number (See Table 1).

On examining the number of students analysed teaching materials in terms of differentiation (Aspect 6 and 7) we find that only the fifth part of the students could apply theory of differentiation, be aware of the potential of the material for differentiation and deduce the potential for it. Interestingly, the concepts of teaching in general are understood quite deeply either by a half or more than a half number of students depending on the aspect. 65 % percent presented high level of analysis of managing learners' forms of work, and close to that percentage turned out to be the percentage of students' awareness of the adequacy

of the set of exercises and activities for the achievement of the learning outcomes. Evidently, the students' difficulty with identifying differentiation laid down by the textbook writers led to the difficulties with deducing the capacity of the content and procedures in terms of differentiation.

To answer the research question 2 «What types of differentiation do students use for adapting textbook materials?» we collected their written assignments with adapted and/or developed materials. Table 2 presents types of the differentiation students chose.

Table 1

**The levels of student potential for language teaching materials evaluation and readiness to adapt FL textbook material**

The aspects of an EL textbook material analysis	Level 1, N of students out of 32	Level 2, N of students out of 32	Level 3, N of students out of 32
1. Learning outcomes	7	9	16
2. Adequacy of the material for the achievement of the learning outcomes	6	10	16
3. Adequacy of the set of exercises/activities for the achievement of the learning outcomes	5	9	18
4. Appropriateness of the sequence of the learning tasks through the lesson	4	13	15
5. Types of grouping through all stages of the lesson	3	8	21
6. Differentiation laid down by the textbook writers	8	16	8

Table 2

**Types of the differentiation students used for adapting textbook materials**

The types of differentiation used for adaptation of textbook materials	Percentage, %
Providing options	98
Giving more/less time and space for preparation/task fulfillment	97
Mixing pairing (a weaker learner with a stronger one)	95
Changing grouping	89
Giving extra support or challenging stronger learners	87
Catering for learning styles	82
Asking different types of questions (closed- and open-ended)	62
Using questioning techniques	60
Pre-teaching and encouraging to do tasks without preparation	60
Asking different types of questions using B. Bloom' taxonomy	44
Changing instructions of exercises for learners using B. Bloom' taxonomy	43
Increasing / reducing the limit for sentences in a topic/ words in an essay	40
Encouraging students to self assessment and setting their own objectives	32
Differentiated learning outcomes	27



The list above does not reflect how the types of differentiation were implemented into learning tasks, texts, didactic materials, exercises, instructions and procedures of the exercises, presentation of the new material, etc. but it presents the ideas explained by the students. It was really hard to interpret students' choices (*in italics*) below the top 6 types without the students' explanations. Thanks to their honest feedbacks we know that among the reasons for not using some other types of differentiation are the following: «I agree but don't know how to implement the idea», «doubt», «it can insult learner's feelings», «I don't share the idea of differentiation», «time-consuming» and other similar opinions. Thus, we can conclude that some students do not understand some concepts, others doubt benefits of the approach, and even find it harmful and relieving students' responsibility, while the others are not ready to invest much time in changing materials radically. Six top ideas of differentiation were used by almost all students as they consider them natural and clear.

## 6. CONCLUSION

The aim of the current study was to examine levels of students' professional skills in adapting teaching materials for differentiated FL classroom. We assume the skills can be considered «as a valuable component of the professional culture of the teacher of the future that requires reasonable conditions for effective interaction of the participants of the educational process» [3, p. 65].

This study has shown that the students struggle difficulties with identifying differentiation laid down by the textbook writers, and with deducing the capacity of the content and procedures in terms of differentiation. It leads to the difficulties with teaching material adaptation. The study also has found that generally a half of the total number of students understands the main principles of language teaching, which becomes the foundation for developing their materials adaptation skills.

The results of the study confirm that the most frequent types of differentiation implemented into adapted materials are the following: providing options, giving more/less time and space for preparation/task fulfillment, mixing pairing (a weaker learner with a stronger one), changing grouping, giving extra support or challenging stronger learners, and catering for learning styles. Unexpectedly, values and beliefs of some students served as an obstacle to adapting textbook materials, and there are four main reasons for that: knowledge gaps, misunderstanding of the approach value, positive refusal of the differentiation, and unwillingness to do extra work.

The theoretical input into types of differentiation and analysis of the differentiated tasks only minimize difficulties with teaching material adaptation. However, a complex of the activities aimed at developing students' awareness of humanistic teaching aspect and cognitive skills as well as their developer experience would contribute to gaining professional skills to apply differentiated to material adaptation.

## References

1. Belyaev, V. V. *Kak podgotovit i izdatuchebnuyu knigu* / V. V. Belyaev. — Glazov : Glazov, inzhener.-ekon. in-t, 2006. — 197 p.
2. Bepalko, V. P. *Teoriya uchebnika: didakticheskiy aspekt* / V. P. Bepalko. — M. : Pedagogika, 1988. — 160 p.
3. Bulankina, N. E., Mishutina, O. V. *Didactic Design as the Basis for the Professional Spaces of Pedagogical Education* / N. E. Bulankina, O. V. Mishutina // *Siberian Pedagogical Journal*. — 2022. — № 3. — P. 64–74. — DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15293/1813-4718.2203.07>.
4. Ermosh, E. N. *Realizatsiya differentsiatsii obucheniya v obrazovatel'nom protsesse* / E. N. Ermosh // *Aktual'nye problemy sovremennosti: nauka i obshchestvo*. — 2017. — № 1 (14). — P. 50–55.
5. Hatami, V. *Materials Adaptation* / V. Hatami, T. Rahimi T., F. Shahidzade // *Project: Principled materials development and evaluation*. — 2021. — DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.30616.11521.
6. Isaeva, T. E. *Kompetentsii i «elektronnaya» pedagogicheskaya kul'tura prepodavatelya vysshey shkoly v postpandemicheskom mire* / T. E. Isaeva // *Vysshee obrazovanie v Rossii*. — 2021. — № 6. — S. 80–95.
7. Isaeva, T. E. *Kompetentsii studentov i prepodavatelya vysshey shkoly: sposoby formirovaniya i otsenivaniya: monografiya* / T. E. Isaeva. — Rostov n/D, 2010. — 152 p.
8. Jolly, D. *A framework for materials writing* / D. Jolly, R. Bolitho // *Materials Development in Language Teaching* / B. Tomlinson. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1998. — P. 107–134.
9. Khutorskoy A. V. *Mesto uchebnika v didakticheskoy sisteme* / A. V. Khutorskoy // *Pedagogika*. — 2005. — № 4. — P. 10–18.
10. Kraevskiy, V. V. *Didaktika i metodika*. / V. V. Kraevskiy, A. V. Khutorskoy. — M., 2007. — 352 p.
11. Lerner I. Ya. *Metodologicheskie problemy didakticheskoy teorii postroeniya uchebnika. Kakim byt' uchebniku: Didakticheskie printsipy postroeniya* / pod red. I. Ya. Lerner, N. M. Shakhmaeva. — M., 1999. — Ch. 1. — 197 p.
12. Littlejohn, A. *The analysis of language teaching materials: inside the Trojan Horse* / A. Littlejohn // *Materials Development in Language Teaching* / B. Tomlinson. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1998. — P. 179–211.
13. Lygina, N. I. *Uchebnoe izdanie: printsipy razrabotki, osnovnye komponenty i vidy, otsenka kachestva* / N. I. Lygina, T. Yu. Surnina, E. M. Turlo. — Novosibirsk : Izd-vo NGTU, 2006. — 81 p.
14. Martyushova, Ya. G. *Soglasovanie trebovaniy k pechatnomu izdaniyu i elektronnomu uchebniku na ego osnove kak sostavnym chastyam sovremennogo UMK* / Ya. G. Martyushova // *Innovatsii v obrazovanii*. — 2017. — № 7. — P. 10–20.
15. Monastirev, P. *Etapy sozdaniya elektronnykh uchebnikov* / P. Monastirev, E. Alenicheva // *Vysshee obrazovanie v Rossii*. — 2001. — № 5. — P. 103–105.

16. Osmolovskaya, I. M. *Uchebniki novogo pokoleniya: poisk didakticheskikh resheniy* / I. M. Osmolovskaya // *Otechestvennaya i zarubezhnaya pedagogika*. — 2014. — № 4 (19). — S. 45–53.
17. *Prikaz Ministerstva prosveshcheniya RF ot 31 maya 2021 g. № 286 «Ob utverzhdenii federal'nogo gosudarstvennogo obrazovatel'nogo standarta nachal'nogo obshchego obrazovaniya»: informatsionno-pravovoy portal «GARANT.RU»*. — 2 avgusta 2021 g. — Elektronnyy resurs. — URL: <https://www.garant.ru/products/ipo/prime/doc/400807193/>.
18. *Prikaz Minobrnauki Rossii ot 07.08.2014 № 940 «Ob utverzhdenii federal'nogo gosudarstvennogo obrazovatel'nogo standarta vysshego obrazovaniya po napravleniyu podgotovki 45.03.02 Lingvistika (uroven' bakalavriata)»*, 2014. — 12 s. — Elektronnyy resurs. — URL: <https://rulings.ru/acts/Prikaz-Minobrnauki-Rossii-ot-07.08.2014-N-940/>.
19. *Primernaya osnovnaya obrazovatel'naya programma osnovnogo obshchego obrazovaniya. Odobrena resheniem federal'nogo uchebno-metodicheskogo ob'edineniya po obshchemu obrazovaniyu (protokol ot 8 aprelya 2015 g. № 1/15) v red. protokola № 1/20 ot 04.02.2020 federal'nogo uchebno-metodicheskogo ob'edineniya po obshchemu obrazovaniyu*. — Elektronnyy resurs. — URL: [https://fgosreestr.ru/registry/poop\\_000\\_06-02-2020/](https://fgosreestr.ru/registry/poop_000_06-02-2020/).
20. Roberts, R. *Planning for Differentiation* British Council; BBC World Service / *British Council Teaching for Success Online Seminar*. — 2016. — Elektronnyy resurs. — URL: <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/rachael-roberts-planning-differentiation>.
21. Skok, G. B. *Kak sproektirovat' uchebnyy protsess po kursu Tekst.* / G. B. Skok, N. I. Lygina. — M.: Ped. o-vo Rossii, 2003. — 94 p.
23. Talyzina, N. F. *Mesto i funktsii uchebnika v uchebnom protsesse* / N. F. Talyzina // *Prob, shk. uchebn.* — 1978. — Vyp. 6. — P. 14–25.
24. Temerbekova, A. A. *Istoriya vozniknoveniya i razvitiya idey differentsirovannogo obucheniya v Rossii* / A. A. Temerbekova // *Vestnik TPGU*. — 2002. — № 2 (30). — P. 96–99.
25. Tomlinson B. *Materials Development in Language Teaching* / B. Tomlinson. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. — 368 p.
26. Tomlinson, C. A. *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms* / C. A. Tomlinson. — 2nd ed. — Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Alexandria, Virginia USA, 2001. — 128 p.
27. Zarubina, V. S. *Genezis i razvitie podkhodov k proektirovaniyu i razrabotke elektronnykh uchebnikov* / V. S. Zarubina // *Vestnik Tverskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya: Pedagogika i psikhologiya*. — 2021. — № 1 (54). — P. 183–190. ▲

## НОВОСТИ

### Состоялось Межрегиональное родительское собрание «Родители и школа: вместе в будущее»

20 сентября на базе НИПКиПРО состоялось Межрегиональное родительское собрание с онлайн подключением представителей родительской общественности из Сибирского федерального округа «Родители и школа: вместе в будущее».

Мероприятие собрало представителей родительских комитетов, педагогических работников, организаторов работы с родителями, победителей и участников конкурсов, посвященных организации работы с родителями и семейным ценностям, представителей родительского сообщества, а также органов государственной власти и местного самоуправления, осуществляющих управление в сфере образования.

Организаторами мероприятия выступили Национальная родительская ассоциация, министерство образования Новосибирской области, ГАУ ДО НСО «ОЦРТДиЮ» и НГПУ.

Всего в собрании, проходившем в смешанном формате (очно и онлайн), приняли участие более 1760 человек из 20 районов Новосибирской области, г. Новосибирска, г. Искитима, г. Бердска, р. п. Кольцово, а также Алтайского края и Республики Хакасия в режиме ВКС.

Модератором проведения собрания стал Алексей Гусев, кандидат исторических наук, ответственный секретарь Координационного совета Национальной родительской ассоциации, член Коллегии Министерства просвещения России. В работе собрания также принял участие общественный деятель, заместитель ответственного секретаря Координационного совета НРА Дмитрий Епов.

С приветственным словом к участникам обратилась Марина Сидоренко, заместитель директора ГАУ ДО НСО «ОЦРТДиЮ», координатор Областного родительского собрания.

Темы докладов, прозвучавших в рамках Межрегионального родительского собрания, были посвящены актуальным вопросам вовлечения родителей в образование и воспитание с учётом тематик, обсуждённых на Общероссийском родительском собрании 2022 года, важности развития культуры родительского консультирования, работе с родителями в рамках реализации в Новосибирской области федерального проекта «Современная школа» национального проекта «Образование», безопасности детей как важнейшего элемента ответственного родительства, а также семейному волонтерству в семье и школе на примере региональных практик Алтайского края. Мероприятие завершилось сессией «Вопрос — ответ».