

**TE 842 Analyzing Student Data Project**

**CASE 1: William**

William is currently in September of his second grade year. Based off of the Test of Phonemic Awareness results and the Alphabet Recognition Chart, William demonstrated mastery on all of the phonological awareness tasks and he was able to successfully recognize all upper and lower case letters of the alphabet.

**Analysis of Assessment Data**

<u>William's Informal Phonic Inventory</u>		
Subtest	Score	Result
Consonant Sounds	16/20	Mastery
Consonant Digraphs	4/5	Mastery
Beginning Consonant Blends	15/20	Review
Final Consonant Blends and ng	6/12	Systematic Instruction
Short Vowels in CVC words	5/10	Systematic Instruction
The Rule of Silent e	0/4	Systematic Instruction
Long Vowel Digraphs	5/10	Systematic Instruction
Diphthongs	4/6	Review
r-Controlled Vowels and -al	2/6	Systematic Instruction
Total	57/93	Review

The Informal Phonics Inventory assesses students' knowledge of phonics beginning with the basics (consonants) to more advanced skills (r-controlled vowels). Based off of William's Informal Phonics Inventory, he scored within the mastery range on consonant sounds however, still missed 20% of the consonant sounds. According to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), CCSS.ELA-Literacy.R.F.2.3, students should be able to "know and apply grade-level phonics and word analysis skills in decoding words" ("National"). William scored 50% on short vowels in CVC Words (consonant-vowel-consonant pattern) and was unable to apply the rule of 'silent e'. CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RF.2.3.b states students should be able to distinguish long and short vowels when reading regularly spelled one-syllable words" ("National"). Based off of this

data, William’s phonics and word recognition skills are currently below grade level and he is not meeting Common Core State Standards expectations in this area at this time.

<b>William’s Fry Sight Word Inventory. Words Read Incorrectly:</b>		
He – his (Self Correct)	What— wait	Were—where
Been—be	Now—know	Find—friend

William was administered the Fry 1-100 Sight Word Inventory which assesses a students’ ability to identify 100 frequently words used in the English language. When administering this test, the child has about 1 second to pronounce each word accurately to be considered a sight word. William read 94/100 of the sight words fluently with one self-correction averaging 95% accuracy and requires practice reviewing the five words read incorrectly.

<b>William’s Elementary Spelling Inventory</b>		
<b>ESI Features</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Needs</b>
Consonants	6/7	N/A- Independent
Short Vowels	2/5	Review work
Digraphs	0/3	Careful Instruction
Blends	3/7	Careful Instruction
Long Vowels	1/5	Careful Instruction
Inflected endings	0/1	Careful Instruction
Words spelled correctly	1/10	

The Elementary Spelling Inventory has “25 words ordered by difficulty to sample features from the letter name—alphabetic stage to derivational relations stage.” (McKenna & Stahl, 2009, p. 143). Based off of William’s data, he requires additional support learning short vowel sounds and digraphs. According to the Spelling Stage Expectations provided by McKenna & Stahl, William is currently scoring in the Middle Letter Name stage which is at the end of Kindergarten and students should be scoring in the late “letter name-early syllables and affixes stage” in the beginning of second grade. CSSS.ELA-Literacy.RKF.2.3b states, students should “know spelling sound correspondences for additional common vowel teams” (“National) and

therefore, William is not meeting grade level expectations at this time and requires letter-sound knowledge review.

Informal Reading Inventory (IRI)

Fluency on IRI Level One/I Passage		
Total Miscues	11	Instructional Range
Total Meaning Change Miscues	5	Instructional Range
Words Per Minute	91	2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade Range: 43-89
Correct WPM	86	2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade Range: 19-77

Comprehension based off IRI Level One/ I Passage		
Concept Questions	7/9	78 %
Retelling	4 ideas	1 inference
Explicit Questions	3/4	Total: 3/6 Frustration
Implicit Questions	0/2	

William was administered an Informal Reading Inventory which includes a reading passage, comprehension questions, and a retelling feature. William’s level I passage is in the first grade range according to the Reading A-Z level correlation chart. William is currently able to read within an instructional range on a first grade passage which is the “highest level at which a child could benefit from instructional support.” (McKenna & Stahl, 2009, p. 43). William’s reading rate of 91 words per minute (wpm) did not fall within the second grade range of 43-89 wpm. According to CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RF.2.4, by the end of second grade William should be able to “read grade-level text with purpose and understanding” (“National”). William also scored a 50% on comprehension and hit a frustration level which is “the lowest level at which a child is likely to be frustrated, even with instructional support” (McKenna & Stahl, 2009, p. 43). According to the Common Core State Standards, William is currently not meeting fluency and comprehension grade level expectations at this time.

### **William's Goals for Instruction**

**Goal One:** William needs to work on building his phonics skill beginning with consonants and short vowels by learning word patterns to develop sight-word knowledge and decoding strategies.

It is crucial for William to build his phonics and word recognition skills by reviewing short consonants and short vowels then moving up to word patterns. Based off of William's Informal Phonics Inventory, he scored within the mastery range on consonant sounds; however, he still missed 20% of the consonant sounds. According to CCSS, by second grade William should be able to independently identify consonant sounds. Based off of William's Spelling Inventory, he also requires additional support learning short vowel sounds (scored 40% accuracy). William scored a 5/10 on short vowels in CVC Words and was unable to apply the rule of silent e when decoding –VCE word patterns.

Even though William struggled with other consonant blends and vowel patterns according to his Informal Phonics and Spelling Inventory, he needs to begin with reviewing the basic skills (CVC, and –VCE word patterns) before moving on to more difficult phonic patterns. Since the single vowels and final single vowel-consonant-e rules “are reasonably easy to memorize and to apply, they form a good starting point for teaching beginning readers to break the code” (Gates & Yale, 2011). William's goal to build his phonics skills aligns with CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RF.2.3a which states students will, “distinguish long and short vowels when reading regularly spelled one-syllable words” (“National”). William's phonics and word recognition skills are currently below grade level and it is imperative he builds these skills to make successful gains towards the Common Core State Standards grade level expectations.

**Goal Two:** William needs to work on improving his fluency and comprehension by slowing down his reading rate and improving his strategic knowledge.

According to Williams Informal Reading Inventory, it is imperative for William to improve his fluency skills by slowing down his reading rate. William was administered a Level I, first grade passage according to the Reading A-Z level correlation chart and read too quickly at a rate of 91 words per minute. This did not fall within the second grade range of 43-89 words per minute. William also substituted words on his Reading Inventory which he read accurately on his Sight Word Inventory ('the' and 'his') as a result of reading too quickly. According to the CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RF.2.4b, William should "read grade-level text orally with accuracy, appropriate rate, and expression on successive readings" ("National").

William's comprehension also suffered since he scored within the frustration range on his Informal Reading Inventory; however, it is vital for William to improve his fluency first. McKenna & Stahl's Modified Cognitive Model explains how students' need to master fluency in context before mastering reading comprehension because "if reading is not fluent, then comprehension usually suffers" (McKenna & Stahl, 2009, p. 12). Since William is reading too quickly, he does not comprehend what he is reading. William needs to improve his strategic knowledge and understanding the purpose of reading a text. Many students "believe that the goal is to say all of the words correctly or simply to arrive at the last word" and therefore, reading too quickly and not comprehending what they are reading (McKenna & Stahl, 2009, p. 20). Based off of the CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RF.2.4a, William should be reading grade leveled texts with "sufficient accuracy and fluency to support comprehension. ("National"). William is currently not meeting grade/age level expectations independently at this time and requires additional modeled support to build his fluency rate and ability to comprehend what he is reading.

### **Instructional Strategies for William**

#### **Goal One, Instructional Strategy #1: Word Sorts**

I plan to use word sorts to build William's phonics, word recognition, and decoding skills. This instructional strategy is a hands-on, "spelling-based approach to teaching children how to decode" by sorting words into patterns (McKenna & Stahl, 2009, p. 115). For example, since William needs to work on consonant words and short vowels in CVC word patterns, I will have him sort consonant sounds pictures sorts and move onto CVC words ('cat' vs. 'cut'). By sorting these words into piles William will begin to analyze their word patterns and sounds. I picked this strategy based off his inventories it is apparent William needs to begin with reviewing the basic consonant and vowel patterns (CVC, and -VCe word patterns). I plan to implement this strategy with my whole class during my Language Arts block. Word sorts "allows teachers greater ease of differentiation among students with various learning needs" (Caldwell, p. 602). I will assign word sorts on my students' level and target their individual needs.

Additional Resource: *Words Their Way* by Templeton, Johnson, Invernizzi & Bear

#### **Goal One, Instructional Strategy #2: Making Words**

The second strategy I plan to implement to support and build William's phonics deficits is 'Making Words.' Making Words is a strategy where students are given manipulative letter tiles to spell words. This strategy is popular because children have the opportunity to use hands-on tiles while learning about phonics and spelling patterns. This strategy helps "children learn letter sounds and how to segment words and blend letters and transfer what they have learned to reading and spelling new words." (Gambrell & Morrow, 2011, p. 205). Research "conducted on recoding by analogy suggests that once children have some words which they can read and spell, they use these known words to figure out unknown words." (Cunningham & Hall, 1994, p. 1). I

intend to implement this strategy during literacy centers to build William's phonic and spelling development by focusing on single vowels and CVC-e patterns before transitioning into vowel blends. My students will be grouped based on ability level so I can differentiate each small group lesson to sign word patterns which are on their level.

Additional Resource: *Making Words*, Patricia Cunningham and Dorothy Hall.

Goal Two, Instructional Strategy #1: Reader's Theater

Reader's Theater allows students to have the opportunity to practice building fluency by reading a script out loud. Classroom-based research has discovered "Reader's Theater approach to fluency instruction leads to significant improvements in reading fluency and overall reading achievement" (Gambrell & Morrow, 2011, p. 287). According to William's inventory, William reads too quickly and needs to learn how to slow down. Reader's Theater will assist William in learning how to "read with expression, pace himself effectively, read with fluency, and increase comprehension." (Cornwell). I plan to implement this strategy by grouping students with a different reader's theatre script. To develop fluency, the students will have multiple opportunities to practice their text throughout the week through repeated exposure and eventually present their scripts to the class. William will have the opportunity to listen to his peer's model fluent reading which will help William learn how to pace himself and slow down while reading aloud.

Goal Two, Instructional Strategy #2: High Noon Book Series- Guided/Choral Reading

High Noon Book Series is a reputable reading intervention program which I plan to use with William's book club book. The book series "focuses on the development of decoding, fluency, and comprehension skills while also building skills in spelling, writing, and vocabulary" ("High Noon", 2009). Since William is still working on one-syllable words I will begin with Reading

Level 1 which targets short and long vowel sounds. During guided reading book club I will read aloud and model think aloud strategies to build students’ fluency and comprehension skills.

According to Timothy Rasinski, to build fluency “students should have the opportunity to hear their teacher model fluent reading to them along with support”(Gambrell & Morrow, 2011, p. 279). I will also have William participate in choral reading opportunities during book club.

Choral reading is when a group of students read aloud together providing “a model for fluent reading and improving the ability to read sight words” (“Choral Reading”). After reading a passage aloud to the students, while encouraging them to follow along with a tracking tool or finger, they will read the passage in harmony modeling my fluency ultimately improving William’s reading rate.

Resources: [www.highnoonbooks.com/index-hnb.tpl](http://www.highnoonbooks.com/index-hnb.tpl) & [www.readingrockets.org/strategies/choral\\_reading](http://www.readingrockets.org/strategies/choral_reading)

## CASE 2: SARAH

### Analysis of Assessment Data

<b>Sarah’s Elementary Spelling Inventory (ESI)</b>		
<b>ESI Features</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Needs</b>
Consonants	7/7	N/A- Independent
Short Vowels	5/5	N/A- Independent
Digraphs	6/6	N/A- Independent
Blends	7/7	N/A- Independent
Long Vowels	5/5	N/A- Independent
Other Vowels	5/5	N/A- Independent
Inflected Endings	4/5	N/A- Independent
Syllable Junctures	5/5	N/A- Independent
Unaccented Final Syllables	4/5	N/A- Independent
Harder Suffixes	0/5	Careful Instruction
Bases or Roots	0/5	Careful Instruction

Sarah’s data was administered at the beginning of her fourth grade year. The Elementary Spelling Inventory has 25 words which can be used in first grade and up. In this inventory, “the 25 words are ordered by difficulty to sample features from the letter name—alphabetic stage to



derivational relations stage.” (McKenna & Stahl, 2009, p. 143). At the beginning of fourth grade students should be typically spelling within word patterns-syllables and affixes stage. Based off of Sarah’s spelling inventory, she scored in the derivational relations stage which is above grade level expectations. Based off of her inventory results, Sarah would benefit from moving on to building morphology and word derivation skills to continue to build her overall spelling skills.

Informal Reading Inventory:

Fluency on IRI Level Four /P Passage		
Total Miscues	9	Instructional Range
Total Meaning Chance Miscues	2	Independent Range
Words Per Minute	71	4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Range: 57-115
Correct WPM	69	4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Range: 54-112
Comprehension on IRI Level Four/P Passage		
Concept Questions	8/12	67%
Retelling	7 ideas	
Explicit Questions	3/4	Total: 6/8 Instructional
Implicit Questions	3/4	

Fluency on IRI Level Four /Q Passage		
Total Miscues	7	Independent Range
Total Meaning Chance Miscues	4	Independent Range
Words Per Minute	76	4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Range: 57-115
Correct WPM	74	4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Range: 54-112
Comprehension on Level Four/Q Passage		
Concept Questions	6/12	50%
Retelling	5 ideas	
Explicit Questions	3/4	Total: 5/8 Frustration
Implicit Questions	2/4	

Sarah was administered an Informal Reading Inventory which “consists mainly of a sequence of graded passages, followed by comprehension questions, and occasionally a retelling scoring guide” (McKenna & Stahl, 2009, p. 43). She was assessed a passage on a level P which is in the second grade range according to the Reading A-Z level correlation chart. Sarah was also

administered an Expository Level Four, Guided Reading Level Q Informal Inventory which is in the third grade range according to the Reading AZ level correlation chart. Sarah is currently able to read within an independent range on a second/third grade passage. On the second grade passage Sarah scored within the instructional range when assessing comprehension knowledge. A child's "instructional level is the highest level at which a child could benefit from instructional support." (McKenna & Stahl, 2009, p. 43). On the third grade passage Sarah scored within the frustration range. According to CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RL.4.3, students should be able to "explain events, procedures, ideas, or concepts, including what happened and why, based on specific information in the text" ("National"). Sarah is currently not meeting CCSS at this time and demonstrates an imperative need to build her overall comprehension knowledge.

### **Sarah's Goals for Instruction**

**Goal One:** Sarah needs to work on building her vocabulary knowledge to improve her ability to comprehend text.

Based off of Sarah's Basic Reading Inventory, it is evident Sarah needs to build her vocabulary which is "essential to content-area learning" (Gambrell & Morrow, 2011, p. 347). For example, on a Level P passage Sarah pronounced 'frontier' as 'fronter.' Consequently, this impacted her ability to comprehend the passage since the passage about the main character traveling across the western frontier. Based off of Sarah's Informal Reading Inventories, her inability to read these vocabulary terms had a direct impact on comprehension question responses. For example, in the passage which was about western frontier, Sarah did not understand that they were traveling across America and assumed they were on the west side of town versus west side of the country. She did not understand 'west' referred to a direction and inserted 'to the west side' while reading. Sarah also did not use context clues within the passage

to define unknown words. Instead of making the connection that the main character walked many miles and all kinds of weather (which shows the main character traveled far across multiple climates), Sarah assumed the character was traveling across town. According to CCSS.ELA-Literacy.L.4.4a, Sarah should be using “context (e.g., definitions, examples, or restatements in text) as a clue to the meaning of a word or phrase” (“Common Core”).

It is important for Sarah to build her vocabulary because “vocabulary instruction plays an essential role during both literacy and disciplinary area instruction. Vocabulary knowledge is inextricably linked to reading comprehension and conceptual knowledge” (Bravo & Dougherty Stahl, 2010). On a Level Q passage Sarah was unable to read ‘locomotive’ accurately yet was able to segment the words properly which demonstrates ‘locomotive’ is not a word in her vocabulary. It is essential for Sarah to build her vocabulary to gain makes toward the 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Common Core State Standards Reading Objectives.

**Goal Two:** Sarah needs to build her background knowledge and develop strategies to activate her background knowledge while reading to improve her reading comprehension.

It is evident from Sarah’s Basic Reading Inventory she lacks background knowledge which negativity impacts her comprehension. For example, Sarah did not recognize the names of different states and continues (i.e: ‘Massachusetts’ and ‘Europe’) which impacted her ability to retell details about the setting. She also had a difficult time answering the concept questions before reading the passage. Based off of her narrative level P passage, Sarah did not know who Jonny Appleseed was, which was who the narrative was based on. Based off of her expository (informational) level Q passage, Sarah was unable to elaborate on what “railroads” were or explain “why people run races”. Sarah also had a difficult time making predictions. According to Kathleen J. Brown, students need to be able to activate their background knowledge in order to

make accurate predictions. On one passage, Sarah’s prediction was limited to “someone plants apple trees to make cider.” She pulled this information directly from the previous concept questions which were asked (what was making cider mean, why do people plant apple trees) and did not use background knowledge when making her prediction. On the level Q passage, Sarah’s prediction was inaccurate because she didn’t have any background knowledge on railroads, steam, or races which resulted in a weak prediction (“Someone is going on vacation on a train to race leaving out essential information on railroads”). According to CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RL.4.1, students are expected to “refer to details and examples in a text when explaining what the text says explicitly and when drawing inferences from the text” (“National”). Lacking background knowledge creates gaps in students learning and ability to draw information from the text therefore, it is imperative for Sarah to improve her background knowledge.

### **Instructional Strategies for Sarah**

#### *Goal One, Instructional Strategy #1: Word Meaning Graphic Organizers*

One strategy I will implement to improve Sarah’s (and all of my students) vocabulary skills, would be to begin involving my students more activity by having them construct word meaning graphic organizers. When executing vocabulary instruction it is crucial to remember “good instruction is having the learners actively attempt to construct their own meanings” (Gambrell & Morrow, 2011, p. 233). There have been many studies which “have shown the efficacy of putting word meaning into a graphic form such as a map or web, a semantic feature chart, advanced organizer, or other graphic form.” (Gambrell & Morrow, 2011, p. 233). I will incorporate this strategy into students’ book club groups. For example, each quarter the students are paired into groups of five and assigned a book on their reading level. After their weekly book club discussions, I will assign them a vocabulary word from their text to map out. This will

encourage the students to make word meanings and relationship connections while having a small group discussion. I can also implement this strategy after reading aloud a book or passage to the whole class to carry on a discussion with the entire class since this strategy is only effective with a discussion. This strategy will expand Sarah's vocabulary and overall word meaning knowledge.

*Goal One, Instructional Strategy #2: Defining Words in Context*

Another instructional strategy I will put into practice to build Sarah's vocabulary development will be to execute the vocabulary activities provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research into practice. The Florida Center for Reading Research "focuses on applied research that will have an immediate impact on policies and practices related to literacy instruction" ("Florida"). Based off of Sarah's Informal Reading Inventories, Sarah particularly needs support identifying the meaning of words in context. The Florida Center for Reading Research provides interactive games to facilitate vocabulary growth. I will implement this strategy during literacy centers and group the students based upon ability level to target their individual needs. I will focus on games with Sarah directed towards building her ability to use context clues to define unknown words. The meaning of word games will allow Sarah to practice using alternative words, identify meaning of words in content, and build her overall vocabulary knowledge.

Additional Resource: <http://www.fcrr.org/curriculum/PDF/G4-5/45VPartFour.pdf>

*Goal Two, Instructional Strategy #1: KWL Graphic Organizer*

To build Sarah's background knowledge I plan to incorporate K-W-L charts into my classroom. K-W-L charts encourage students to activate their background knowledge by having

students draw three columns to identify What I Know, What I Want to Learn, and What I Have Learned. When introducing a new concept, I will have my class fill out the K (What I Know) column to give my students the opportunity to activate their prior background knowledge. While this activity takes place I will rotate around the room and provide additional support for Sarah and others who are struggling to attempt to activate their background knowledge by scaffolding their thinking and encouraging think aloud strategies. I will then bring the whole group together and discuss what the students already know about the assigned topic. I can help Sarah and others expand on their knowledge by showing them pictures and introducing essential vocabulary terms to enhance their ability to make “essential connections to what they already know in order to begin building a schema for new information” (Gambrell & Morrow, 2011, p. 350).

*Goal Two, Instructional Strategy #2: Anticipation Guides*

An anticipation guide is a pre-reading “comprehension strategy that is used before reading to activate students’ prior knowledge and build curiosity about a topic” (“Anticipation”). These guides also help students make accurate predictions by using their activated prior knowledge. I will use this strategy with Sarah either during small group book club discussions or during whole group reading instruction. Before reading, I will pass out a chart with at least 4-6 main ideas from the text and model strategies to determine if you agree or disagree about the statement. While modeling this strategy I will have a whole group discussion with the students to allow them to share their ideas and activate prior background knowledge. After we review the guide, I will read the story aloud, continue have a discussion about each statement, and model prediction strategies to allow Sarah to continue to build, develop, and activate her prior knowledge.

Additional Resource: [http://www.readingrockets.org/strategies/anticipation\\_guide](http://www.readingrockets.org/strategies/anticipation_guide)

## References

- Alderman, G., & Green, S. (2011). Fostering Lifelong Spellers Through Meaningful Experiences. *The Reading Teacher*, 64(8), 599-605.
- Anticipation Guide / Classroom Strategies / Reading Rockets*. (n.d.). Retrieved November 2013, from [http://www.readingrockets.org/strategies/anticipation\\_guide](http://www.readingrockets.org/strategies/anticipation_guide)
- Brown, K. J. (2000). What Kind of Text: For Whom and When? Textual Scaffolding for Beginning Readers. *The Reading Teacher*, 53(4), 292- 307. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/stable/pdfplus/20204794.pdf?acceptTC=true>
- Choral Reading / Classroom Strategies / Reading Rockets*. (n.d.). Retrieved November 2013, from [http://www.readingrockets.org/strategies/choral\\_reading/](http://www.readingrockets.org/strategies/choral_reading/)
- Cornwell, L. (n.d.). *Scholastic.com for Librarians / What Is Readers Theater*. Retrieved November 2013, from <http://www.scholastic.com/librarians/programs/whatisrt.htm>
- Cunningham, P. C., & Hall, D. P. (1994). *Making Words*. Greensboro, NC: Carson-Dellosa Publishing LLC.
- Dougherty Stahl , K. A., & Bravo, M. A. (n.d.). *Classroom Vocabulary Assessment for Content Areas / Reading Topics A-Z / Reading Rockets*. Retrieved from <http://www.readingrockets.org/article/41555/>
- Florida Center for Reading Research*. (n.d.). Retrieved November 2013, from <http://www.fcrr.org/>

Gambrell, L. B. & Morrow, L. M. (2011). *Best Practices in Literacy Instruction* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Gates, L., & Yale, I. (2011). A Logical Letter-Sound System in Five Phonic Generalizations. *International Reading Association*, 330-339. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41000926>

*High Noon Books - High Interest Books and Programs for Struggling Readers*. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.highnoonbooks.com/index-hnb.tpl>

McKenna, M. C., & Stahl, S. A. (2009). *Assessment for Reading Instruction*. New York: Guilford Press.

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common Core State Standards for English language arts and literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects*. Washington, DC: Authors.

*Reading A- Z Level Correlation Chart*. (n.d.). Retrieved November 2013, from <http://www.readinga-z.com/readinga-z-levels/level-correlation-chart/>

Young, C., & Rasinski, T. (2009). Implementing Readers Theatre as an Approach to Classroom Fluency Instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 63(1), 1-13.