

Background Information

Jacob* is a fourth grade student at Meadowbrook Elementary* in Raleigh, North Carolina. After reviewing his cumulative file and special education paperwork, Jacob initially underwent Psychological and Academic testing at 3 years old and began receiving early intervention services during preschool under the Early Developmental Delay label. Jacob was initially tested for Autism Spectrum Disorder and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder in first grade. He was diagnosed with ADHD and qualified for an IEP under Other Health Impairment label to receive specialized instruction in writing, reading, and instructional behavior. Jacob also receives Occupational Therapy services to address fine and gross motor concerns (Standard III).

Since my caseload consists of students in grades 4-6, this is my first year working with Jacob. I have had the opportunity to work with Jacob throughout this year which allowed me to develop a positive rapport with him prior to the case study. According to his most recent IEP, Jacob is currently performing below grade level in writing and reading at this time. The concerns in reading include: identifying the main idea of a given passage, making inferences, answering comprehension questions by citing his answers within the text, identifying main/supporting characters within a novel, fluency, activating background knowledge, and making accurate predictions. It is evident from his IEP Jacob would benefit from further instruction in reading comprehension. In writing, Jacob currently receives 'modified grading' on his report card and struggles with the following: overall written expression, sentence structure, adding details to his writing pieces, punctuation, capitalization, and writing in a sequential order. As a result, it will be important to keep Jacob's writing concerns as well as fine motor concerns in mind during our case study and

not make the task too labor intensive in order to facilitate his reading development and overall motivation level towards reading. Based off of his most recent IEP, on state testing Jacob has the 'read aloud to self' and 'one-on-one' testing accommodations to help address focus concerns. This information is helpful to make sure I have Jacob read aloud the assessments. Based off of North Carolina's End of Grade Testing, Jacob scored a 1 on the Reading Assessment and fell within the 5th percentile. (Standard II and III).

Jacob had private testing for Autism Spectrum Disorder through the TEACCH program at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill in March of 2014. While our school is currently waiting for the report, I met with his mother recently to discuss his testing results. During our meeting, Mrs. Scott* informed me TEACCH diagnosed him with High-Functioning Autism, ADHD, and Anxiety. He currently takes stimulant medication at this time to address his ADHD concerns. (Standard III).

My school, Meadowbrook* Elementary School, follows a predominately inclusion based model with small pull out sessions depending on the individual student's needs. In addition to the special education support provided within the general education setting, Jacob receives services in the special education setting removed from his nondisabled peers as well in the areas of reading and writing. He can become overwhelmed at times by environmental stimuli and requires a quiet setting in order to minimize distractions when learning new material. Subsequently, for both of my lessons I will be teaching him 1:1 in the special education classroom (Standard III and IV).

Case Study Summary

The first lesson involved several pre-assessments to get a better sense of where Jacob is currently performing at in reading. I administered several reading attitude surveys to get a better sense of his overall interests. This allowed me to select passages for his two lessons which related to his current interests. Prior to my comprehension lesson, I administered a Qualitative Reading Inventory which provided me with additional information on Jacob's background knowledge, ability to make valid predictions, identify the main idea, and answer basic comprehension questions. For my fluency lesson, I administered a running record and used the MLPP Oral Reading Record/rubric to score his fluency. This will allow me to determine how many words Jacob can accurately read in a minute along with his ability to read with inflection and expression (Standard V).

My second lesson was focused on improving Jacob's fluency. I used a 'words per minute' bar graph to keep track of Jacob's fluency progress. This chart will allow him to visually see/understand his progress he has made during our sessions. I based my fluency lesson off of the Fluency-Oriented Reading Instruction model in Morrow & Gambrell. Since our lesson will be 1:1, I modified the model to meet Jacob's needs, but still incorporated reading the passage aloud to model fluent reading as well as participating in echo and choral reading. Due to attention concerns, Jacob's fluency rate has been inconsistent throughout the year. From this lesson I hope for Jacob to build his ability to improve his overall smoothness and expression while reading aloud. We will also discuss the passage after with extension activities (discuss main idea, information learned from the passage, and unknown vocabulary terms) which will help lead into our comprehension lesson. Since Jacob is in fourth grade, this lesson will fall under the Common Core State Standard:

CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RF.4.4 Read with sufficient accuracy and fluency to support comprehension (“Common Core”) (Standard I, II and III).

My third lesson targeted building Jacob’s overall comprehension skills and ability to cite his answers within the text. I utilized a modified KWL graphic organizer to activate Jacob’s background knowledge prior to our lesson and taught him how to refer to the text when answering question questions by utilizing different colored highlighters. Since Jacob has an IEP and struggles with reading, I am not expecting him to demonstrate tremendous growth throughout this comprehension lesson. However, I expect him to model the strategies I teach him and apply these strategies to monitor comprehension when reading passages and assigned texts in class. The National Reading Panel (2000) has determined that “instructing students to monitor their reading, answer high-level comprehension questions, generate questions about the text, identify and organize ideas based on text’s structure, and summarize the text increases reading comprehension” (McKenna & Stahl, 2009, pg. 174). This comprehension lesson will fall under the following Common Core State Standards for fourth grade: CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RL.4.1 Refer to details and examples in a text when explaining what the text says explicitly and when drawing inferences from the text. And CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RL.4.10 By the end of the year, read and comprehend literature, including stories, dramas, and poetry, in the grades 4–5 text complexity band proficiently, with scaffolding as needed at the high end of the range (“Common Core”) (Standard I, II, and III).

The fourth and final lesson incorporated administering two post-assessments. These two post assessments assessed Jacob’s fluency rate and ability to apply comprehension strategies learned during our lesson to a given reading selection.

Comprehension & Fluency Pre-Assessments

Prior to administering both lessons, I gave “Jacob” two Reading Attitude Surveys to get a better sense of his overall interests. While my two lessons are not targeted towards motivation, I thought it was important to understand Jacob’s feelings towards reading to help him feel successful during our two reading lessons. The first survey was from ReadWriteThink titled Reading Attitude Survey. His results indicated that he prefers to read non-fiction texts but dislikes reading in his free time. He said he only reads when “it’s for school” (Artifact 1). When he has to complete his nightly reading, Jacob prefers to list books on tape and reading print on the screen (i.e. ReadWorks.com). The second attitude survey helped me get a better sense of Jacob’s views towards reading. While he stated he dislikes reading and does not like to be challenged, he also said he believes it is very important to himself to be a good reader. He also circled that it made him “very happy when someone recognizes his reading” (Artifact 2). This information allowed me to gain insight into Jacob’s motivation level and the importance of making sure I use positive reinforcement to further foster Jacob’s confidence level towards reading. I plan to use non-fiction passages when implementing my comprehension reading lesson to increase his overall motivation level during our sessions (Standard III and V).

Based off of Scholastic Reading Inventory, Jacob’s current lexile level is at a 634 which is currently in the third grade range (Artifact 3). Due to attention concerns and accommodations in his IEP, Jacob reads his lexile assessments out loud. Based off of a Qualitative Reading Inventory, Jacob is currently reading words in isolation on a fifth grade independent level. He was able to automatically identify all 20 words on the fifth grade list

independently without any errors (Artifact 3.5). While Jacob is currently reading words in isolation on a fifth grade independent level, it is evident from his Scholastic Reading Inventory Jacob's comprehension and inference skills impact his overall reading level. Consequently, I administered Jacob a third grade passage to assess his fluency rate and comprehension (Standard III and V).

I administered Jacob a third grade passage from the Qualitative Reading Inventory. I began the assessment by asking him four concept questions about the passage before reading the story. The questions were about why people go to libraries, what "getting animals to come to you" means, and what sounds dolphins make (Artifact 4). He had a difficult time answering all three questions and gave very vague answers. For example, when I asked Jacob "why do people go to libraries?" he responded with, "There are books." I prompted him to expand on his answer by asking "what do people do with these books?" and he said "look at them." I then asked him, "How long do people stay at the library? What do they do there?" but, he responded to both of these questions by repeating his initial answer, "Well, because there are books." Another background knowledge question asked, "What does "getting animals to come to you" mean to you?" and Jacob responded with "to keep them as a pet." I encouraged him to elaborate on these questions by asking him, "What would it mean if your dog, who is already your pet, came to you?" and "What does "getting your dog, Oliver, to come to you mean?" but he was unable to answer these questions. After I asked the concept questions to Jacob, I asked him to make a prediction. He told me he thought the story was going to be about "a boy with a pet." His answers to his questions demonstrated lack of background knowledge and ability to make appropriate predictions

which according to the Qualitative Reading Inventory, “may explain difficulty in comprehension” (Leslie & Caldwell, 2011, pg. 48) (Standard I, III, and V).

He read a third grade passage at a rate of 86 words per minute with only 2 miscues on a 357 word passage averaging 85 correct words per minute (Artifact 4). After reading the third grade passage aloud, I assessed his comprehension level and he scored within the third grade ‘Instructional’ range. Based off of teacher observations, Jacob is extremely literal and requires directions to be stated very clear and concisely. Consequently, he a difficult time making inferences based off a given passage/text along with citing information within a passage when answering comprehension questions. According to his Qualitative Reading Inventory, Jacob is quick to answer questions based off of his knowledge versus what is stated in the text. For example, when I asked him how the boy in the story learned how to make dolphin sounds he replied “used his flute.” In the story the boy used the flute to make the dolphin sounds; however, the question was asking how he learned to do this. After I assessed his comprehension without referencing back to the passage, I gave him the passage to try and find his answers he missed. Jacob was unable to find the answers in the text to either of the questions and still fell within the ‘Instructional’ third grade range (Artifact 4) (Standard III and V).

In order to get a better sense of Jacob’s fluency, I administered him an additional second shorter passage on a fourth grade passage which he read at a rate of 65 words per minute with only 2 miscues. One of these miscues was an insertion and the other was a substitution (Artifact 5). Therefore, he is averaging 65 words per minute on a grade leveled text. According to the Hasbrouck-Tindal Oral Reading Fluency Norms, fourth graders

should be reading 94 (fall) to 123 (spring) words per minute. I also used the MLPP Oral Reading record/rubric to score his fluency on the second passage. He scored with an accurately rate of 98% (Artifact 7). While he does not have many miscues while reading aloud, he reads with a monotone voice and does not use proper inflection/pause during punctuation. Jacob also paused for 5 sections before moving onto the next sentence which impacted his overall fluency rate (Artifact 6) (Standard III and V).

Fluency Lesson & Analysis

Jacob and I met in my office to begin the fluency lesson. For the lesson I kept Timothy Rasinski's four basic principles to develop effective fluency instruction in mind along with the Fluency-Oriented Reading Instruction model. While Jacob is currently reading one grade below grade level, Fluency-Oriented Reading Instruction "works best with texts that would be classified as somewhat challenging" (Morrow & Gambrell, 2011, pg. 282). Therefore, I selected grade leveled texts for this lesson. Since Jacob is currently reading words in isolation above grade level but struggles with reading fluently as well as comprehension (Artifact 3, 4, 5, 6, & 7), providing him with a grade leveled text would be an appropriate challenge for him. It was recommended in Morrow & Gambrell to assign a reading passage which was substantively long enough to ensure the students are reading between 20 to 40 minutes. Due to my child's attention concerns, and the fact that I wanted to encourage several of the recommended strategies of FORI into my Case Study, I selected a smaller passage to meet my student's individual needs. In the reading *What Research Has to Say About Reading Instruction: Fourth Edition*, it was recommended to read a smaller passage between 50-250 words on the child's individual instructional level to read repeatedly to build fluency skills (Rasinki & Samuels, 2011) (Standard I, III, V, and VI).

I decided to administer both lessons in my office. Since Jacob has attention concerns, I decided he would have an easier time focusing in a 1:1 setting. Based off of teacher observations, Jacob also becomes discouraged easily while reading, which he also mentioned on his Reading Attitude Survey (Artifact 2). As a result, I wanted a quiet setting where he would feel comfortable taking risks. When I initially pulled Jacob from class to begin the lesson, he was very excited and exceptionally talkative. He told me he loves leaving the classroom and talked to me the entire way down the hallway about Mario characters and Nintendo. When I would attempt to change the subject, he would immediately change the topic back to Mario. Jacob engaged in conversation and would ask me questions; however, they all related directly to his topic of interest (Standard III and IV).

Once we arrived at my office, I had him take a seat at my kidney table. Based off of previous observations on Jacob, I noticed he was especially fidgety and had a hard time focusing. When I asked him if he was wearing his patch (his ADHD stimulant medication he wears daily), he looked for it on his hip, was unable to locate it, and told me he forgot it at home. Consequently, I knew Jacob would require additional reminders as well as the tasks to be broken down into manageable chunks since he didn't take his medication. I explained to Jacob how I have loved hearing about Mario but now we are going to do a little reading. He looked discouraged and grunted. Since he was off his medication, I knew he would also need visual reminders of the tasks which he would be asked to complete to help keep him on task and have a clear understanding of the expectations asked of him. I quickly drew a checklist on a piece of paper with the following steps: 1) Teacher Read Aloud 2) Echo Read 3) Choral Read 4) You Read! 5) Questions? (Artifact 8). I told Jacob after each of these

reading tasks, he was allowed to tell me about Mario for 1 minute. His eyes immediately lit up and with a smile strewn across his face, he agreed to the deal (Standard IV).

I gave Jacob the first passage and told him we are going to do five things with this passage today. I showed him the checklist and told him the first task was to listen and follow along as I read aloud. I had him point to each word with his finger as a read to ensure he was following along. I modeled this strategy and pointed to each word as well with my copy of the passage. I pointed out several points in the passage where I used my voice to add meaning to the passage along with where I slowed down when I reached a part of the text which was difficult to understand. Since “reading too fast can be detrimental to comprehension” I wanted to over emphasize the importance of not reading the passage too quickly (Rasinski & Samuels, 2011, pg. 101) (Standard V and VI).

After I read the selection, I asked Jacob to tell me what the passage was about to further “reinforce the notion that text comprehension is the primary goal” of fluency (Morrow & Gambrell, 2011, pg. 283). He reread the title to the passage (“What is it”) and said it was about “Figuring out what something was.” I prompted him further and asked him “what was he trying to figure out?” to which he responded “what the painting was.” I allowed him to place a checkmark next to the “Teacher Read Aloud” step on the checklist and he told me about Mario for one minute. I used an hourglass timer during this time so he was able to visually see when his minute was up (Standard IV).

Afterwards we participated in an echo reading. As I read aloud a sentence Jacob would track the sentence with his pencil. He would then read the sentence back to me. Jacob has a difficult time using expression in conversational speech, so I knew this would

be a challenging task for him. However, taking turns reading aloud helps students with autism understand facial expressions and how to appropriately use volume, tone, and inflection in speech (Kluth, 2003), so I was eager to echo read with Jacob. During this task, Jacob paused at commas and imitating my expression. I emphasized several times throughout the reading the importance of pausing between periods and showing meaning with his voice to build his prosody. Research has shown that “readers who read with good oral prosody and text phrasing tend to have better comprehension in silent reading than readers who are less proficient in the use of prosody” (Rasinski & Samuels, 2011, pg. 96). After we finished reading, Jacob checked off the 2nd task, shared some information on Mario, and we participated in a final choral read together before I had him read the passage independently. During the choral reading activity, we read aloud in union while I modeled fluent reading and further improved Jacob’s “ability to read sight words” (“Choral Reading”). As recommended by David D. Paige in “That Sounded Good!”: Using Whole Class Choral Reading to Improve Fluency, I counted down “3, 2, 1” prior to reading to help Jacob stay on cue. During the choral reading, I listed for reading miscues and difficulties with the text. While we were reading aloud together, Jacob interrupted when we landed on the word “exquisite” and said “I don’t know what that word means.” After we finished reading we discussed what the word meant and he was able to use the word in a sentence independently (Standard I, V, and VI).

After this task, I had Jacob complete a running record on the passage. He read the passage aloud with 1 error (omission) in 92 words per minute (Artifact 9). He paused when he reached the commas, which is something he was not previously doing independently (Artifact 9). While his expression seemed forced (Artifact 10) he read with some expression

which is noted improvement from his pre-assessment when he was demonstrating little to no expression (Artifact 6). Jacob eagerly checked off the second to last task box and told me a story about a Nintendo clip on YouTube. When completing the extension activity, Jacob was able to write a portion of the main idea independently but required teacher scaffolding to complete his idea. He was able to accurately explain three facts he learned from this passage verbally along with identify two unknown words in the passage (Standard IV, and V).

For Jacob's fluency post-assessment, I administered a running record. I allowed him to read the passage once to himself in his head, and then read it aloud to me. He read the fourth grade passage in 74 words per minute with only one omission and one substitution totaling two miscues (Artifact 12). Initially, he had a difficult time decoding 'jostling', but was able to self-correct himself independently. He omitted the word 'just' in one sentence which did not make away from the overall meaning of the passage (read as "I was [just] watching"). His insertion of 'the' for 'her' also didn't impact the overall meaning of the passage (read as "Jane dragged her feet into the [her] bedroom") (Artifact 12). According to his Oral Reading Record, Jacob read the passage with a 97% accuracy rate (Artifact 15) which increased one percent from his pre-assessment's accuracy rate of 96% (Artifact 7). Based off of his Oral Reading Fluency Assessment, Jacob increased his smoothness and ability to read with expression as well (Artifact 14). During his pre-assessment Jacob had frequent extended pauses with word-by-word reading (Artifact 6) but during his post he increased to only several pauses and choppy reading (Artifact 14). He also improved his expression from having little expression (Artifact 6) to reading with some forced expression (Artifact 6).

Based off of the post-assessment, Jacob demonstrated growth during the fluency lessons and further developed his overall fluency and prosody skills through the strategies learned during our lessons (Artifact 8.5). By modeling what a fluent reader sounded like, Jacob was able to mimic the teacher and read with more expression and tone (Artifact 10). It is evident from Jacob's Fluency Graph that his fluency improves drastically when he has multiple opportunities to read the text. Jacob's words per minute considerably increased by 27 words between his pre-assessment and the passage administered during the fluency lesson (Artifact 8.5). While his words per minute dropped on his post assessment to 74 wpm, this is still a 9 wpm increase from his pre-assessment (Artifact 8.5). These two assessments were also administered as cold reads without allowing him to have the opportunity to hear the passage modeled to him by an adult. Through this lesson Jacob had the opportunity to develop his fluency skills and learn strategies for him to become a better reader. During the pre-assessment Jacob was very eager to see his time. He said constantly throughout the fluency assessment, "I read so slow" (his words) which demonstrated his insecurity towards reading aloud (Artifact 7). During his post-assessment Jacob did not make any comments about his reading speed and was eager to see how many errors he made while reading aloud in addition to his time which demonstrated his increase in confidence when reading a given text aloud (Artifact 15) (Standard V).

Comprehension Lesson & Analysis

When Jacob and I met again I had him come down to my office to work. He was equally as enthusiastic as last time and eager to discuss Mario. I showed in a new checklist which had four tasks to complete: 1) Graphic Organizer 2) Read/Questions 3) Graphic Organizer 4) Read/Questions (Artifact 16). I explained to him how after each task, he

would have a chance to take a break for 1 minute to discuss Mario. He eagerly accepted and I explained to him how we were going to work on finding facts in a paragraph. By using “explicit instruction, which includes modeling, scaffolding, facilitating, and participating,” I intend to teach Jacob new comprehension strategies to apply to future reading assessments (McLaughlin, 2012, pg. 434). I formatted the comprehension lesson as a two part lesson following a gradual release model for Jacob to successfully apply the learned strategies independently. Since it was evident from Jacob’s Qualitative Reading Inventory that he struggled with activating his background knowledge (Artifact 4), I geared my lesson towards Jacob filling out a K-W-L graphic organizer to make “essential connections to what they already know in order to begin building a schema for new information” (Gambrell & Morrow, 2011, pg. 350). It is important to note I modified the K-W-L chart to meet Jacob’s individual needs. Dr. Nell Duke recommended encouraging students to build their self-questioning skills by asking the question “I wonder” while reading (Duke & Martin). Subsequently, I had Jacob fill out a graphic organizer which considered of the question “I know” to activate background knowledge and “I wonder...” to improve his comprehension skills (Artifact 16.5) (Standard I, IV, V, and VI).

Since Jacob prefers reading non-fiction passages, I selected two non-fiction passages for the comprehension lesson on a fourth grade level. Since the level of non-fiction reading will increase when Jacob moves into fifth, I also wanted him to become more comfortable with comprehension non-fiction readings. I began the lesson by asking Jacob what he knew about The Titanic and asked him to write these facts down on his graphic organizer since “graphic organizers can help students recall and organize the ideas in informational texts” (McKenna & Stahl, 2009, pg. 177). He was able to tell me a few facts orally with heavy

teacher guidance. I scaffold his thinking by encouraging him to ask “who, what, when, where, and why” and the topic presented. For example, Jacob initially said “it sunk and doesn’t float anymore.” I guided his thinking by asking “I wonder... How it sank?” Jacob was able to tell me the ship sank when it hit an iceberg and wrote this fact down on his organizer (Artifact 16.5). I modeled to Jacob several questions which I still had about The Titanic (Artifact 17) and then he wrote down what he wondered about The Titanic on his graphic organizer (Artifact 16.5) (Standard II, III, and VI).

We took turns reading the 6 sentence reading passage aloud as I modeled comprehension fix-up strategies recommended by McKenna and Stahl. While reading, I would pause and ask Jacob questions aloud. If we approached a confusing part in the passage or if he was unable to answer the question, I would think aloud, “That doesn’t make sense; let’s reread that last sentence again.” When we approached the answers to one of his “I wonder...” questions we would reference back to our graphic organizer and fill in the answer. When we read that the ship sank on April 14, 2912 I paused and said aloud, “I think this is one of your questions” and I modeled for him how to fill it in on his graphic organizer. The next answer we came across was to the question, “How could the ship sink?” and Jacob eagerly said, “Oh! This was one of my questions.” After reading the passage, we answered several comprehension questions from the selection assigning a separate colored highlighter for each individual question. The questions all correlated to his graphic organizer, which he was able to utilize when he answered the questions. Based off of previous teacher observations, Jacob usually grunts during class when asked to highlight/cite his answers within the text and states the task is boring. When I explained to him finding his answers within the text it will help him get the question right the first time

around and he wouldn't lose points, he quickly changed his attitude. He was able to find the majority of his answers within the text but required additional assistance figuring out when the ship left England. Jacob wanted to put the first date he found in the passage (April 14th) as his answer, which was actually when the ship sank (Artifact 18). Although he didn't read the text carefully and picked the first date he saw, I was proud of him for referencing back to the text. Even though this lesson is centered on building background knowledge through his graphic organizer, I had Jacob answer comprehension questions after as an extension activity to have the opportunity to use his background knowledge while still referencing to the text to answer questions since "the ability to look back in the text and locate information is a characteristic of effective readers" (Leslie & Caldwell, 2011, pg. 36). Based off of previous observations, Jacob tends to in class answer information based off of what he thinks or his inaccurate background knowledge versus what is stated in the text. As a result, I also had him complete this extension activity to hopefully see he had an easier time comprehending the passage since he activated his background knowledge prior to the lesson through the graphic organizer; however, still referred to the text as well when answering the comprehension questions (Standard III, V, and VI).

After our introduction lesson with heavy modeling, we transitioned into reading a lengthier text which was 24 sentences long. Since I was following a gradual release model time I had Jacob fill out the graphic organizer independently. At times, when I sensed he was becoming overwhelmed (i.e. head down on desk, sighing, or grunting), I would scribe for him when instantly put him in a better mood allowing him to comfortable to take risks. He required an additional teacher prompt when filling out the "I Know..." column. I guided his thinking by asking, "Anything else? What do you think about when you hear the word

Beaver?" This allowed him to have an easier time activating his background knowledge.

Next I had Jacob independently read the passage on beavers aloud. While he read, I would pause him frequently when something on his graphic organizer related to the text since "good comprehenders integrate prior knowledge" while reading (Duke & Martin, Pg. 242). (Standard I and IV).

On Jacob's graphic organizer, he said he knew that "beavers lived in lakes and oceans" (Artifact 19). When he approached the statement, "Beavers build their dams across _____," he referenced back to his organizer and was about to circle "oceans" as his answer but I reminded him he had to find the answer in his text. After doing so, he changed his answer to streams and said, "Good thing I looked in the text." (Artifact 20) Hearing Jacob say this comment aloud demonstrated Jacob's realization of the importance of referencing back to the text to answer questions and not always rely solely on his background knowledge. Transitioning into fifth grade, Jacob will be exposed to a variety of non-fiction texts throughout his classes and it is vital he understands how to appropriately apply his background knowledge to a text. Since "students with learning disabilities have specific difficulty getting the point because they build up less effective text representation through inappropriate use of background knowledge or the intrusion of personal points of view," it is imperative Jacob understands he should not rely independently on his background knowledge when answering comprehension questions (Gersten et al., 2001, pg. 285) (Standard II and III).

For his post-assessment, I had Jacob independently complete the modified KWL graphic organizer. Since Jacob required heavy teacher support during the pre-assessment, I

was eager to see what he would be able to complete independently and if he would be able to activate his background knowledge independently without scaffolding. I gave him a passage on 'Starfish' and had him complete the graphic organizer. He was able to successfully list two facts he already knew about star fish independently which related directly to the topic and asked two *W* questions (Where? "Found in the ocean" and what [does it look like]? "[it is] orange"). He asked two valid "I wonder..." questions which related directly to the topic as well (Artifact 21). This showed me he was able to attend to the task and reflect on the non-fiction reading topic before reading the passage to successfully activate his background knowledge. As a conclusion to our post-assessment, I had Jacob read aloud independently the passage on starfish and answer the comprehension questions independently. I provided him with the highlighters and remaindered him to highlight his answers within the text and to use a different color for each question. While he only answered 3/5 (60%) of the comprehension questions correct, he applied highlighting strategies and referenced back to his graphic organizer, which were the two goals I had for Jacob during this lesson. I am not expecting him to demonstrate tremendous growth throughout these lessons; however, I expect him to model the strategies I teach him and apply these strategies to future comprehension passages and readings in class (Standard III, V, and VI).

Reflection

When reflecting on my case study, I was extremely proud of my student's process he demonstrated throughout the two reading lessons. The pre-assessments I administered gave me a clear indication of Jacob's current reading performance. With a combination of the Qualitative Reading Inventory, Scholastic Reading Inventory Lexile Assessment, and the

MLPP Oral Reading Record, it was evident Jacob needs to develop his overall reading comprehension through activating his background knowledge and fluency skills (Standard V). If I were to reteach these lessons, I would have incorporated an extrinsic motivator. During the beginning of our fluency lesson, I had a difficult time keeping Jacob focused. He was fixated on discussing his interests and had a hard time switching gears to the reading assignment. I quickly made a checklist which allowed the lesson to go more smoothly. Incorporating this checklist into the comprehension lesson allowed Jacob to understand the expectations of the lesson. I am eager to continue using this checklist during small group lessons as well as integrate this checklist into the general education setting (Standard III).

In the future, when I work with this student I would like to incorporate more than one strategy into my comprehension lesson. Jacob struggles with multiple comprehension strategies (Artifact 3 and 4), and I had an extremely difficult time narrowing in on just one particular area for this Case Study. Consequently, our lesson incorporated citing his answers within the text when learning how to activate background knowledge. In the future, it would be beneficial to integrate multiple strategies because “interventions involving multiple-strategy approaches tend to be stronger than those for interventions involving single-strategy instruction” (Duke & Martin, 2005, Pg. 247). Jacob did a wonderful job filling out his modified KWL chart during the lesson (Artifact 19). Since he required heavy teacher guidance and support during the beginning of his lesson, I believe this modified organizer met his needs. Jacob acquired the skills from this lesson to be able to use a complete KWL chart in the future (Standard III and VI).

I would have also changed the fluency lesson by introducing the strategies taught to a small group of students. While the lesson was effective and Jacob learned skills to increase his overall fluency (Artifact 8), it would have been beneficial for him to have the opportunity to read with his peers. After participating in echo and choral reading, Fluency-Oriented Reading Instruction recommends having students partner read alternating pages of the text. During the echo reading, Jacob imitated my fluent reading to successfully read with expression. By providing Jacob with the opportunity to hear his peers read fluently, he would have additional opportunities to develop his fluency skills. In addition, Jacob has a difficult time engaging in conversations; therefore, a small group fluency lesson would also allow him develop his social skills and foster a positive relationship with his peers. Lastly, I would have changed the comprehension lesson post-assessment to an additional QRI assessment. While both assessments provided me with information to measure Jacob's reading abilities, I would have liked to have a similar pre and post-assessment for concrete data of Jacob's growth throughout the Case Study (Standard I, III, IV, V and VI).

In conclusion, Jacob demonstrates limited comprehension strategies and fluency skills, but he was able to further develop these skills throughout our two reading lessons. Jacob thrives off of direct instruction, teacher modeling, and clear expectations when learning new reading strategies. Jacob's reading skills should continue to grow throughout the years as he continues to develop and learn new reading strategies.

*pseudonym used

Works Cited

- Choral Reading / Classroom Strategies / Reading Rockets*. (n.d.). Retrieved November 2013, from
http://www.readingrockets.org/strategies/choral_reading/
- Common Core State Standards Initiative / Home*. (2014). Retrieved April 2014, from
<http://www.corestandards.org/>
- Dennis, D.V. (2009). "I'm Not Stupid": How Assessment Drives (In)Appropriate Reading Instruction. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 53 (4), 283-290.
- Duke, N.K., & Martin, N. M. (n.d.). *Comprehension Instruction: Research-Based Best Practices* (2nd ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Duke, N. K. (2013, January 14). Dr. Nell Duke Explaining What Good Readers Do. Retrieved from
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CgSRH0EYvhU>
- Dr. Neel Duke. Video: <https://d2l.msu.edu/d2l/le/content/96574/viewContent/774249/View>
- Gersten, R., Fuchs, L., Williams, J., & Baker, S. (2001). Teaching Reading Comprehension Strategies to Students With Learning Disabilities. *Review of Educational Research*, 71(2), 279-320.
- Kluth, P. (2003). *Supporting the Literacy Development of Students with Autism / Reading Rockets*. Retrieved from <http://www.readingrockets.org/article/36972>
- Leslie, L. & Caldwell, J.A. (2011). *Qualitative Reading Inventory: 5*. Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- McKenna, M. C. & Stahl, K. A. (2009). *Assessment for Reading Instruction Second Edition*. New York: Guilford Press.
- McLaughlin M. (2012). Reading Comprehension: What Every Teacher Needs to Know. *The Reading Teacher*, 65 (7), 432-439.
- Morrow, L. M., & Gambrell, L. B. (2011). *Best Practices in Literacy Instruction* (4th ed.). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Paige, D. D. (2011). "That Sounded Good!": Using Choral Reading to Improve Fluency. *The Reading Teacher*, 64(6), 435-438. Retrieved from
<https://d2l.msu.edu/d2l/le/content/96574/viewContent/548434/View>
- Samuels, J. S., & Farstrup, A. E. (2011). *What Research Has to Say About Reading Instruction* (4th ed.)