Analyzing Student Data

Jessica Mills

Michigan State University

TE 842: Elementary Reading Assessment and Instruction

William's Analysis

Analysis of Assessment Data

The first assessment that was given to 2nd Grader William, was called the Phonics Inventory. The Phonics Inventory Assessment was used to measure William's development of decoding skills, and will help the teacher monitor what specific skills need to be targeted in the students literacy instruction (Stahl, Flanigan, & McKenna, 2020, p. 113). The Phonics Inventory is separated into 9 subtests. When reviewing William's assessment data, I noticed that the first two subtests, Consonant Sounds and Consonant Digraphs, he scored at the Mastery Level, which does not mean he needs systematic instruction in those areas. After that, William seemed to struggle with the subtests that followed. For Beginning Consonant Blends and Diphthongs, William scored between 60-79% meaning he would need some review with those skills. The skills that William seemed to struggle the most with, and would require systematic instruction were Final Consonant Blends, Short Vowels in CVC Words, The Rule of Silent e, Long Vowel Digraphs, and R-Controlled Vowels. When adding up all of William's scores, I found that he scored a 57/93 putting him at 61% overall. This tells me that William is missing some of these key decoding skills he needs to become a fluent reader. According to the Common Core State Standards, by the end of second grade, William should be able to "Distinguish long and short vowels when reading regularly spelled one-syllable words" (National Governors Association, 2010, CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RF.2.3.A). He is not meeting grade-level expectations in this area. Therefore, instruction should be targeted in this area to meet grade level expectations.

The second assessment that was given to William was the Fry Sight-Word Inventory. The Fry Sight-Word Inventory measures the amount of high-frequency words a student can read immediately at sight. Recognizing words "at-sight" means that the child can recognize and read

the word in 1 second or less and is normally shown by the teacher on a flashcard or electronic device (Stahl, et. al, 2020, p. 101). Out of the 100 words given to William, he was able to read 95 of the words correctly. According to the Common Core State Standards, by the end of second grade, William should be able to "Recognize and read grade-level appropriate irregularly spelled words" (National Governors Association, 2010, CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RF.2.3.F). He is meeting grade-level expectations in this area. The five words that William read incorrectly were "what," "were," "been," "now," and "find." All five words that William read incorrectly, the words that he did say instead were very similar to the word he read incorrect. For example, William read the word "find" as "friend." This tells me that William recognizes the beginning and ending sounds but did not recognize the correct word at sight. Because of William's high score on the First 100 Words List, I would recommend giving the Second 100 Word List to William to see if he can master that list, or needs to focus on practicing some of these next 100 sight words.

The third assessment that was given to William was the Spelling Inventory. The Spelling Inventory informs the teacher of what spelling stage the child is in and measures the specific word features that need to be reviewed or taught (Stahl, et. al, 2020, pg. 125). When looking at William's spelling, I found that out of the ten words, William was consistently able to spell the beginning and ending sounds for each word. Out of the ten words, William was able to write the correct vowel for 7 of the words. This tells me William has a pretty good idea of his consonant and vowel sounds when spelling words. After reviewing his assessment, I would review vowel patterns and vowel teams with William. In the words "float" and "train" William was able to write the correct vowel but did not write the correct vowel teams "oa" and "ai" in each of these words. According to the Common Core State Standards, by the end of second grade, William should be able to "know spelling-sound correspondences for additional common vowel teams" (National Governors

Association, 2010, CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RF.2.3.B). He is not meeting grade-level expectations in this area. Therefore, instruction should be targeted in this area to meet grade-level expectations. In addition, the words "ship" and "trash" William was unsuccessful in spelling the "sh" digraph. Once long and short vowels are mastered, I would work on practicing digraphs with William.

The final, and most telling assessment that was given to William was the Informal Reading Inventory (IRI). An IRI is a passage followed by comprehension questions and a retelling scoring guide that helps determine a child's reading fluency. After the child reads the passage, the teacher can determine if it is the child's independent, instructional, or frustration level. The teacher can determine this level by the scores the child receives on the accuracy of word recognition and success in answering the comprehension questions. When reviewing William's IRI, I first counted the number of miscues he had, to find his overall accuracy of the passage. I found that William had a total of 12 miscues, which puts him at the instructional level for accuracy. Next, I examined William's retelling and comprehension questions. William's retelling ability seemed to be extremely limited. Out of the 31 ideas, William was only able to retell 4 ideas, and may have benefited from question probes. When looking over the comprehension questions, William was able to answer 3 out of the 4 explicit questions correctly, and 0 out of the 2 comprehension questions were answered correctly. Because William was only able to answer 3 of the comprehension questions correctly and had trouble with his ability to retell important details of the story, this puts him at a frustration level for comprehension. When thinking about William's accuracy and comprehension scores together, I found that he was unable to successfully read this passage at an instructional level. He had several miscues and his overall rate of 91 WPM was slow, making it difficult to retell and overall comprehend the story.

Goals For Instruction

Goal 1: The first goal that I have for William based on the assessments described above, would be to improve his overall fluency. If a student is not reading fluently, comprehension is usually impacted (Stahl, et. al, 2020, pg. 13). His low fluency became apparent when looking over his IRI assessment. According to the Common Core State Standards, by the end of second grade, William should be able to "Use context to confirm or self-correct word recognition and understanding, rereading as necessary" (National Governors Association, 2010, CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RF.2.4.C). He is not meeting grade-level expectations in this area. Therefore, instruction should be targeted in this area to meet grade-level expectations. William's retelling abilities and comprehension was low, making it apparent that he was not fluently reading the text, and in-turn, not comprehending what he was reading. William did not reread or self-correct often, and his miscues did affect the meaning of the text. Therefore, I think he would benefit from practicing self-monitoring and rereading to comprehend the text. If he can practice this skill, I think it would help his comprehension and overall fluency.

Goal 2: The second goal that I have for William based on the assessments described above, would be to improve his decoding skills. One assessment where this challenge became apparent, was William's Phonics Inventory. I noticed in his phonics inventory, one subtest he struggled with was Final Consonant Blends. William was unable to read the word "limp" which is a word that can easily be decoded and read if the student knows their letter sounds. This tells me that William is lacking some decoding skills that could help him with his overall fluency. Another assessment where decoding seemed to be difficult for William was in his Informal Reading Inventory Passage. When William was reading a word like "father" he pronounced the word "fat-her." This miscue

tells me he is aware of the two syllables in the word but is missing the "th" sound that is made in the word "father." According to the Common Core State Standards, by the end of second grade, William should be able to "know and apply grade-level phonics and word analysis skills in decoding words" (National Governors Association, 2010, CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RF.2.3)." When observing his assessments, it is apparent that William needs additional support in decoding. When he can improve his decoding abilities, I think it will help his overall fluency immensely. It is extremely important for William's fluency to improve, for his overall reading comprehension to improve.

Instructional Strategies

Instructional Strategy Goal 1 (Course Text): The first goal I have for William is to work on his overall fluency. For children making progress when striving for proficiency, fluency activities are extremely important during their instructional time (Stahl, et. al, 2020, pg. 160). The first instructional strategy I would conduct with William would be having him participate in a play or reader's theater activity. William, along with his classmates, would have a part to act out in the play, requiring him to practice his parts by reading the text repeatedly, until he can reach a desired level of fluency. It is recommended that students with lower reading fluency, are assigned to more substantial roles and have adequate practice. I selected this strategy for William because it would help his overall fluency when reading aloud and would also be an engaging activity he can participate in with his peers. Because he would be practicing his parts many times, I would expect William to improve his reading fluency. (Stahl, et. al, 2020, pg. 166).

Instructional Strategy Goal 1 (My Own Resource): Another instructional strategy I would have William try to improve his fluency, would be an activity from The Florida Center For Reading and

Research called "Digraph and Diphthong Dash." I selected this strategy because his Phonics Inventory Assessment told me he needed systematic instruction with digraphs and needed to review diphthongs. I would implement this strategy by placing the digraph-diphthong practice sheets in front of William. William and I would take turns reading the sounds aloud to each other. Then, I would time William to see how many sounds he can read in one minute. After one minute is up, William will try to read the sounds again, focusing on increasing his speed and accuracy. The objective of this strategy is for William to gain speed and accuracy in recognizing letter sounds, which will improve his overall fluency.

Instructional Strategy Goal 2 (Course Text): The second goal I have for William is to work on his decoding skills. The ability to decode requires the knowledge of the processes involved in decoding and knowing specific letter-sound relationships (Stahl, et. al, 2020, pg. 14). The first instructional strategy I would conduct with William would be a word sort. First, I would present William with a variety of words on notecards. Based off his Phonics Inventory Assessment, I would pick a group of words with short vowels in CVC words, words that have the rule of silent e, and words with long vowel digraphs. He scored low in these areas on this assessment, so I would use these words to help him with these skills along with decoding. I would implement this strategy by modeling how certain cards would go in certain columns and explain spelling pattern or rule. Then, I would have William try sorting the cards on his own. I selected this strategy for William because it would help William's ability to read words that have spelling patterns, he already has trouble with, and would require him to decode each word in order to sort it. This activity also gives William the opportunity to practice decoding skills in a verbal and hands-on way. (Stahl, et. al, 2020, pg. 129).

Instructional Strategy Goal 2 (My Own Resource): Another instructional strategy I would have William try to improve his decoding skills, would be an activity from the Florida Center for Reading and Research called "Word Spinners." I selected this strategy for William because his Phonics Inventory Assessment told me he needed systematic instruction with final consonant blends. I would implement this strategy by placing two spinners in front of William: Final Consonant Blends Spinner and Initial Sounds Spinner. William would spin both spinners and combine both sets of letters together by writing the word in the corresponding final consonant blends on their recording sheet. If the word is a nonsense word, William would cross the word out. I selected this strategy for William because it would assist William in his struggles with final consonant blends and would also help William to practice his blending and segmenting skills. This activity also gives William the opportunity to practice his decoding skills in a hands-on way and could also be played with a partner.

Sarah's Analysis

Analysis of Assessment Data

The first assessment that was given to 4th Grader Sarah, was called the Spelling Inventory. Because Sarah is at a higher reading level than William, it was not necessary for Sarah to be given a Phonics Inventory or Fry Sight-Word Inventory. Like explained previously, the Spelling Inventory informs the teacher of what spelling stage the child is in and measures the specific word features that need to be reviewed or taught (Stahl, et. al, 2020, pg. 125). When looking at Sarah's spelling, I found that there was only one word she spelled incorrectly because she forgot the "oa" vowel team in the word "throat." According to the Common Core State Standards, Sarah is able to "Use combined knowledge of all letter-sound correspondences, syllabication patterns, and morphology to spell accurately unfamiliar multisyllabic words in context and out of context" (National Governors Association, 2010, CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RF.4.3.A). She is meeting grade-level expectations in this area. Therefore, instruction does not need to be targeted in this area. Most words she spelled incorrectly were words that could not be spelled based off of sound. Therefore, these words become sight words, which means they are words she will have to memorize. Another thing I noticed is that Sarah sometimes uses capital letters in the middle of the word, so this could be an area that may need to be targeted for instruction.

The second assessment that was given to Sarah, was called the QRI. This QRI was a narrative reading passage that requires Sarah to retell the story after reading it, and answer comprehension questions. After looking over Sarah's data, I can tell if this her independent, instructional, or frustration level. I can determine this level by the scores the child receives on the accuracy of word recognition and the success in answering the comprehension questions. When reviewing Sarah's QRI, I found that this student has good background knowledge on the topics

covered in the narrative passage. She also can make a sensible prediction as to what the narrative may be about. Next, I calculated the rate at which she read, and found that she read 71 words per minute. This means that she is reading at a good rate for her grade-level. Next, I counted the number of miscues to find her overall accuracy. Sarah had a total of 11 miscues which puts her at an instructional level. It is important to note that 3 out of her 11 miscues were not meaning-change miscues and would not affect her overall comprehension of the text. Next, I reviewed Sarah's retelling ability and found that she recalled 4 ideas of the 47 total ideas. She may have benefited from question probes when retelling the story. Lastly, I reviewed Sarah's comprehension questions. There were a total of 8 comprehension questions: 4 explicit questions and 4 implicit questions. Sarah answered all 4 explicit questions correctly and answered 2 implicit questions correctly. This means that she answered 6 of the 8 comprehensions correctly, putting her at an instructional level. For Sarah's grade-level, she should be at a level "S" by the end of 4th Grade. Because she is instructional at a level "P" this means she is reading three levels below her grade-level. According to the Common Core State Standards, Sarah is unable to "read grade-level text with purpose and understanding" (National Governors Association, 2010, CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RF.4.4.A). One thing that Sarah can work on improving is trying to provide a deeper understanding of the text when answering implicit questions. She does a great job with the explicit questions but can work on having a deeper understanding of what is happening in the story.

The last assessment that was given to Sarah, was another QRI. Instead of giving Sarah another narrative passage, she was now given a more difficult QRI passage that was expository. When going up or down levels with the QRI assessment, it is helpful to switch genres to get a more accurate reading level. As described in the paragraph above, the QRI assessment helps the teacher understand the students' independent, instructional, or frustration level. When reviewing Sarah's

expository QRI, I found that Sarah has some background knowledge on topics addressed in the passage, but it does seem to be limited. Therefore, background knowledge could be an area of improvement for Sarah. Next, I calculated the rate at which she read, and found that she read 75 words per minute. This means that she is reading at a good rate for her grade-level. Next, I counted the number of miscues to find her overall accuracy. Sarah had a total of 8 miscues which puts her at an instructional level. It is important to note that 2 out of her 8 miscues were not meaning-change miscues and would not affect her overall comprehension of the text. Next, I reviewed Sarah's retelling ability and found that she recalled 3 ideas of the 57 total ideas. She may have benefited from question probes when retelling the story and may have had some trouble with the vocabulary in the passage. Lastly, I reviewed Sarah's comprehension questions. There were a total of 8 questions: 4 explicit questions and 4 implicit questions. Sarah answered 3 of the explicit questions correctly and answered 2 implicit questions correctly. This means that she answered 5 of the 8 comprehensions questions correctly, putting her at the frustration level for comprehension. For Sarah's grade-level, she should be at a level "S" by the end of 4th Grade. Because she is instructional at a level "Q" this means she is reading 2 levels below her grade-level. According to the Common Core State Standards, Sarah is unable to "read grade-level text with purpose and understanding" (National Governors Association, 2010, CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RF.4.4.A). One thing that Sarah can work on improving is trying to improve her background knowledge and overall vocabulary to find a deeper understanding of the passage.

Goals For Instruction

Goal 1: The first goal that I have for Sarah based on the assessments described above, would be to improve her decoding ability. Children who have trouble learning decoding skills, may rely on

context to help them identify words (Stahl, et. al, 2020, pg. 12). Her trouble with decoding skills became apparent when looking over her both the narrative and expository QRI assessments. In her first IRI Narrative Assessment, I noticed how Sarah misread the word "frontier" by saying the word "fronter." Sarah did not notice the irregular vowel pattern "ie" in the word, resulting in her missing the long "e" sound in would make in the word. In her second QRI Expository Assessment, I noticed how Sarah segmented, or broke the word apart by its phonemes, to read the word "locomotive." Sarah read the word as "lo-co-mo-tive" proving she can easily break the word into its phonemes but may need some practicing blending the word back together. Lastly, I noticed that Sarah read the word "valve" with a long "a" sound pronouncing it "vail-v." Sarah read the word with a long "a" sound when there were no vowel patterns or teams that would tell her to read it that way. According to the Common Core State Standards, by the end of fourth grade, Sarah should be able to "Use combined knowledge of all letter-sound correspondences, syllabication patterns, and morphology, to read accurately unfamiliar multisyllabic words in context and out of context." (National Governors Association, 2010, CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RF.4.3.A). After looking over her two QRI assessments, I found that she is not meeting grade-level expectations in this area. Therefore, instruction should be targeted in this area to meet grade-level expectations. I think she would benefit from practicing decoding skills such as blending, to better comprehend the text. If she can practice these skills, I think it would help her fluency and overall reading comprehension.

Goal 2: The second goal that I have for Sarah based on the assessments described above, would be to improve her vocabulary. Vocabulary knowledge is a key element to reading comprehension and must be assessed in order to provide instruction (Stahl, et. al, 2020, pg. 171). According to the assessments taken, Sarah's vocabulary knowledge seemed to lack the most in her QRI Expository Assessment. This passage told Sarah information about early railroads in the 1800's. I noticed

throughout the passage, Sarah had trouble seeing a number or date, and understanding how it should be read. For example, the date "1840" Sarah read "one thousand, eight hundred, and forty)." This miscue is important to note because it not only would change the meaning of the sentence, but it is also an important date for Sarah to understand the timeline of the events throughout the passage. Another example is when Sarah saw the number "3,000" in the passage and read it "three hundred." This miscue changed the meaning of the sentence from three thousand railroad tracks in the United States, to three hundred railroad tracks in the United States. Because this is an expository passage, telling real facts and information about railroads, this miscue is misleading and overall, false. According to the Common Core State Standards, by the end of fourth grade, Sarah should be able to "Determine the meaning of general academic and domain-specific words or phrases in a text relevant to a grade 4 topic or subject area" (National Governors Association, 2010, CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RI.4.4). After looking over her expository QRI assessment, I found that she is not meeting grade-level expectations in this area. Therefore, instruction should be targeted in this area to meet grade-level expectations. Miscues with vocabulary can have a large impact on the students reading comprehension of the passage. I think Sarah would benefit from expanding her knowledge of historical dates, locations such as states and countries, and her overall vocabulary. If she can practice these skills, I think it would help her oral language comprehension, and overall reading comprehension.

Instructional Strategies

Instructional Strategy Goal 1 (Course Text): The first goal I have for Sarah is to work on her decoding ability. The first instructional strategy I would conduct with Sarah would be word sorts. First, I would present Sarah with a variety of words on notecards. Based off her Spelling Inventory

assessment, I would include words in the word sort with both irregular and regular spelling patterns. Because of her age and abilities, I would make the sort an "open sort" meaning Sarah can sort the words in groups based off commonalities in words that she notices. I would implement this strategy by modeling how certain cards would go in certain columns. Then, I would have Sarah try sorting the cards on her own. I selected this strategy for Sarah because it allows her to practice decoding skills by reading each word, finding the regular or irregular spelling pattern, and reflect on which grouping the word would go in. (Stahl, et. al, 2020, pg. 129).

Instructional Strategy Goal 1 (My Own Resource): Another instructional strategy I would have Sarah try to improve her decoding skills, would be an activity from The Florida Center For Reading and Research called "Domino Duo." I selected this strategy for Sarah because her Spelling Inventory assessment and QRI assessments told me she needed support with variant correspondences in words. I would implement this strategy by giving Sarah the domino cards on a flat surface. Sarah would pick up the "start" domino and place it down. Then Sarah and I would take turns finding dominoes that have the same underlined consonant sounds, making sure to read the word aloud, and connecting it to the end of the previous domino. We would continue this process until all the dominos are used. I selected this strategy for Sarah because it would assist her in her struggles with her decoding skills, specifically segmenting and blending words. This activity also gives Sarah the opportunity to participate in a hands-on activity with the teacher or another student.

Instructional Strategy Goal 2 (Course Text): The second goal I have for Sarah is to work on expanding her vocabulary knowledge. Students require multiple different exposures to vocabulary words throughout units (Stahl, et. al, 2020, pg. 191). The first instructional strategy I would conduct with Sarah would be giving her question banks to support her in answering questions

about key concepts and ideas. First, I would present Sarah with a vocabulary word bank. We would

read the words together, and I would remind her that she will read these words in the text. After

reading, I would ask Sarah a focus question and provide her with a vocabulary bank that includes

general academic vocabulary words and terms that represent important concepts from the reading.

This could be a verbal or written activity for Sarah. After answering the questions using the

vocabulary bank, I would give Sarah feedback on her responses. I selected this strategy for Sarah

because I think it would be a wonderful way for her to practice key vocabulary words in the text.

I would intentionally read the words in the bank before reading, to get her exposed to vocabulary

words she may be unfamiliar with. In her QRI Expository passage, having already known how to

read the date "1840" may have helped her overall fluency and comprehension of the text. (Stahl,

et. al, 2020, pg. 188).

Instructional Strategy Goal 2 (My Own Resource): Another instructional strategy I would have

Sarah try to improve her vocabulary knowledge, would be an activity from the Florida Center for

Reading and Research called "Context Clues." I selected this strategy for Sarah because her QRI

assessments told me she needed support with her vocabulary knowledge and could use assistance

using context clues to find meaning. Sarah would start the activity by placing the header cards

across the top of her desk: Definition, Synonym, Antonym, Example, and General. Then, Sarah

would draw a card from the deck, read the card, look at the underlined word, and decide what type

of context clue is used to assist with understanding the meaning of the word. Lastly, Sarah would

place the card under the correct header. I selected this strategy for Sarah because it would assist

her in her struggles with vocabulary. This activity also encourages Sarah to increase her

understanding of synonyms and antonyms and forces her to use the context clues to comprehend

the overall meaning of the sentence. This activity also gives Sarah the opportunity to work hands

on with a partner.

References

Bear, D. R., Invernizzi, M., Johnston, F., & Templeton, S. (2019). *Words their way: Word study for phonics, vocabulary, and spelling* (7th ed.). New York: Pearson.

Fourth and Fifth Grade. (n.d.). https://www.fcrr.org/student-center-activities/fourth-and-fifth-grade

Leslie, L., & Caldwell, J.S. (2010). *Qualitative Reading Inventory* (5th ed.). New York: Pearson.

National Governors Association. (2010). *Common Core State Standards.* Washington, DC.

Second and Third Grade. (n.d.). https://www.fcrr.org/student-center-activities/second-and-third-grade

Stahl, K. A. D., Flanigan, K., & McKenna, M. C. (2020). *Assessment for reading instruction* (4th ed.). New York: Guilford.