Janelle Mayes-Henry
November 22, 2015
TE 842 FS15

Analyzing Student Data – William

Based on the assessments provided, I will give my best recommendations for future

goals and instructional strategies that will help William, a second grader, meet specific Common

Core State Standards for his grade level.

The first assessment I was able to analyze was William's Informal Phonics Inventory that

was used from McKenna and Stahl's (2015) Informal Reading Assessment's book (p. 134). The

Informal Phonics Inventory measures "specific skill acquisition" to see "which areas to focus

instruction and to track progress as they learn specific skills" (McKenna and Stahl, 2015, p. 112-

113). Mastery of the skills will be 80% or better, review would be in the 60%-79% range, and

instructional support would fall below the 60% range (McKenna and Stahl, 2015, p. 130). The

Common Core State Standard that William needs to focus on achieving will be RF.2.3: "Know

and apply grade-level phonics and word analysis skills in decoding words" (Reading

Foundational Skills, 2015). William mastered Consonant Sounds and Consonant Digraphs. He

needs review on Beginning Consonant Blends and Diphthongs. William could really use

instructional support on the following: (1) Final Consonant Blends and *n*, (2) Short Vowels in

CVC words, (3) the Rule of Silent *e*, (4) Long Vowel Digraphs, and (5) *r*-Controlled Vowels and –

al.

Looking at William's Fry Sight Word Test of the First 100 Words that was used from

McKenna and Stahl he was able to get 95/100 words correct. The Fry Sight Word Test is

administered to "survey a child's ability to recognize 300 frequently occurring words" (150

McKenna and Stahl). The only thing William should focus on here is learning the last five words, which are: he, what, were, been, now, and find. After William masters this first list of 100 sight words, he can move on to list of the second 100 words.

William was given a spelling test using the words on the Elementary Spelling Inventory (ESI) assessment (McKenna and Stahl, 2015, p. 160). The ESI assesses which stage the student falls under and whether earlier or more advanced stages of spelling should be focused on. Out of the 10 words on the assessment that William completed, he only was able to spell 1 word correctly, which was "bed". According to the Feature Guide and the Qualitative Checklist on page 161-162 of McKenna and Stahl (2015), I would rate William in the early stage of the Letter Name – Alphabetic stage. RF.2.3 of the CCSS that was mentioned earlier will also be used as a guide on what William needs to focus on based on the results of this assessment.

The next assessment I took a look at was William's Narrative Informal Reading Inventory (IRI) titled, "The Bear and the Rabbit". The IRI measures and is assessed by a student's "accuracy of word recognition and success in answering comprehension questions posed orally by the teacher" (McKenna and Stahl, 2015, p.45). After assessing the IRI, the teacher should be able to see whether the reading abilities of the student falls under the independent, instructional, or frustration level. Further instructional strategies will then be used to focus on what the student needs to succeed in reading future academic leveled text. On the left side of the IRI William scored a 7/9 when answering the concept questions which showed that he was familiar with the some of the key concepts before he read the text. Although William's reading ranges put him at a third grade reading level, his comprehension was low based on the results of the total number of questions he answered correctly at the end. The Common Core State

Standard that William is to achieve during ELA for second grade is RL.2.4: "Read with sufficient accuracy and fluency to support comprehension" (Reading Foundational Skills, 2015). Based on the results of the IRI, William is not meeting this expectation of the state standard since he scored low on the comprehension questions. The standard calls for William to be able to read **AND** comprehend literature. He is able to read the selection, but his results show that the comprehension is not being met. Therefore, William needs to learn how to comprehend text during and after reading a selection.

Based on the evidence of all the assessments that were given, we know that William needs help in phonics and fluency. When reading the Language Arts Common Core Standards for second grade, it is important for William to be able to "Know and apply grade level phonics and word analysis skills in decoding words" (Reading Foundational Skills, 2015). Within the Reading Foundational Skills of RF.2.3, it has components a-f which all deal with phonics and word recognition such as; distinguish long and short vowels, decode words with prefixes and prefixes, and decode regularly spelled two-syllable words. Another Common Core State Standard William should focus on achieving is Fluency, RF.2.4. RF.2.4 reads, "Read with sufficient accuracy and fluency to support comprehension" (Reading Foundational Skills, 2015).

The Modified Cognitive Model used by Mckenna and Stahl (2015) shows how automatic word recognition, text comprehension, and strategic reading can impact reading comprehension for students (p.8). McKenna and Stahl (2015) mentioned that "A child will have difficulties with comprehension if he or she had difficulty with any of these three components" (pg.8). By looking at the cognitive model, a student can only have fluency in context if the student can decode words and be able to read sight words. In order to decode words and read

sight words, students need to have phonological awareness and understand the concepts of print. William was able to recognize most of Fry's First 100 sight words, but his spelling test results were less satisfactory. Since there is a problem with phonics then there is a breakdown in the fluency of the text. A break down in fluency affects his automatic word recognition which leads to a breakdown in understanding and answering comprehension questions dealing with text.

The first goal for William is to focus on Phonics / Word Recognition and Spelling. According to the results of Williams IPI, he was able to master his consonant sounds by scoring a 16/20 and consonant digraphs by scoring a 4/5 but every thing else posed as a problem for him. William needs to review his beginning consonant blends since he scored a 15/20 instead of a 16 or better to master it. He needs to review diphthongs as well since he scored a 4/6 instead of the 5. He scored only half for the following phonics subjects: final consonant blends and *ng* (6/12), the short vowel in CVC words (5/10) and the long vowel digraphs (5/10). The rule of silent *e* was a real big problem for him since he scored a 0/4. He had a low score for the r-Controlled Vowels and *–al* which was a 2/6. So it's safe to say that because of the results of William's IPI, he could use systematic instruction and review on most of the phonics that were tested.

On the ESI, William was able to correctly place the "b" and "d" in bed. He was not able to write the "e" in "when", the "u" in "lump", or the "o" in "shopping". He was, however, able to write "flot" for the word "float" which was one of the requirements to qualify for the middle of the Letter Name range. I think keeping him at the early stage is best since he did not master all of the requirements for the middle of the Alphabetic stage. He did however manage to

write his "p" backwards twice for the words "ship" and "lamp" but later on in the test he wrote it correctly for the words "place" and "shopping", so therefore, I know he hears and understands the sound of "p".

The spelling tests is another piece of evidence that phonics is an issue with William. When spelling the word "ship", William wrote, "siq". He missed the "/sh/" digraph and also the "/p/" sound. In "when", he missed the "/wh/" digraph and the "/e/" sound. In "lump", William wrote a "a" instead of a "u".

The second goal will be to focus on Fluency. On the Narrative IRI, William scored 3/4 for the explicit questions and 0/2 for the implicit questions. Overall, he scored 3/6 for the total questions answered correctly which puts him at the frustration level. His total accuracy was at the instructional level since he only had about 13 miscues, but his total acceptability put him at a frustration level since his 10 miscues changed the meaning of the words read in the passage. Also, we find that he reads 91 words per minute (WPM). By using the equation given on the same document, William's Correct Words Per Minute (CWPM) would be about 84.7 or 85 CWPM. Given these results and based off the Ranges of Oral Reading Rates, William is right above the reading range for second grade. His reading rate places him in the middle to upper range of the third grade reading level. As I mentioned before, even though William's reading ranges are high for his grade level, his fluency is causing a problem with how he comprehends the text.

One suggestion for phonics, word recognition, and spelling from McKenna and Stahl (2015) is making words (p. 125). "Making Words is a decoding activity where students learn to think about letters in words by manipulating letters in a spelling task (McKenna and Stahl, 2015,

p. 125). Through this activity, William will be able to see a scramble of letters he can use to make words ranging from two letters words or more. I chose this strategy for William because he will have to rely on sounding out each letter in the word he put together to see if the word makes sense. Making Words could be an activity used in centers. I would suggest putting this at the literacy center so that the whole class could engage in this activity so that William doesn't feel singled out. It would be important to differentiate the activity for William's group to make sure there aren't too many letters to start off with. Modeling and listing a few words would jump start William's thinking on how to make words from the letters given.

Another instructional strategy to increase William's phonic skills would be a letter-sound matching activity suggested by the Florida Center for Reading Research (November 24, 2015). This activity will require William to match initial, medial, and final phonemes to graphemes. William would be able to use both picture and letter cards to say the initial, medial, or final sound of the picture and match it to the letter it corresponds with. I like this activity for William because it could be an independent or partner activity that could be completed in centers to increase literacy skills. The activity also comes with a student record sheet that could be filed away and used to monitor Williams progress as he increases his phonics skills.

In order to increase William's fluency, I suggest the English Language Arts (ELA) instruction to include Fluency Development Lessons (FDL). FDL is where the teacher will read a short passage to the students 2-3 times making sure to discuss the meaning of the text and quality of oral reading, then allow students to partner up and read the selection to each other, and lastly the teacher and students together choose words from the text for word study and analysis (Gambrell and Morrow, 2015, p.274). By using this strategy, William will have the

teacher and classmates as models to guide his reading while he still learning phonics skills. This strategy would go well while there is a 90 block of ELA instruction in the classroom.

Another fluency activity for William would be Fast Phrases from the Florida Center for Reading Research (November 24, 2015). In Fast Phrases, there are flash cards with phrases on them. If William correctly says the phrases, then he will place those flash cards in the "yes" pile, but if he says the phrases incorrectly, they must go into the "no" pile. A record form accompanies this game that will allow William to keep track how many phrases he gets correct, per minute, each time he completes this activity. The record form could be filed and stored away for future references on whether William's rate of fluency has increased or not. This activity would go will in a center activity as well. I would suggest this be a group activity so that someone else can monitor William's reading in order to make sure the phrases are being read correctly.

References

English Language Arts Standards » Reading: Foundational Skills » Grade 2. Retrieved November 25, 2015, from http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/RF/2/

Gambrell, L. (2015). *Best practices in literacy instruction* (Fifth ed.). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

McKenna, M., & Stahl, K. (2015). *Assessment for reading instruction* (Third ed.). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Student Center Activities, Grades 2-3. Retrieved November 25, 2015, from http://www.fcrr.org/curriculum/studentCenterActivities23.shtm

Phonics Inventory: /content/US15/TE/842/US15-TE-842-733-97FDNY-EL-14-815/Phonics_inventory.pdf

IRI, Level One: /content/US15/TE/842/US15-TE-842-733-97FDNY-EL-14-815/William_IRI_LevelOne.pdf

Sight Word Inventory: /content/US15/TE/842/US15-TE-842-733-97FDNY-EL-14-815/William_sight_word_inventory.pdf

Spelling Inventory: /content/US15/TE/842/US15-TE-842-733-97FDNY-EL-14-815/William_spelling_inventory.pdf

William, QRI Fluency Norms: /content/US15/TE/842/US15-TE-842-733-97FDNY-EL-14-815/William_QRI_5_Fluency_Norms.pdf