

Analysis of Assessment Data

Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI)

The Qualitative Reading Inventory is a subset of the Informal Reading Inventory assessment. It is used to assess a student's independent reading level: frustration, instructional, or independent (McKenna & Stahl, 2015, p.46). William was tested on four sections: concept questions, narrative, retelling, and post-narrative questioning. The administrator assesses all sections of the assessment and provides a grade for each one. At the independent reading level, students should be able to read without assistance; instructional would include minimal to moderate support; and at a frustration level, the student will most likely not be able to complete the text without instructor support through the majority of the text (McKenna & Stahl, 2015, p.46).

In analyzing William's data, he was considered to be familiar with the vocabulary/background knowledge pertaining to the narrative content. After reading the narrative, I calculated a total of 13 miscues with five meaning-change miscues. This means that five of the miscues he made change the meaning of the intended passage. Tallying his score, William's accuracy (miscues) and acceptability (meaning-change miscues) place him at an instructional level for this grade one passage. Overall, he was speaking around 91 words per minute, with the correct words per minute averaging at 84.7. William's score has placed him at an oral reading rate of that of a grade three student. For retelling, he was able to recall four out of thirty-one ideas and answer two out of six questions correctly (frustration level) in the post-narrative questioning section. Because of his background knowledge/vocabulary and his strong sight-word inventory, they helped diminish the amount of miscues and increased his accuracy. As William was able to retell the beginning of the story, he only briefly shared one point of information from the beginning, two events from the middle, and one resolution from the end of the story. A majority of details were missing. According to Wright (2015), passage comprehension can be measured based on the details that the student includes in the beginning, middle, and end of the story. Due to the lack of details that William provided in the retell section, William seems to be struggling with text comprehension. Additionally, McKenna and Stahl (2015), mention that fluency affects comprehension. If William is struggling with fluency, comprehension will suffer as a result. This is further enforced by William answering two out of six questions correctly on the post-narrative questioning.

Elementary Spelling Inventory (ESI)

The Elementary Spelling Inventory is used to measure a student's spelling development through a list of 25 pre-selected words. After assessment, the instructor will be able to determine the student's spelling stage of development. McKenna & Stahl (2015) state that the words are arranged beginning from easy and then increase in difficulty (p. 160). William was administered the first ten words of the ESI. On all words, he was able to correctly identify the first consonant. For three out of the ten words, he identified the blends that were within the word (for lump, he wrote letter "p" backwards so I did not count that as correct blend identification). The three blends were at the beginning. The other words he would be placed in the middle letter name category (ship and bed) and early emergent (drive). For words such as when, bright, and shopping, he only correctly identified the beginning consonant. Looking at *Spelling Stage Expectations by Grade* in McKenna & Stahl (2015) on page 159, William should be "Late Within Word Pattern" since this assessment was given at the end of second grade. This is the "end-of-the-year" spelling goal. However, the range for this grade can extend from Late Letter Name to Early Syllables and Affixes. Judging from William's data, he is in lower half of the middle to late letter name stage.

Informal Phonics Inventory

The Informal Phonics Inventory is used to assess knowledge of phonics (letter-sound relationship). It assesses the following phonics sections: consonant sounds, consonant digraphs, beginning consonant blends, final consonant blends and ng, short vowels in CVC words, the rules of silent e, long vowel digraphs, diphthongs, and r-controlled vowels and -al. (McKenna & Stahl, 2015, p. 130). As stated in William's data, he has reached the mastery level of consonant sounds and digraphs. A review of consonant blends is needed and beginning with final consonant blends and ng and all sections thereafter, systemic instruction is needed. A total score of 57 out of 93 requires review, but because William is very close to the threshold of review and systemic instruction, systemic instruction should be considered.

Fry Sight-Word Inventory

The Fry Sight-Word Inventory measures a child's recognition of the top 300 (100 for William) high-frequency words that appear most commonly throughout English texts (McKenna & Stahl, 2015, p. 150). William scored a 94 out of 100. Looking at William's incorrect responses, he is able to pronounce the beginning conso-

nants correctly, but seems to not to be able to pronounce the rime. His Elementary Spelling Inventory produced similar results.

Summary

William is a second, soon to be third grade student who possesses a good amount of background knowledge, but is having trouble retelling and answering questions after the story is told. His answers were short and lacked detail. Also, some of his answers in the questioning were either incomplete or one-word sentences. At a first grade reading level, he is in need of instructional support. William will need to learn how to develop his own comprehension strategies. When looking at the CCSS standards in fluency for grade two, William needs to be able to “read with sufficient accuracy and fluency to support comprehension” (Common Core State Standards, 2019). For now, he is not meeting the grade two expectations.

William is in the middle to late letter name spelling stage. He is able to recognize beginning consonants and some beginning blends, but is unable to identify long vowels and digraphs. With more practice, William should continue to work on digraphs and ending blends. In accordance with Common Core State Standards (2019), William should be able to “decode regularly spelled two-syllable words with long vowels.” William is slightly below this standard.

William has a strong grasp of beginning consonant sounds, digraphs, and blends. When looking past the beginning sounds, we find William will need instructional support for more than several areas. Because final consonant blends and -ng follow beginning consonant blends, it’s imperative to focus on this section first.

Finally, William is able to identify the majority of high-frequency words, but he often relies on the beginning sounds or parts of a word in attempts to identify it. William should be able to “know and apply grade-level phonics and word analysis skills in decoding words” (Common Core State Standards, 2019). William should work to improve his decoding skills in order to sound out/pronounce words that are unfamiliar to him.

Goals for Instruction

Goal 1: Decoding

In choosing Pathway 1: Automatic Word Recognition to be the most suitable path William should embark on, improving his decoding and sight word knowledge is the first goal in guiding him towards achieving automatic word recognition. William must have knowledge of the specific letter-sound relationships. (Mckenna

& Stahl, 2015, p. 13). In decoding, William should be able to sound out the words he sees, followed by being able to blend them together. For example: /sh/ /i/ /p/ — ship. Ehri's (1998) model of successive decoding consists of three parts:

1. acquisition of the alphabetic principle
 2. the ability to blend letter-sounds into words
 3. the ability to use both phonograms (rimes: after the onset or beginning of a word) and analogies.
- (p. 13)

In order for William to move to automatic word recognition, he first must surpass the controlled word recognition which is seen in Spear-Swerling and Sternberg's stage model (McKenna & Stahl, 2015, p. 5). This stage is described as a student being an accurate reader but nonautomatic word reader which impedes reading comprehension (Spear-Swerling & Sternberg, 1996). According to his QRI and Fry Sight-Word Inventory, William is reading fairly accurately, but because his word recognition is nonautomatic, it is causing the miscues and lack of comprehension after the story is read. With the Elementary Spelling Inventory and Informal Phonics Inventory, William is having a difficult time blending letter-sounds into words along with being able to use phonograms. Phonograms or rimes are typically the string of letters that follow an initial vowel. Additionally, as William is approaching third grade, it is necessary to improve his multisyllabic word decoding. This includes morphemes which are prefixes, suffixes, and roots (Gambrell & Morrow, 2014, p. 172). McCutchen, Green, and Abbott (2008) state that morphemes add to students' decoding skills. Nagy and Anderson also support this claim that understanding morphology and their relationships would allow a student to expand their decoding and thus comprehension skills (Gambrell & Morrow, 2014, p. 172). Gambrell & Morrow (2014) also do not hesitate to remind us of the emphasis that the CCSS place on decoding especially in grades three through five (p. 173).

Goal 2: Fluency

Next, I would like to improve William's fluency as that is the next step on the path towards automatic word recognition. McKenna and Stahl (2015) make mention of the fact that if a student has poor decoding skills or an inadequate sight vocabulary, fluency will be negatively impacted (p. 170). William's lack of fluency is causing more of his focus to be put towards stopping, sounding out, and guessing at words. Thus, when it has come time to retell or comprehend a story, he is unable to provide the needed details due to his focus being not on comprehension, but on decoding. In order for students to be fluent, they must possess the decoding skills and

competent sight vocabulary. In order to reach fluent reading, the reading must be accurate, automatic, and with prosody (McKenna & Stahl, 2015, p. 163). This is why I feel the need for William's decoding skills to first be managed and improved before moving on to his fluency. Gradually, as his decoding skills improve, his fluency skills will naturally progress. It's crucial and advantageous for William if the process of automatic word recognition is natural for him. Less struggle could also contribute to an increase in key motivations to read: interest, confidence, and dedication. The CCSS presents challenging texts and these motivations are what students will need to be successful at tackling them (Gambrell & Morrow, 2014, p. 62-63).

As the data available did not inform me of William's prosody, I would hope to eventually gather data on this as well. Prosody can also provide evidence of comprehension (Gambrell & Morrow, 2014, p. 270). I can see that his automaticity (Fry Sight-Word Inventory) requires minimal instruction due his ability to score 94 out of 100, but his QRI shows that he is not proficient in accuracy; having an instructional level of miscues. Inaccuracy affects text comprehension (McKenna & Stahl, 2015, p. 163). This could be partly responsible for his lack of details given during his retelling and short, one-word and incomplete answers given in the post-narrative questioning. Furthermore, fluency is a major strand of the CCSS for grade two. One of the requirements for grade two students is to be able to "read with sufficient accuracy and fluency to support comprehension" (Common Core State Standards). The CCSS standard of fluency is also highlighted as a foundational skill and central to literary curriculums throughout elementary schools in the United States (Gambrell & Morrow, 2014, p. 268). Fluency is not something can be solved by simply repeating text over and over again as many may claim. There are a myriad of strategies to help increase fluency.

Instructional Strategies

Goal 1: Strategy 1

In order to assist William in his decoding strategies which help to promote comprehension, I would like to start "synthetic phonics" with him. Synthetic Phonics teaches students letter sounds and once they have mastered those individual sounds, they are taught the typical blends to form words (McKenna & Stahl, 2015, p. 123). Focusing on William's Elementary Spelling Inventory and Informal Phonics Inventory, they show that he has still has room to develop his phonics skills. When being told to pronounce or spell a word, he is unsure of some of the individual phonemes and blends that comprise words. If he is in need of systemic instruction in the

basic building blocks of phonics, he will struggle to decode and eventually comprehend words. McKenna and Stahl (2015) offer their own method using the short vowel “e.” Using William’s data as an example, I see on his Informal Phonics Inventory that he received a six out of ten on “final consonant blends and ng.” Because there are many ending blends, I would start by writing one or two on the board such as -sk and -sp. On the board or using notecards, I could then write the words “mask” and “wasp.” After having practiced the blends, I would provide other additional words that have the same ending blends and ask William to sort them into their appropriate categories. Finally, we would practice reviewing the words. Once William is able to recognize those individual sounds and blends, he will be able to decode a word he sees and be able to pronounce it without hesitation. With less focus being dedicated to decoding, his comprehension increases and more effort can be put towards discussing and retelling a story after it is read.

Goal 1: Strategy 2

Another activity that I would like William to do with me in order to assist in his decoding skills comes from the Florida Center for Reading Research. It is a phonics, letter-sound correspondence activity called, “Change My Word.” William’s Informal Phonics Inventory and Elementary Spelling Inventory demonstrate that he needs support in developing his phonics. This is a great activity because it combines not only working with the beginning sounds and blends that William has excelled in, but the rimes that he is unable to pronounce and/or spell. He will make words through these combinations. One can use individual stacks of pictures, onsets, and rimes. This can be done individually, with the teacher or a buddy. William will say what the picture is and then can be assisted by his partner to choose the correct onset, rime, or both (Florida Center for Reading Research, 2019). He will receive more practice, reinforcing his phonics skills.

Goal 2: Strategy 1

The first strategy that I would like to carry out to encourage William’s fluency is partnered reading. There are numerous methods for increasing fluency, but I’ve chosen this one for that fact that William will be able to work with a partner, taking turns to read the text. I can’t make a judgment about William’s motivation based on the available data, but I feel that giving William a chance to work with another struggling reader or someone who is able to offer the support he needs will boost his attitude and outlook on his reading ability. Also, William could get the chance to be a problem solver as there may be another struggling reader partnered

with him (McKenna & Stahl, 2015, p. 173). Each person in the group has a responsibility and there is no time to be lax. As suggested by McKenna & Stahl (2015), I would choose a text that is both short and interesting. Because I know William is able to handle a challenge, I would prefer to have his partner and him read a text that is slightly above their instructional reading level. This is where their problem solver duties come into place. The more and varied chances William has to practice, the more he will become familiar with different genre vocabularies and high-frequency words. As he did a wonderful job on the Fry Sight-Word Inventory, the text may not pose much of a problem. Once appropriate fluency has been reached, group mates can be encouraged to ask each other questions about the reading as well. When William's fluency improves, he will have more time to devote himself to text comprehension.

Goal 2: Strategy 2

The final strategy that I would like to use with William is the "Word Family Zoom," also suggested by the Florida Center for Reading Research. This activity will help William increase his speed and accuracy (FCRR, 2019). As William was struggling with word rimes (as seen in his ESI), this activity will help him to recognize these unfamiliar rimes when he comes across them in texts. William can be timed while he reads the common set of rimes that are on the pre-formatted sheet. The activity is recommended to be done at least three times to assess speed and accuracy. This activity seeks to increase fluency therefore helping with reading comprehension and guiding William to become a more fluent reader and better comprehender after reading texts.

References

Florida Center for Reading Research. (2019). *Fluency Words* [PDF file]. Retrieved from https://fcrr.org/documents/sca/G2-3/2-3Fluency_2_Words.pdf

Florida Center for Reading Research. (2019). *Phonics Letter-Sound Correspondence* [PDF file]. Retrieved from https://fcrr.org/documents/sca/G2-3/2-3Phonics_1_Letter_Sound_Correspondence.pdf

Gambrell, L. B., & Morrow, L. M. (2014). *Best Practices in Literary Instruction* (5th ed.). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

McKenna, M. C., & Dougherty Stahl, K. A. (2015). *assessment for reading instruction* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.