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ABSTRACT

Despite extensive research on Response to Intervention and Retrospective Miscue Analysis, students in fourth and fifth grade are still reading below grade level. This case study investigated how Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA) implemented during Response to Intervention (RTI) assists students in learning to apply new reading strategies that increase comprehension. Over a twelve week period, data were collected in four contexts. First, orally administered pre/post-Burke Reading Inventory. Secondly, computer generated STAR assessment for screening and progress monitoring. Thirdly, one-on-one Dominie. Finally, audio recording of student read aloud, retelling and follow-up discussion. Students’ responses on pre-Burke Inventory indicated students think reading is being able to say all the words. Screening results placed students at second and early third-grade instructional reading levels. Dominie results were somewhat similar. These initial recorded readings showed students unable to retell what they read and unable to answer questions about the text. As students engaged in recording their reading and discussions with the teacher, they learned strategies to monitor and problem-solve during reading to better understand and remember what they read. Students were more than willing to use the iPad for recording and to independently listen to their reading. By the end of the twelve-week period, students were applying strategies learned during their recorded readings and conferences with the teacher, and retellings became more complete. Follow-up Burke Reading Inventory
indicated that students were more focused on understanding what they were reading. While words were still important, they were more interested in the meanings of words to help them understand the text they were reading. STAR and Dominie assessments both indicated students improved in reading comprehension levels and were at or near grade level by the end of the study.
PREFACE

This dissertation was a study of the use of Retrospective Miscue Analysis with fourth-grade students. It was designed to assist them in understanding the importance of reading for comprehension and learning from their reading. I wanted them to love books as much as I do. As students became more aware of how they were reading, they began to challenge themselves as readers. They also became reader leaders within the classroom engaging in conversations about books. This study enabled me to see my students in new ways. I became more aware of my teaching practices and expectations of students. It was clear that students responded positively to supportive discussions about their learning and tackled the challenges set forth to them successfully.
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CHAPTER 1

The Nature of the Problem

Every year in my urban southeastern school, more and more students have continued to read below grade level. Their test scores did not qualify them to receive special education services, and usually screening assessment scores were just above the cutoff for additional small group tutoring provided by reading specialists and grade level tutors. These students disengaged when given time to read in class, and they did little if any reading at home. They only utilized the library when the class went as a group and were usually the last ones to choose books by grabbing any book when the class was ready to leave. These students usually did not have books in the house and did not take home the books they checked out of the library. Our school provided free books from RIF (Reading is Fundamental) and books for students to take home for summer reading, but the books were often thrown away or left in the classroom.

Data from testing showed that for the last five years, a substantial number of students in grades four and five were performing below grade level expectations (see Table 1.1). The data did not show significant improvement with 46% of fourth graders in 2014 not reaching grade level expectations. With the number of students falling below grade level expectations there appeared a need for something to change, hence a need for this research study.

Our school used PASS (Palmetto Assessment of State Standards) test data to
assign students to either Tier 2 RTI with a tutor or Tier 3 RTI with an Interventionist for additional support. These groups lasted the entire year and were limited to one or two small groups of up to four students per grade level. Based on the data, it was apparent that not all students performing below grade level received additional services; therefore, their needs must be addressed within the classroom. This study implemented a strategy with a group of students who were not meeting grade level expectations and did not receive additional support from tutors or interventionists to attempt to bring their reading levels up to grade level.

By the time students reach the fourth grade, they have already developed a set of reading habits and attitudes. They either enjoy reading and feel they are good readers or do not like to read, avoid reading, and think they are not good readers. After reading the book *Reading Conversations* by Rita A. Moore and Carol Gilles (2005), I realized that most classroom teachers tend to focus on weaknesses to help them improve their reading skills. Teachers often do not spend time focusing on what students do well. Identifying strengths helps students realize their successes and recognize the good reading strategies they are already using with automaticity. Students are more motivated if they feel they are successful and we as educators need to help them see their successes. The idea of (RMA) to find students’ strengths, guide instruction, and engage the students in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1 PASS scores - percent of students scoring below grade level expectations.
discussions about the reading process. Research shows that knowing their strengths and talking about those strengths could help the students better understand themselves as readers (Moore & Giles, 2005). I felt that this could be a missing link that might help students who were reading below grade level, and that it might offer part of the solution to the problem my school faced.

Many of the students in my school came to fourth grade one, two, and sometimes three years below grade level expectations as indicated by STAR Reading test results (see Table 1.2). The instructional reading levels of 78% of the students were below grade level, making their independent reading level even lower. Most instruction in the classroom tended to use material at or above grade level making it difficult for these students to find success.

Table 1.2 Number of fourth-grade students at a given instructional reading level at the beginning of the 2014-15 school year based on STAR reading assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P-PP level</th>
<th>1.0-1.9</th>
<th>2.0-2.9</th>
<th>3.0-3.9</th>
<th>4.0-4.9</th>
<th>5.0+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When given time for self-selected reading, many of the students chose simple picture books they could find and read quickly or spent time staring off into space absentmindedly turning pages to look like they were reading. Still others spent time as they said “looking for a book.” When conferring with students, many of them spent the
time reading word-by-word and had difficulty talking about the book or retelling what they just read. As a classroom teacher, I have observed that students who have the most trouble even getting started and staying engaged with a book are students who are at least two years behind in their reading levels. They choose books at or above grade level even when multiple selections are available on their reading level. They respond very negatively when asked to read. When invited to bring a book they are reading for conferencing, they grab something from a book basket because they have not been reading. They make little or no effort to read independently. No matter what book they are given, what models provided them, they still cannot or perhaps will not read orally or read independently. During conferences, they struggle to read the book they brought with them and often give up saying they don’t like to read because they are not good readers. Often the books they brought to conferences were above their reading level, and they struggled reading the words. When offered a lower level book to read aloud, they refused the book saying it was too easy or doesn’t look interesting. It was often difficult to engage these students, and I am always on the lookout for strategies that would encourage them to read more.

As I continued to read professionally, I found three topics that influenced my thinking and helped me reexamine my teaching to better attempt to reach my students and support them as readers. Those three topics were 1) cultural influence, 2) Response to Intervention and 3) Retrospective Miscue Analysis.

After I read Shirley Brice Heath’s book *Ways With Words* (1983), I began to think about the reason my students disengage. It might be because I was imposing my white, middle-class upbringing and cultural views on a group that does not share those views.
As a child growing up, books were important in my family, and they were always in the house including two different sets of encyclopedias. We went to the local library to check out books almost every Saturday. I also spent my money buying books from the book club flyers my teacher sent home. The student population I teach is urban African American from low-income families. For many of the families, books do not appear to hold the same place of value as they did for me. There are few if any books in the home. They seldom went to the local public library to check out books, and they did not spend money ordering books from book club flyers offered to them at school. I realized I would need to reevaluate my thinking and teaching to reach the children with whom I worked for them to see the importance of reading in their future lives.

I began to spend more time reading aloud to my classes making sure always to choose a chapter book at or above grade level. I would read the book every day for a few days until I got them to a point where they were asking me to read more because they were so interested in the story. At that point, I would switch to a new book the next day. Someone always asked to read the rest of the book because they wanted to know what happened next. Sometimes several would read the book together, and I found multiple copies to satisfy all who wished to finish the book. After hearing the book read aloud, they did not struggle to finish the book because they could build on what they heard. However, many students were still disengaged during independent reading and reading achievement levels were not improving sufficiently. There had to be some other intervention I was missing which led me to further research.

As a member of The International Reading Association, I received a copy of *Response to Intervention: A Framework for Reading Educators* (Fuchs, Fuchs & Vaughn,
The book was part of my membership and piqued my interest. I had not heard the term before and wanted to know more about it. As I read through the book, I realized that the testing and data I had been gathering in my classroom was one of the principal components of Response to Intervention (RTI). I saw reinforcement for the need to pull small groups based on strengths and needs. Researching RTI, I found the key component is providing early intervention through small group work. Intervention could occur in the regular classroom accompanied by frequent progress monitoring (Brown-Chidsey, 2007; Brown-Chidsey & Steege, 2005; Daly, Fletcher & Vaughn, 2009; Ysseldyke, 2008). Our district already had in place several mandated methods of progress monitoring teachers used regularly. The district also put Reading Interventionists in the elementary schools to pull students for RTI. However, the program is not used with fidelity throughout the school and the district. Our school even hired a reading tutor for each grade level to pull small groups of students which has since changed to one tutor serving all third-grade through fifth-grade classes. Having only one tutor limited the number of students served in fourth and fifth grade because the school focused on third graders.

Research studies implementing RTI generally began in Kindergarten or first grade, often following students through third grade (Barnett, D. W., VanDerHeyden, A. M., & Witt, J. C. 2007; Compton, D. L., Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., & Bryant, J. D., 2006; Fuchs, D., Compton, D. L., Fuchs, L. S., Bryant, J., & Davis, G. N., 2008; and many others). Research on the use of RTI in fourth and fifth grade is limited. After reading over 45 studies using RTI, including several meta-analyses of multiple studies, I was able to find only three that involved older students (Geer, 2008; Richards & Omdal, 2007; Slavin, Chamberlain & Daniels, 2007). Richards and Omdal’s study was a secondary
science class; Slavin, Chamberlain & Daniels was a middle school, and Greer was a case study of two third graders and one fourth grader. There appears to be a need for additional research in how starting RTI Tier II in a regular fourth-grade classroom can be used to improve students’ reading further illustrating a need for this research study.

An additional method I recently discovered was the book *Reading Conversations Retrospective Miscue Analysis with Struggling Readers, Grades 4-12* by Rita Moore & Carol Giles (2005). Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA) involves taking the data from oral reading and analyzing the types of miscues the student makes then discussing the impact those miscues made on comprehension (Brown, 1980; Goodman & Marek, 1996; Goodman, 2008). The research shows that proficient readers tend to make miscues while reading without impacting comprehension. Recognizing the fact that not every word needs to be read correctly, but understanding what the author is saying was the missing link for my students. Through classroom observations and reading conferences, it appeared that students found a need to read every word correctly before moving on causing them to lose the meaning of the text. RMA has sufficient research to show that it is an effective, instructional strategy for helping students understand what good readers do (Black, 2004; Brown, 1980; Costello, 1992; Goodman & Marek, 1996; Marek, 1987; Martens, 1998; Moore & Seeger, 2009; Seeger, 2009; and Worsnop, 1996). RMA research tends to begin with middle school students (Brown, 1980; Ohaver, 1972; Paulson, 2001; Paulson & Mason-Egan, 2007; Seeger, 2009; Smith, 1980, and Warde, 2005). Even Moore and Gilles book (2008) focuses on research with middle and high school students. Utilizing RMA might be beneficial to assist fourth-grade students in identifying their miscues with a focus on their strengths instead of weaknesses.
Therefore, this study will address that need in an attempt to help them realize they are good readers and use the strategies good readers use when they are reading. It is also designed to help students realize it is not necessary to read every word correctly but to understand the text.

Therefore, I designed this case study to determine if Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA) as part of a Response to Intervention model can be implemented to help upper elementary students become more proficient readers. This study will examine the use of Retrospective Miscue Analysis in Classroom Tier III RTI with fourth-grade students. The study focused on emphasizing student strengths and talking about reading to enable the development of a positive attitude about their reading ability and an interest in independent reading. Specifically, this study is designed to answer the following question:

What is the impact of a Response to Intervention instructional program utilizing Retrospective Miscue Analysis for fourth-grade students reading below grade level?

The study will:

1. Focus on students’ reading strategy use and improved strategy instruction.
2. Increase engagement in meaningful reading based upon student interests.
3. Engage students in conversations about reading and provide feedback to students about their reading strengths.

The impact of the study will be determined by:

a. Burke Reading Interview as pre/post measures to assess reading attitude changes.
b. Analysis of scores on Dominie and STAR Reading to document changes in achievement levels.

c. Analysis of transcripts of student/teacher conferences to identify reading strengths and strategies used by students as they read.
CHAPTER 2

Review of Related Literature

Levels of literacy in the United States have been a concern since early in the 20th century. Historically, explanations for the cause of low literacy levels in individuals have ranged from suggestions of low intelligence or a broad intellectual deficit to more specific learning disabilities. The Education for All Handicapped Children’s Act (EAHCA) in 1975 provided funds to diagnose and support specialized education for children with specific learning disabilities. In 1990, this bill was reauthorized as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Then in 2004, a significant movement began with the reauthorization of the IDEA bill. This law requires that identification of learning disabilities be based upon a history of service in regular education settings where a record of students’ responses to appropriate, high-quality instruction with qualified teachers is observed prior to placement. The term used in the literature became Response to Intervention and RTI was its acronym. The bill raised a persistent question about whether the instruction has been optimal before a determination is made about specialized services (Johnston, 2010). This movement has helped in mounting, monitoring, and adapting instructional plans for students who struggle with reading, and has turned our attention to the quality of instruction offered in regular classrooms.

As a classroom teacher of fourth grade students, I believe the results of this movement offer me and other teachers a way to focus on children’s strengths as well as
their needs, and to marshal the most effective resources we can to mount the most effective instruction we can, to address children’s literacy learning needs. If we are successful, we can help to avoid the problems cited in the research that has led to the unnecessary identification of children to special education services. The RTI movement encouraged me to pose a research study to examine the impact of my RTI classroom reading instruction for my lowest achieving students through the use of a case study approach. The review of research led me to crafting the best methods; a combination of high-interest literature, progress monitoring on a regular basis, miscue analysis, student conferences, and small group guided reading focusing on students’ strategy use and literature discussions.

This research study resulted from a review of the literature on three main topics. The topics included Response to Intervention (RTI), miscue analysis as a research tool, and Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA) as an instructional strategy. This review builds an argument to show that this study contributes to what is currently known about assisting students in upper elementary classrooms to develop improved comprehension skills as a means of improving their overall reading ability.

This review documents three important statements. That the research currently available about Response to Intervention theory, while extensive, is limited to early reading at primary grades as a strategy to avoid placement in special education. That miscue analysis theories and research are limited to primary grades as well, with a focus on qualities of miscues strategies, cueing systems, and the acceptability of structures used. That theory and research focused on Retrospective Miscue Analysis as a classroom intervention strategy to improve comprehension of upper elementary students is also
limited. Taken together, these limitations on our current knowledge and research shows that a study of this nature is needed. The study is designed to describe, analyze, and document that Retrospective Miscue Analysis used as a Response to Intervention model in an upper elementary classroom will improve reading comprehension levels of students performing below grade level.

This chapter examines the broad base of research in literacy interventions and focuses this discussion further to explore the research and theory relevant to the need to build comprehension of struggling readers in the upper elementary grades. It is organized around three key areas involved in this study (1) RTI and its practical implementation in classroom instruction; (2) critical research on the use of miscue analysis as a research tool; and (3), a review of how RMA can be used to engage upper elementary readers in a personal interpretation of their reading strategy use as a means of deepening comprehension and fostering reading growth.

2.1 RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION

In 2008, Response to Intervention (RTI) was recognized by the International Reading Association as a “hot topic” for research by 75% of their readers (Mesmer & Mesmer, 2008/2009). RTI is a systematic method of instruction and assessment that is designed to meet the needs of all students to assist them in achieving greater academic growth and accelerate the growth of “at-risk” students. There are four main components of RTI: 1) universal screening, 2) intervention, 3) progress monitoring, and 4) intervention efficacy and fidelity. RTI often uses a three-tier approach to support students with varying instructional needs. Tier I includes all students using research-based and effective instruction and assessment. Tier 2 includes students who have not
achieved expectation levels of Tier 1 who receive additional instruction time and are
progress monitored for a given amount of time. Tier 3 addresses the needs of students
who have significant differences in their performance from that of other students.
(Brown-Chidsey, R.: 2007). Intervention is in addition to the regular class not in place of
the regular class (Jennifer Demski, 2009).

Numerous books have been published to help teachers and administrators
understand the RTI model and implement it in their classrooms and schools with efficacy
and fidelity. One of the first books written by Rachel Brown-Chidsey and Mark Steege
(2005) was *Response to Intervention: Principles and Strategies for Effective Practice.*
The book provides a guide for implementing a school-wide response to intervention
program with a theoretical and empirical foundation using a ten-step model. In 2008,
several more books were published. Fuchs, Fuchs, and Vaughn edited *Response to
Intervention: A Framework for Reading Educators,* to explain RTI and how to use it
emphasizing early and effective teaching using assessment data for decision making.
Also in 2008 *Using RTI for School Improvement* written by Cara Shores and Kim Chester
provides a step-by-step approach to implementing RTI as a school-wide improvement
process. A guide for elementary and secondary schools written by Matthew Burns and
and Secondary Schools: Procedures to Assure scientific-based practices,* addresses
academic, social, behavioral, and emotional needs of students. Today over five hundred
books can be found on the subject of Response to Intervention ranging from general
handbooks to describe the process to materials that could be used when implementing
RTI.
Because of the emphasis associated with RTI and IDEA of 2004 (Gersten & Dimino, 2006), allowing districts to spend up to 15% of their federal special education dollars on RTI programs, many companies label their products as RTI. They label their products as RTI materials for intervention in reading and math as a marketing tool to sell them to schools and districts across the nation. There are even websites devoted solely to providing information on RTI that include descriptions and teaching strategies such as www.rtinetwork.org and www.rtimdirc.com.

History and Development of RTI

In 1975, the Individuals with Disabilities Act was passed entitling every student with a disability to a free public education to meet their unique needs and to enable them to lead productive adult lives. In 1977, learning disability was defined as a “severe discrepancy between achievement and intellectual ability” (U.S. Department of Education). Many education professionals have traditionally relied on a wait-to-fail process to identify and assist students experiencing academic difficulties (Jimerson, Burns and VanDerHeyden, 2007). This model led to a skyrocketing number of students identified as learning disabled, particularly minorities.

In 2001, the No Child Left Behind legislation was passed which mandated that school-based professionals adopt scientifically based research to equalize reading disparities among students. Fuchs, Deshler, and Reschly (2004) found that 2.72 million children between the ages of 6 and 17 had an LD label representing nearly 6% of the general population and slightly more than half of all children with disabilities. Classification of students as LD is primarily based on IQ-achievement discrepancy. They
reviewed various research studies that invalidated the claim that IQ is an important marker for identifying learning disabilities.

More than 80% of students identified with special education needs struggle with literacy (Mesmer and Mesmer, 2008/2009). Laura Justice (2006) claims that students who perform poorly in reading achievement do so because schools fail to provide adequate instruction to at-risk children who exhibit significant risk factors that make learning to read very difficult. She suggests that RTI prevention models implemented in the earliest stages of their reading development and continued to the end of second or third grade would make a difference. In 2004 Congress reauthorized IDEA and shifted the emphasis from the identification process toward providing support and intervention for struggling students early. This shift is similar to the Reading First provision of No Child Left Behind.

**Defining RTI**

RTI is an acronym used interchangeably for Response to Intervention, Response to Instruction, Responsiveness to Instruction or Responsiveness to Intervention. Johnston (2010) noted that the first person to clearly articulate the logic behind RTI was Dr. Marie Clay in her article entitled Learning to be Learning Disabled published first in 1987. She argued, “Learning disability is more often acquired through inadequate instruction than through genetics” (Johnston, p. 3). To her, ruling out the possibilities of inadequate instruction would avoid costly, long-term specialized services.

Many researchers have provided definitions and guidelines for RTI (Brown-Chidsey, 2007; Daly, Glover & McCurdy, 2006; Justice, 2006; Reschly, Coolong-Chaffin, Christenson & Gutkin, 2007 and others) that include high quality, personal...
instruction based on need accompanied by frequent progress monitoring. RTI is a process of providing intervention as early as possible to address the needs of students beginning in the general education classroom. A key goal of RTI is the prevention and remediation of academic and/or behavioral difficulties through effective instruction and intervention for all students (Fletcher & Vaughn, 2009; Hosp, 2008; Renaissance Learning, 2008; Ysseldyke, 2008). All of these definitions incorporate the use of data to identify the needs of students and to use those data to plan and implement instruction that addresses particular needs.

Data analysis is only one part of RTI. The principal elements of RTI are high-quality scientific research-based instruction/intervention, monitoring student progress, and data-based decision making (Mesmer & Mesmer, 2008/2009; Ysseldyke 2008). The National Center for Learning Disabilities (2009) adds the component of parental involvement. RTI is a process, not a program, which is intended to reach students where they are and take them where they need to be using the most efficient method. Five fundamental principles common to all models based on a flexible approach include; (1) a proactive and preventative approach, (2) ensuring a match between student skills, curriculum, and instruction; (3) progress monitoring and data-based decision making, (4) utilization of effective and evidence-based practices, and (5) school-wide use. The common features of RTI models are (1) multiple tiers, (2) a reliable and valid assessment system, (3) protocol, and (4) evidence-based instruction. (Barnes & Harlacher, 2008)

RTI Models

All RTI models have these same basic components even though they may differ in approach. Many researchers identify two fundamental paradigms of RTI; the standard
protocol model and the problem-solving model sometimes called problem-analysis (Fuchs, Deshler & Reschly 2004; Hale, Kaufman, Naglieri & Kavale, 2006). Hale, Kaufman, Naglieri & Kavale (2006) explain the main difference between the two paradigms as offering slightly different implementation and methods for determining learning disabilities. Fuchs & Fuchs (2006) continue the comparison as a problem-solving process that tends to be used by practitioners in an attempt to personalize intervention and researchers tend to favor a standard protocol approach. Both models incorporate problem-solving to identify needs. The primary difference being the use of a universal screening to identify students in a standard protocol design, and a teacher or other adult who presents the student to a team in a problem-solving model.

The standard protocol model utilizes a standard set of instructional approaches or implementations applied to all students. It emphasizes scientific research-based classroom instruction (Fuchs, Deshler & Reschly, 2004; Gerber, 2005; Marston, 2005: Ysseldyke, 2008). The standard protocol model is usually represented as a triangle broken into at least three tiers as shown in figure 2.1. Students progress through the tiers before placement in special education programs (Brown-Chidsey, 2007; Demski, 2009; Fuchs, Fuchs & Vaughn, 2008; Ysseldyke, 2008). Tier 1 represents appropriate evidence-based instruction and progress monitoring of all students in the general education classroom and universal screening with about 80% meeting expectations. Students not making satisfactory expectations move to Tier 2 where implementation of specific interventions that are more specialized for varying lengths and times usually in small groups with approximately 15% of the students reaching expectations. The tip of the
triangle represents about 5% of the students significantly below established grade-level expectations that need additional individualized interventions.

Figure 2.1: Standard RTI model

Another RTI model focuses on problem-solving, and it is this model that I address in this study. The problem-solving model involves interventions on a case-by-case basis (Ysseldyke, 2008). In the problem-solving model an identified problem is analyzed, goals are set, and planned interventions are implemented and assessed (Renaissance Learning, 2008). However, in the problem identification step the detection of a problem by any adult who may interact with the student, including parents, replaces the universal screening methods of the standard protocol model. The problem-solving model
emphasizes scientifically-based instruction and also utilizes regular student progress monitoring, data-based decision making, and strategically selected interventions (Nebraska, 2006). The model further suggests individualized interventions and measurement practices for non-responsiveness. Deno (2005) has identified a five-part problem-solving model. This model includes (1) problem identification, (2) problem definition, (3) designing intervention plans, (4) implementing the intervention, and (5) problem solution. Once the problem it identified it is evaluated by the intervention team to determine the magnitude of the problem that may include an additional screening assessment.

The third step is the creation of an intervention plan designed specifically to meet the needs of the student. In the fourth step, the plan is implemented as outlined and progress is monitored based on the particular nature of the problem. Finally, the problem is solved when certain preset criteria are met. If an intervention does not meet the success criteria, an alternative intervention may be designed and implemented as needed. The significant difference in the two models is the number of students addressed; in the standard protocol model all students are screened and in the problem-solving model one student at a time is discussed. In this study, Retrospective Miscue Analysis utilized the problem-solving model by identifying individual needs and addressing them through analysis and discussion of oral readings. However, an initial screening was administered to all students to identify specific students for the study along with parental concerns and school identification of pull-out support assignments.
Articles and Research Studies

Articles about RTI appeared in almost every major education publication such as *Educational Leadership, Education Week, and Reading Research Quarterly*, to name a few. Brown-Chidsey (2007); and Slavin, Chamberlain & Daniels, (2007) explained the RTI model including case studies of a first grader, a kindergartner, and a middle school reading class. They focused on reducing the number of students who needed special education services. The first study incorporated the use of Open Court Reading in first grade and DIBELS in kindergarten for assessment. The middle school group used a program called Reading Edge. These studies reported an increase in student reading levels.

One article from *Education Week* by Christine A. Samuels (2008), focused on a description of a demonstration site in Oregon centered around children just learning to read. They found an increase in DIBELS fluency scores of first graders. *Reading Research Quarterly* has incorporated a large number of articles about RTI including those by Sue Samson (2000), Gersten & Dimino (2006), McEneaney, Lose, & Schwartz (2006), Klingner & Edwards (2006), and Fuchs & Fuchs (2006). These articles included foundational information about RTI, addressed concerns with the implementation, identified advantages and disadvantages, and described the use of Reading Recovery as an RTI model. One concern identified in numerous studies of RTI models, both tier and problem solving, is the use with fidelity and efficacy reflected in teacher training. Advantages include not waiting for students to fail including the abandonment of the deficit model and assumptions being made about reading difficulties. Most of the studies reviewed by the articles focused on the first two or three years of schooling.
Many more additional articles were found in educational journals. Other articles were published in journals addressing special education and gifted education such as *Journal of Learning Disabilities, Exceptional Children,* and *Journal of Advanced Academics.* In articles by Margo A. Mastropieri & Thomas E. Scruggs (2005) in *The Journal of Learning Disabilities,* concerns addressed the theoretical and practical aspects of RTI as an alternative method of identification for special education. Additional *Journal of Learning Disabilities* articles reviewed several studies done with first-grade students concluding RTI is beneficial in improving reading levels in some studies, but not others suggesting a need for further studies. However, no particular program was identified. Lynn S. Fuchs and Douglas Fuchs continue their discussion of the RTI model in *Teaching Exceptional Children* article in an attempt to clarify misunderstandings and confusion about the use of RTI. *The Journal of Advanced Academics* article by Richards & Omdal (2007) is a study of a secondary science classroom where RTI was used and demonstrated a difference in student performance. Additional articles explored studies that used the RTI model to decrease placement in special education through case studies as well as longitudinal studies.

The field of Psychology also saw relevance in the utilization of the RTI model. They included articles in their journals; *Journal of Educational Psychology, Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, School Psychology Review, Psychology in the Schools,* and *California School Psychologist.* Some of these articles included research studies as well as opinion papers. Articles by VanDerHeyden, Witt, and Gilbertson (2007) in *Journal of School Psychology* and Compton, Fuchs, Fuchs, Bryant (2006) in *Journal of Educational Psychology,* both reviewed a longitudinal study of first graders with one
using word identification fluency and one using a STEEP model. Both articles showed increases in student performance and decreases in recommendations for special education programs. A study by Hatcher et al. (2006) for *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, conducted over two 10 week periods with first graders, showed RTI as an effective intervention, however, one-fourth of the students did not respond to the intervention. There was no indication of the materials or strategies used in the study. Additional studies were almost all implemented with first-grade students with some using DIBELS for assessment.

Several organizations have devoted entire issues of their journals to the topic of RTI. The Council for Exceptional Children focused on Responsiveness to Intervention in their 2007 May/June (Volume 39 Number 5) issue of Teaching Educational Children. The School Psychologist (winter, 2005), published by The American Psychological Association, discussed studies of the RTI model’s implementation as a strategy to improve reading and behavior (Volume 9 number 4). The International Reading Association journal *The Reading Teacher* (volume 62 number 4) December 2008-January 2009 featured articles on what educators need to know about RTI. Even the 2007 issue of *The Journal of Positive Behavior Intervention* focused on the use of RTI three-tier models for reading and behavior intervention.

The majority of research conducted on the use of RTI focused on reading research studies beginning in kindergarten or first grade with some research studies following the students through third grade. Lipson and Wixson’s (2010) review of RTI models used in all grade levels, including middle and high school, showed a need to expand RTI beyond the early years. Most of the research studies have identified benefits from the
implementation of RTI primarily in early and emergent readers. Benefits identified by McEneaney, Lose & Schwartz (2006) are no longer a need for students to “wait to fail”, and avoid problems associated with process deficit and discrepancy models. RTI is instructionally grounded enhancing the validity of the diagnostic process. Benefits identified included identification of risk rather than a deficit, early identification, and a link between assessment and instruction.

But the research base is less robust for older students and students in other academic subjects. Further study is needed to inform other teachers in the upper elementary, middle and high school as well as different content areas about best practices in RTI to affect change in student achievement in these higher grade levels. Very few studies have been conducted with upper elementary students beyond the third grade when reading shifts from learning to read to reading to learn, emphasizing comprehension. A discussion of late onset reading difficulties were not part of any study, but are becoming a topic of interest in schools (Leach, J. M. & Scarborough, H.S., 2003). Late onset reading difficulties could be due to the shift from learning to read to reading to learn.

After reviewing research, it appears that one major component seems to be missing in the research. Most of the studies do not indicate the strategy used during RTI sessions. However, some first-grade studies did use Reading Recovery (Clay, 2005). The studies often identify assessment and progress monitoring tools and provide a time frame for the study. Even the few studies with fourth graders through high school did not implement Retrospective Miscue Analysis. Therefore, this study will offer valuable insights from this literature.
2.2 MISCUE ANALYSIS

*Miscue analysis is a window on the reading process (Goodman, 1973).*

The majority of RTI research focused on reading in primary grades by screening using some running record of oral reading followed by questions about the passage. When assessing the reading experience of young readers the use of running records provides insight into their abilities. It is a focus on what the reader is saying and identifies the words read as correct or incorrect. Marie Clay (2002) introduced running records as a way to assess text reading of young children by testing the number of letters, sounds or words they know and recording any mistakes made during oral reading. Running records account for the accuracy of text through a count of errors made during oral reading and an assigned label of easy, instructional and hard depending on the percent of words read correctly. Running records could also include questions about comprehension but with caution because comprehension is dependent on the difficulty level of the text. Teachers ask various questions providing an unreliable gauge of comprehension, and answers are dependent upon the complexity of the sentence structure of the question (Clay, 2002).

However, when looking at readers in the upper elementary grades, one wants to go beyond running records and dig deeper into the kinds of miscues students make. Along with what those miscues identify what strategies readers use as they to try to make sense of the text. The term miscue is used instead of a mistake to indicate changes in the text. Miscues suggest the reader’s use of language and knowledge of the reading process and miscues may not interfere with comprehension. Miscue analysis has been studied since the early 1960s as an assessment and instructional tool (Davenport, 2002;
Goodman, K. 1965, 1972, 1973; K. Goodman, & Burke, 1973; Goodman, Y. 1976; Martens, 1997; Tovey, 1979; Weaver, 2002; Wilde, 2000). A miscue is a reader’s response that does not match the expected response (Davenport & Watson, 2002; K. Goodman, 1967, 1996; Y. Goodman & Burke, 1972). Kenneth Goodman (1996) analyzed the degree to which miscue changes, disrupts, or enhances the meaning of written text. When conducting a miscue analysis, one is looking at the kind of miscues being made by the reader and what it says about the reader. These miscues provide information about the reader that involve the reader’s proficiency, knowledge about the reading process, strategies used to understand text, construct meaning, and provide evidence of reading problems (Goodman, Watson & Burke, 1987).

One of the significant differences between running records and miscue analysis is the use of audio recording when conducting a miscue analysis to focus and build on the reader’s strengths (Wilde, 2000). After a student reads orally, the student then retells the story, and this is also audio recorded (Wilde, 2000; Goodman, Watson & Burke, 1987; Weaver, 2002). The teacher carefully analyzes the story possibly with the reader.

In 1967 Goodman defined reading as a means of constructing meaning and making sense of print. Kenneth Goodman spent four decades doing research on miscue analysis. He concluded that proficient and non-proficient readers used a single reading process that is best described as a transactive, socio-psycholinguistic perspective (Goodman Y., 1996; Goodman, Watson & Burke, 1987). By analyzing the effects of miscues on making meaning of the text, he developed the Goodman Taxonomy of Reading Miscue in 1973. The taxonomy has been revised (Goodman, K. 1984,2004; Y.
Goodman, 1996), and delivered to classroom teachers as an assessment tool entitled *A Reading Miscue Inventory* (Y. Goodman & Burke, 1972).

Many have written about the use of miscue analysis as an instrument for diagnosis, evaluation, and instruction (Campbell, 1993; Davenport & Watson, 2002; Flurkey & Xu, 2003; Goodman, 1973; Y. Goodman & Burke, 1972; Y. Goodman, Watson, and Burke, 2005; Y. Goodman, Watson, & Burke, 1987; Wilde, 2000). Wilde (2000) provided a common sense interpretation of miscue analysis with a focus on the strengths of readers and using those strengths to build proficiency. Methods for conducting and using miscue analysis for evaluation and instruction through the use of a reading miscue inventory were written by Yetta Goodman and Carolyn Burke (1972). In 1987, Yetta Goodman, Watson & Burke provided alternative methods for the reading miscue inventory. An additional explanation of miscue analysis by Yetta Goodman, Dorothy Watson, and Carolyn Burke (2005) also included research-based references and a historical view of the development and use of miscue analysis. Davenport and Watson (2002) explained the why and how of miscue analysis with an over the shoulders approach. The teacher listens over the shoulder to a student read while taking quick running records of some students, while others are reading independently.

Numerous studies using miscue analysis were conducted (Altwenger & Goodman, 1981; Brown, Goodman & Marek, 1996; Goodman, 1996; Long, 1985), but none of them have addressed the use of miscue analysis in an RTI setting. The International Reading Association published an annotated bibliography of research on miscue analysis written by K. Goodman, Marek & Brown (1996). Miscue Analysis has also been the focus of doctoral dissertations by Dorothy Menosky (1971), Robin Sims (1972), Laura Smith &
Margaret Lindberg, (1972), and Patricia Long (1985) among others. The research shows that when teachers conduct miscue analysis of the students they are better informed of students’ weaknesses as well as their abilities as readers and are better able to provide effective instruction.

2.3 RETROSPECTIVE MISCUE ANALYSIS

Yetta Goodman (2008) states that there are two purposes for Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA). The first purpose being an instructional tool and the second being a research tool. As an instructional tool, it involves the reader in becoming consciously aware of how they read and allows teachers to use miscue analysis to plan reading instruction. As a research tool, it provides knowledge to teacher researchers about how readers respond to their miscues and the role those miscues have in influencing reading development. Classroom reading instruction should provide lessons personalized to students’ needs as opposed to moving all students through a single core reading program (Allington, 2006).

RMA is an instructional strategy that aims to heighten a reader’s awareness of the reading process by recording their oral reading. The reader then listens to their reading and analyzes their deviations from the written text. Examining these deviations from text also allows the evaluator to note ways in which a reader is interacting with text to inform future instructional decisions. RMA invites readers to build an understanding of themselves as a reader and how they use the reading process. Students become consciously aware of how they use reading strategies and their knowledge to respond to written texts through collaboration. Engaging the reader in a discussion of those interactions helps to make the reader cognizant of their reading strategies and thus builds
on their strengths as a reader. RMA has been shown to help readers renegotiate their view of themselves and how they implement reading strategies (Black, 2004).

**Development**

RMA is an extension of miscue analysis that involves readers in discussing their oral reading and retelling. RMA was originally developed in the 1970s by a Canadian secondary school reading specialist, Chris Worsnop. RMA is grounded in extensive research on miscue analysis as a procedure that engages the reader in reflecting upon and evaluating their reading process (Goodman & Marek, 1996, Marek, 1987). Yetta Goodman (2008) provided an overview of RMA as an instructional strategy, where readers actively construct meaning by realizing that miscues are an important part of the reading process influenced by background, experiences, culture, and linguistic differences.

**Retrospective Miscue Analysis Research studies**

Early research showed that RMA can be a successful instructional strategy (Goodman & Marek, 1996; Goodman, Marek, Costello Flurkey, Wizinowich & Brown, 1989; Martens, 1998; Ohaver, 1972). Additional RMA research documents use with third grade through college students; (S. C. Brown, 1980; E.A. Brown, 1996; Marek, 1987; Paulson & Mason-Egan, 2007). RMA has been shown to change the readers’ self-efficacy by allowing them to begin to see the strategies that they need to use to make meaning of text and understand what good readers actually do while reading (Seeger, 2009). At the college level, RMA has been used with students who are underprepared for the demands of reading at the college level. Paulson & Mason-Egan (2007) found that underprepared students pessimism about their abilities as readers affects their motivation to read and becomes the most significant obstacle for teachers. A negative self-concept
hinders learning because if students believe they have the ability to read they will be more engaged with the text enhancing comprehension (Goodman & Flurkey, 1996). RMA with the students led to a dynamic instructional intervention through exploration, reflection, and evaluation with students gaining insight about their reading strategies to make changes in their reading actions.

Recent research has been done to analyze the effectiveness of RMA as an instructional strategy (Almazroui, 2007; Black, 2004; Goodman & Paulson, 2000; Moore & Aspergren, 2001; Paulson, 2001; Paulson & Mason-Egan, 2007; Seeger, 2009; Sherman, 2010; Warde, 2005). Many of these studies realized that the students thought of themselves as poor readers, so they avoided reading.

One study at the elementary level was conducted by Karima Almazroui (2007) as a case study of a third grader during tutoring sessions outside of school. The student was Arabic and bilingual with a below average reading level. The study exposed him to a variety of reading materials. Miscue analysis was done in different genres using actual texts revealing that he was highly phonetic and disregarded punctuation. RMA sessions focused on comprehension allowing him to identify the theme and infer meaning from his experiences. The student learned to accept miscues, increased his confidence, and was able to discuss strategies to use when reading alone and helped him improve his ability to choose books he likes.

Additionally, Rita Moore & Victoria Seeger (2010) conducted RMA with an entire fifth-grade class using Socratic circles as an organization tool. The entire class participated in recognizing strengths and reading behaviors of their peers. The whole process was examined and explained in their book Building Classroom Reading
Communities: Retrospective Miscue Analysis and Socratic Circles. The students benefited from the support of their peers only after they became familiar with the RMA process.

Another elementary study conducted by Wendy Black (2004) implemented weekly retrospective miscue analysis sessions with one fourth grade student over a five-month period. Her focus involved metacognitive experiences producing metacognitive knowledge by bringing effective reading strategies to a conscious awareness. Findings included a change in student’s attitude and perception of himself as a reader. Also, the student was able to verbalize more reading strategies that he used when reading.

Another case study conducted by Joan Leikam Theurer (2002) of a preservice teacher who examined her personal reading strategies using new knowledge to reconstruct her perception of the reading process. The study was conducted with an adult reader enrolled in education classes. When asked how she would help a struggling reader she focused on reading slowly to get every word correct reflecting on how she was taught to read. She thought she read every word correctly, but after listening to herself read she realized that was not the case. The use of RMA with the preservice teacher enabled her to recognize what she did as a good reader, and changed her beliefs and understanding of the reading process and how to teach reading.

As part of a graduate course with Rita Moore, Christine Aspegren (2001) conducted an eight-week inquiry with a high school student in a juvenile correction center. When she started her inquiry process, the student was reading four grade levels below where he should be. Six sessions each 60-95 minutes in length were conducted using RMA. At the end of the eight weeks, the student moved from the 26th percentile to
the 46th percentile and felt he was a better reader. Additional data in the study showed the student was reading more for meaning than just word calling.

Victoria Seeger (2009) utilized Collaborative Retrospective Miscue Analysis with a group of sixth-grade students. Seeger’s qualitative case study explored the self-efficacy beliefs students held about their reading skills and abilities before and after the study. The students taped their reading of the text followed by a retelling. The next day the student and teacher discussed the miscues. The Burke Reading Interview and Self-Efficacy Reading Scales completed by students in the study revealed positive changes in each of the participants’ self-efficacy in reading.

A study exploring how Retrospective Miscue Analysis using discourse analysis was examined by Goodman & Paulson (2000). Seven students representing different age groups, ethnicity, and linguistic backgrounds engaged in RMA session for eight months. The readers were found to develop a more positive view of themselves as readers. As they spent more time discussing the text, the more in control of the sessions they became and also became more fluent in the language of reading.

Andrew Sherman (2010) conducted research with a grant to examine a strategy that teachers in Saulk Prairie School District could use to improve reading fluency and comprehension. He suggested using RMA and digital recorders to assist struggling students to develop fluency rates that were conversation-like in nature. Progressing past the necessity to decode every word freed the students to engage with strategies to improve comprehension. The grant focused on struggling fifth graders using Retrospective Miscue Analysis as a strategy to analyze reading fluency.


**Concluding Thoughts**

Major conclusions that have emerged from Retrospective Miscue Analysis studies (Brown, Goodman, Marek, 1996) include; (1) readers actively construct meaning as they transact with written texts, (2) miscues are an important part of the reading process, (3) readers use predicting, confirming and inference strategies to construct meaning, and (4) there is a single reading process (Goodman, 2008). Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA) helps students gain insights into themselves as readers by listening to and talking about their miscues that emerge during oral reading.

A review of the research indicated few studies were done at the fourth-grade level where students are working on making meaning of text instead of focusing on word recognition. Secondly, RTI studies have not incorporated the use of RMA as a strategy to assist students and improve reading ability. Building on previous research, this study will add an element of student reflection to RMA, allowing students to guide their learning by recognizing what they do well. In addition, it will demonstrate to students that how they read affects their comprehension. By teaching strategies to students, they will learn to identify and effectively use the strategies taught. Teaching strategies will enable the students to move toward higher reading levels through improved comprehension.
CHAPTER 3

Research Methodology

With the introduction of Response to Intervention, many school districts adopted RTI policies for their schools. My school district implemented the standard protocol RTI method utilizing a three tier model driven by data. Tier I involved classroom differentiated instruction, Tier II small group or individual instruction within the classroom, and Tier III was pull-out small group instruction. Tier II RTI in the classroom was implemented according to the district protocol using a problem-solving model to address individual needs of students identified by the teacher.

Tier I instruction in the standard protocol method was whole class literature-based instruction. The district provided a curriculum and pacing guide that utilized a variety of fiction and nonfiction literature with an emphasis on Common Core Standards for English Language Arts. The instruction was research-based and used reading material at and above grade level for all students. In addition, the district provided an instructional guideline framework that required 10 minutes of read-aloud, 15 minutes of word study, 50 minutes of guided or shared reading, 25 minutes of writing, and 20 minutes of independent reading. The school provided a two hour uninterrupted ELA block with all instruction taking place within this time frame. ELA teachers were also to implement differentiated instruction during the guided reading block.

Tier II classroom RTI was scheduled by school administration three days a week for 45 minutes to be used for both math and reading intervention. However, no specific
materials or instructional strategies were mandated for classroom RTI and decisions about instruction were left to the discretion of the teacher.

The pull-out RTI at Tier III had a specific curriculum provided by the district used with the same group of students all year. The students were pulled out of class three days a week for thirty minutes and worked with a tutor who was a retired teacher. The pull-out occurred during whole class instruction time requiring the teacher to reteach the content to the Tier III RTI students that they missed when they returned.

The purpose of RTI is to prevent failure by catching students when they begin to struggle. The student must be provided instruction through scientifically proven techniques and continuously monitored for progress. As I reviewed data for my students, those students who were receiving pull-out RTI did not seem to be making progress and often received the lowest scores on progress monitoring assessments. This data made me question the effectiveness of the pull-out program. However, since they already received additional services, I chose to implement Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA) as part of the classroom Tier II RTI. The goal of this case study research was to measure the effectiveness of the RMA strategy that would enable the students to show progress and move towards grade level expectations by using students who were not receiving services but were reading below grade level.

3.1 SETTING AND STUDENT SELECTION

Because most RTI research did not include implementation beginning in fourth or fifth grade, the focus group of this case study were fourth-grade students reading below grade level who did not qualify for special education placement, or were not being served by a tutor. The study included four students. One student was included by parent request
as she wanted some extra help for her son, and the other three students had STAR reading scores that were below grade level and they were not receiving any additional support outside the classroom. The program was implemented two days a week during scheduled RTI time within the classroom.

The selected students were from a predominantly African American Title 1 school serving students in Pre-K through fifth grade with many from single-parent families of low socio-economic status. Most of the students benefitted from free lunches and lived in government subsidized housing. The school was one of the 28 elementary schools in one of the two districts located in the state capital. The school had an enrollment of 450 students with 98% African American and 95% receiving free or reduced price lunches.

For the last five years, state-mandated test scores in reading were among the lowest in the district as summarized in Table 3.1. The school continued to make progress in improving test scores but remained below many schools in the district, particularly at fourth-grade level.

Table 3.1 Percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on PASS Reading assessment, (fourth-grade scores for 2010 were not available).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State testing year</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th grade</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth-grade students received instruction from three different teachers. One teacher taught English Language Arts and Social Studies, and the other teacher taught the same group of students for Math, Science, and Health. My assignment was to teach all
subjects in a self-contained fourth-grade classroom. Also, I supported and assisted teachers with Tier II ELA and math RTI at the fourth-grade level.

Tier III students initially identified for pull-out support did not achieve grade level expectations utilizing state mandated test scores, and the school reading coach selected students from that list. The reading tutor provided Tier III services for 30 minutes of small group instruction three days a week utilizing a district-mandated program and materials.

Two district mandated tests were administered at the beginning of the school year to screen and provide benchmark data for all students. They were Measurement of Academic Progress (MAP) and STAR Reading, both administered on the computer. MAP was administered three times a year and monitored for growth with comparison to a benchmark to predict the level of success on state-mandated testing. Screening and progress monitoring assessments that were used to monitor all students and identified students for this study included STAR reading and Dominie. Dominie was originally a district mandate but not required for the 2014-2015 school year.

STAR Reading from Renaissance Learning, a computerized timed assessment, moves students up or down reading levels depending on their response to the each question. The teacher accesses the data immediately after the student finishes. The assessment provided a grade level equivalency, instructional reading level, Lexile level, percentile, stanine, a comparison to others in the class, and a ZPD level for each student. The school media specialist used students’ ZPD to place a colored dot on their library card to assist them in choosing just-right books. Library books that have a corresponding Accelerated Reader assessment were all labeled by reading level using different colored
dots, and students were not permitted to check out books below their level. Classroom teachers used instructional levels for differentiated instruction during reading instruction.

Dominie was an individualized assessment that was used to provide the teacher with information about the students’ growth in reading and writing and served as a progress monitoring tool for classroom teachers. It was designed to identify the strategies the student used when reading, the variety and strength of the miscues, reading fluency, fluency rate, and comprehension. The writing component of this portfolio was not a part of this study.

Students identified for Tier II classroom RTI read below grade level based on screening assessments, did not meet cut scores for acceptable performance on PASS, and did not receive additional services outside the classroom. Students meeting the criteria for Tier II services were given instruction during classroom ELA small group differentiated instruction and classroom RTI sessions that were designed to address their individual needs. Students identified for this study were to receive individualized instruction and participated in small group discussions about reading and what good readers do to comprehend text.

3.2 PARTICIPANTS

Students classified as Tier II selected for this study received intervention utilizing Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA) during scheduled classroom RTI times. I served as both teacher and researcher with my students as participants and worked with them individually once a week and then as a group once a month.

Of the four students participating KW was receiving pull out support with a reading tutor, but the parent has asked for further support to help her child improve his
overall school performance. He did not like to read at home, but his mother continued to 
encourage and support him. His family recently suffered a tragic loss when their house 
burned down causing him to miss a week of school during the study. His initial 
instructional reading level on STAR was a Primer level indicating that he needed urgent 
intervention. During our first reading conference of the school year before beginning the 
study, he was very hesitant to read to me and read very softly, word for word making 
many pauses and many miscues.

The second student, RS, was a young man who received tremendous support from 
his mother who has high expectations for her son. State testing scores were very high on 
untimed tests. However, when taking timed tests, he struggled because he spent time 
thinking through responses before making a decision. Initial screening placed him just 
below grade level at an instructional reading level of third-grade ninth-month in August, 
but he soon dropped by October to a second-grade second month. He tended to read 
quickly and often repeated himself when reading aloud. Because of the major drop in 
reading level from August to October he was chosen for the study.

The final male student, HJ, included in the study had an instructional reading 
level of second-grade ninth-month during initial screening in August. He struggled with 
accepting constructive feedback, and he got angry when indicated that he had done 
something incorrectly or should try something different. He wanted to be placed in an 
advanced academic class, but reading levels did not support the placement. Initial 
observations during independent reading show him with the same book for several days, 
usually a short picture book. He flipped through pages in and spent time looking around 
the room. He liked to take tests on the computer but failed more than he passed. He took
tests on books he did not read because he thought he knew what they were about, and often did not pay attention to the details when entering titles and test numbers that placed him on a test he should not have taken.

The final student in the group, AG, was a female who lived with her mother and had a supportive father. However, the parents were often in disagreement about many different things so consequently she did not see her father as much as she would have liked. After initial screening, her reading instructional level was a third-grade, first month, a full year behind grade level. She only seemed to read when she was asked to do reading in the classroom. She did not always have a book available to read and often did not finish books she checked out from the library. However, she volunteered to read aloud in class and did so with fluency and intonation. When asked to respond to questions about what she read she was unable to provide a reasonable response.

3.3 DATA COLLECTION

Data were collected and analyzed throughout the school year. Data collected included district mandated assessments for progress monitoring and teacher generated data. District mandated data were STAR testing administered monthly school-wide to all students in the first through fifth grade. The data generated by the program monitored student growth through a variety of reports available to the teacher. One report generated was a test record report that summarized all tests taken during the school year. It quickly shows changes in grade equivalencies, instructional reading levels, ZPD levels and estimated oral reading fluency. An additional report provided a graph to indicate the student’s progress using scale scores. A trend line on the graph indicated the direction the student’s progress was moving. The final report from STAR used to gather information
about the students in this study was the Student Diagnostic Report. This report provides basic information from the test record report with the addition of domain scores for reading literature, informational text and language/vocabulary broken down into different specific skills.

The second set of teacher-generated data included Domini assessments, a criterion-referenced assessment portfolio, and descriptive data from the Burke Reading Inventory. Also included were audio recordings of students’ oral reading with follow-up discussions of the recording as well as anecdotal records of follow-up discussions and reading observations. Students were provided spiral reading journal notebooks to record their reading logs, strategies introduced and discussed during RMA sessions, and reflections on their reading after listening to the audio recordings.

The Burke Reading Inventory was administered to all students in the class to determine what they thought good readers did and if they thought they were a good reader themselves. Additionally, the inventory indicated the strategies they felt they used while reading, and identified what strategies they could give others to help them become better readers. Finally, the inventory provided information about how they learned to read and if they felt they could become a better reader.

Audio recordings were done on an iPad using the Apple Store voice recorder app that is a free download. The app automatically dated the recording, and the student typed a title for their session that included their name and the book read. After each student listened to their recorded reading and retelling, an additional recording labeled follow-up was used to record the discussion of their reading. Transcriptions were made of all data for later analysis.
Students were provided spiral notebooks as a designated reading journal. Students used the notebook to record the books they were reading, and Accelerated Reading tests taken. Students listed the types of strategies they were using as they read orally, and they recorded their suggestions for strategies that they tried to help them better understand what they were reading. Also, students added any additional information that could help them build comprehension as they read.

Students each met for an RTI session once a week allowing time to meet with two students each of the two scheduled RTI days provided by the school. RMA sessions followed an outline similar to that supplied by Goodman, Martens, Flurkey & Bacon in *Retrospective Miscue Analysis: An Overview* (2008). RMA reading sessions included retelling, miscue analysis, miscue selection discussion and response to miscues, and a follow-up. Students chose the book they wanted to read, often using the library book they had checked out. Before they began reading, they were asked why they chose the book they were reading and how much of the book they had already read. The students then began reading aloud from the book for 2-3 minutes while recording on the iPad app. The length of the reading depended on how much they struggled with the text, or even if they did not struggle but read with fluency. The student completed a recorded retelling of the pages read with prompting to add more if necessary. When the students finished their retelling, we listened to the recording together. They were then asked to respond to what they heard themselves doing as they read, and we identified strengths and discussed miscues. As part of the follow-up discussion, I identified the strategies I noticed the students utilized that showed they were good readers. I then offered them a strategy to
try as they continued to read the book that might help them better understand and remember what they were reading.

I later listened to each recording, transcribed it, and made notes about the types of miscues used by each student and the effect the miscues had on comprehension of the text. The miscue analysis was used to determine an instructional strategy for use with each student as part of the next RMA session. The follow-up conference included a discussion of high quality miscues showing strengths and one weakness, guided by a set of questions in Reading conversations: Retrospective Miscue Analysis for struggling readers Grades 4-12 by Moore & Gilles, (2005). The session usually ended with a discussion of what they learned about themselves as a reader, and they restated the strategy they were going to practice using as they read independently in class and at home until the next session.

At the beginning of each subsequent tape-recorded reading session, the student discussed how they used the previous strategy in their independent reading and how it helped them understand the text. They shared the book they were going to record on the iPad and discussed why they chose the book and how much they had already read if any. If they had read part of the book, they summarized or retold the part they finished. If they could not, they began recording from the beginning of the book. The teacher allowed the student to ask questions or comment about their reading before the taping of the next reading selection.

In addition to the RMA sessions as outlined above, Accelerated Reading tests were monitored and discussed with the student. Reports were collected monthly to monitor the number of tests taken, the level of the books read, and the score on each test.
Students provided feedback and asked questions about the tests they were taking as well as discussed book levels and scores.

Once a month, the group was brought together to discuss the strategies they used and how these strategies affected their reading comprehension. They discussed similarities and differences in the reading strategies they use with automaticity. Students also identified the strategies good readers use to understand what they are reading. Also, students discussed their confidence in their reading abilities and new strategies they used while reading that affected their comprehension of the text. The students were given time to suggest what they would like to do next and suggest strategies they might like to try based on the sharing of strategies.

Table 3.2 Timeline in brief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August</th>
<th>Initial screening using Burke Reading Inventory and STAR Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Dominie Assessment, STAR testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January to April</td>
<td>RMA sessions with students once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress monitoring using STAR Reading Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly group sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of April</td>
<td>Burke Reading Inventory, Final group sessions, Dominie Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early May</td>
<td>Final analysis of data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 ANALYSIS

Burke Reading inventory was re-administered in April to monitor students understanding of strategies good readers use. Responses in April were compared to those in August to provide evidence of changes in students’ reading processes and their understanding of how good reading looks and sounds. The analysis was used to find
changes in student attitude using the outline in *Reading Miscue Inventory: From Evaluation to Instruction* by Yetta M. Goodman, Dorothy J. Watson, Carolyn L. Burke & Brian Cambourne (2005).

STAR Reading Assessment was analyzed to look for growth towards grade level equivalency and instructional level achieved. Additionally, the Diagnostic Report was analyzed for changes in domain scores for reading literature, reading informational text, and language/vocabulary subsets.

Descriptive data derived from Miscue analysis was used to provide information about the types of miscues students made, their frequency and what it indicated about the readers’ strategy use and patterns of comprehension. Analysis of strategies was completed by utilizing information found in Chapter 6 of *Reading Process & Practice* by Constance Weaver (2002). Analysis of data looked for changes in number and type of miscues produced over the duration of the study as well as how the miscues affected the comprehension of the text.

Teacher-generated notes from all reading conferences were used to identify strategies that each student used efficiently, strategies the teacher introduced in retrospective miscue sessions and all subsequent oral readings recorded by the students. The teacher and students recorded the comprehension strategies tried to help focus on comprehension of text. The levels of texts chosen by the students were also analyzed to determine how the recordings were affecting their book choices.

Analysis of Dominie assessment data identified miscues produced and the criterion scores achieved in areas of reading accuracy, accuracy of comprehension, pace
and fluency. Dominie assessments were completed using program guides written by Dominie author, Diane DeFord.

Analysis of the data was used to define growth and identify areas of strength and weakness. The data was utilized to determine if the use of RMA in RTI was an effective strategy for improving reading comprehension for fourth-grade students reading below grade level.

Also, the students completed a self-monitoring reflection of their progress and their attitude towards reading. This self-reflection was part of a final group discussion as well as a written reflection by students in their reading journals. Written reflections also indicated their feelings about being part of the study group and suggestions for continuing or changing the process.

The goal of the study was to find out if Retrospective Miscue Analysis:

1. Positively affected student reading level and time spent in independent reading.

2. Helped students become more strategic readers able to articulate their strategies and strengths.

3. Influenced comprehension by self-monitoring reading.

4. Impacted engagement with text, book selection, and ability to talk about books.
CHAPTER 4

Data Collection and Findings

Gordon Wells (1986) conducted a fifteen-year longitudinal research study recording, transcribing and coding children’s language to see if the language of school is different from that of the home and if those differences affect children. The study was an attempt to identify the major linguistic influences on children’s educational achievement. Wells claims that children are active meaning-makers; however, they need evidence, guidance and encouragement in order to make progress in school. Retrospective Miscue Analysis was the means by which I provided support for the students involved in this study. Assessments and voice recordings provided the evidence for the students and myself as researcher and teacher. The guidance came through discussion of miscues, strategies they were using when reading, assessment results as well as presenting new strategies for them to try out as they continued to read independently. Meeting with them individually and as a small group provided the encouragement they needed to continue to read and make sense of what it was they were reading.

Using a classroom Response to Intervention model as a basis for implementing RMA allowed for consistent time devoted to each child with instruction tailored to their individual needs. Classroom RTI sessions were held two days a week for forty minutes each day allowing sufficient time to meet with two students each day. Each student brought one of their current library books to their intervention session, and they wanted
to audio record their reading and our conference on the iPad. Therefore, books were within their assessed ZPD range, or slightly higher, and they were also of interest to the student. The school media specialist had cards for each student that had a colored dot on it indicating the range they should be using to choose books that they could read. Almost all the books in the library had colored dots on them to indicate the reading level. So all the children had to do was match the colored dots on their card to the books to ensure they chose books within their ZPD determined by their STAR reading assessments. Students checked out two books every time they went to the library with one being fiction and the other being informational. The informational books were the ones almost all students in the class chose first and often asked “Help me find a good book to read” to get suggestions for fiction books to read.

This chapter describes and summarizes the data collected before, during, and after RMA session implementation with the four students during classroom RTI time. The data are divided into three parts. The first set of data reports screening data collected before the study began. This preliminary data included Burke Reading Inventory, Dominie initial assessment, and STAR Reading screening assessment. The second set of data are from the RMA session conversations with each of the four students identifying the strategies each student used in oral reading and strategies suggested for independent reading. The third set includes follow-up Burke Reading Inventory, Dominie assessment results, and end of year STAR reading assessment data.

4.1 SCREENING DATA

Burke Reading Inventory

The Burke Reading Inventory, developed by Carolyn Burke included in many different resources including Reading Process and Practice by Constance Weaver
(2002), was designed to elicit the readers’ awareness of strategies for dealing with what they don’t know as they read and reflect on themselves as readers. The inventory can be administered orally or students can respond in written form.

Before beginning work with selected students, all students in the class were administered the Burke Reading Inventory (Burke, 1987) in September. I wanted to gain insight into their perception of what reading is and the processes they apply when reading. The Burke Reading Inventory was administered to individual students away from the rest of the class while the remainder of the students participated in reading activities at their seats. Each student responded to the questions orally, and the only prompts given were “What else” or “Why did you say that?”

During one-on-one interviews, I recorded their responses provided orally, on paper copies of the interview questions. The Burke Reading Inventory found in Appendix A provided metalinguistic knowledge about their reading and the strategies they reported using. The reading inventory gave me information about what they think they do when reading as well as a reflection on themselves as readers. It also provided information on who they think of as good readers and what good readers do as role models for the reading process.

When looking at the Burke Reading Inventory when the students first started the study, they focused on reading words and using strategies to figure out words. The strategies they used included sounding out letters, breaking words up into small pieces and getting help sounding out words. They were aware that good readers read chapter books and read a lot, but they used different strategies for figuring out words. The students mentioned breaking words into syllables, writing them down and just guessing
and going on. They reported helping others by sounding out words, telling them the words, and getting help in small groups. If they felt they were good readers, it was because they could read a lot of words, and if they did not think they were good readers it was because they had trouble reading words. All responses had something to do with the reading of words.

Kenneth Goodman (1996) describes proficient readers as efficient, reading relatively fast, and effective, able to make sense of the text. KW would be classified a non-proficient reader as described by Goodman and Constance Weaver (2002) because he was neither effective nor efficient. He was unable to construct meaning from text because he was spending time trying to pronounce words rather than trying to maintain meaning. His responses to the Inventory indicated a need to get words correct, and good readers had to read hard words. When someone helped a reader, they helped with pronunciation of words. He felt a need to get help saying words and learn how to read harder words. His responses indicated a sub-skills view of reading.

At the beginning of the year, RS, a moderately proficient reader, also thought reading is a focus on words because to get better he needed to” pronounce words better.” When he got help, it was to pronounce words correctly. However, he might guess at the word and go on. He did indicate he learned to read by his mother having him write about a book he read, but he did not connect this summary activity to being able to read well. Responses indicated that he is closer to working at a skill level because he used syntactic and semantic cueing systems to help him with word recognition, but he focused on the graphophonemic cueing system of saying the words correctly.
HJ focused on the graphophonemic cueing system by breaking words into smaller parts to help sound them out. All of his responses to the Burke Reading Inventory at the beginning of the year, identified him as a less than proficient reader able to read words but not able to construct meaning from what he was reading. He focused on saying words correctly with no mention of understanding what the words meant or their connection to understanding what was being read. Therefore, I classified him as neither effective nor efficient due to his focus on needing to know how to pronounce words. He was dependent on the graphophonemic cueing system using word parts to sound out words.

In her first interview, AG was classified as a moderately effective reader who did not waste time trying to pronounce words she was reading, but she did not spend time on constructing meaning from text. On the other hand, AG did indicate that she “stops and thinks about” what she reads, but she still focused on saying the words and struggled with understanding what she read. In her eyes, good readers “don’t mess up words” and they read chapter books. She believed readers need help with words, yet she also believed good readers think about what they read. She also was at a sub-skill level because she saw the importance of thinking about what she reads, but she did not make the connection to comprehension. She was somewhat of an efficient reader because she did not waste time on words.

The strategies the students said they used for their own reading were similar to their responses to what the people they identify as good readers do when they come to something they do not know. Based on the students’ responses, I was curious to find out through this research study if they did what they said they did when they encountered
something they did not know. This question became one of my focuses for their recorded readings. For instance, initially, RS and KW both said they move on and come back to a word when they do not know it. On the other hand, AG reported that she stops and thinks about it to try to sound it out, and HJ indicated he breaks it into smaller pieces because there is usually a part he knows.

Asking “Who is a good reader you know?” and “What makes them a good reader” brought insight into their understanding of the reading process. RS and HJ both indicated their mothers were good readers, one because she “helps him with words” and the other because “she reads chapter books and pauses at the end of sentences.” The other two students named classmates as good readers because they “don’t mess up when they read aloud in class, read chapter books and help other people read”. The classmates they identified were also the ones they want to work with when doing group activities in class.

When asked “How would you help someone who is having trouble reading?” most of their responses focused on helping read the words. RS would “read it with them and help sound out words.” AG would also “try to sound out words or read the words for them”. Again, HJ would “help them break it into parts, say each part, then put the parts back together.” However, KW would ask them to” keep reading and come back to the word.” All of the responses had to do with being able to read the words with no discussion about understanding what they read. In addition, when asked “What would a teacher do to help that person?” all four students again focused on the teacher helping them with the words. The teacher would sound them out, pronounce them for them, or get the class to help them say the words.
When asked “What would you like to do better as a reader?” again the focus was on reading words. RS wanted to “get better at pronunciation of words,” AG wanted to “study words so that when she opened any book she could read the words on every page,” and KW wanted to “read harder words and figure them out.” The only different response was from HJ, who wanted to “read bigger books” that he elaborated that they would have harder words in them.

The most important question for me was “Do you think you are a good reader? Why? “Kinda” and “so-so” were responses from both RS and KW but neither of them could explain why they felt that way. AG, on the other hand immediately said, “Yes,” she was a good reader because she sometimes stops and thinks about stuff like the main idea and tries to sound out words. HJ was focused on words when he said he was a good reader, because he breaks words into syllables and pronounces them the right way.

Responses are all summarized in Appendix B.

There were many similarities in the group in their responses to the questions. The most prevalent being that the answers focused on word recognition and pronunciation. They all indicated that they would help someone having trouble reading by helping them sound out words or saying the words for them, and teachers would help them sound out words or told them words they could not read. Their opinions of themselves as readers varied, but again focused on word recognition and pronunciation, and they felt they could get better as a reader by reading more words and bigger words. The main difference in responses referred to who they consider good readers. Two of the boys stated that their mothers are good readers because she helped them or reads chapter books. The other two indicated classmates because they help others or read chapter books.
After reviewing student responses to the questions, it appeared that their primary focus as a reader was getting all the words pronounced correctly. Student responses to what they do when they came to something they didn’t know included: “have someone say the word to me,” “sound out the word,” and “get help with the word.” If they were helping someone, they would “tell them the word,” “ask the teacher,” “help them sound out the word,” or “help them break it into parts.” When asked what good readers do, they responded; “reread it to see what word it is,” “help me when I need help by telling me the word.” “reread it,” or “read it aloud or ask the teacher”.

Most of the class did not think they were good readers because they don’t know many words or mess up words as they read. One even stated that if they were a good reader “people might make fun of me if I gloat.” If they said they were good readers, it was because “they could read a lot of words.” Placing all of the class responses into a wordle shown in Figure 4.1, where frequency is indicated by the size of the words, it is clear that most of their answers focus on the reading of words and knowing words because the two most prominent words in the Wordle are words and word.

![Figure 4.1 Wordle of class responses to Burke Reading Inventory](image-url)
STAR Reading

An important component of RTI was the use of universal screening and ongoing progress monitoring (Mesmer & Mesmer, 2008/2009; Ysseldyke 2008). The School District provided us access to Renaissance Learning to monitor students’ reading levels and independent reading through the use of STAR Reading and Accelerated Reader. The school required us to administer the STAR Reading Assessment as a universal screening tool and progress monitoring tool that provided a benchmark for measuring reading growth throughout the school year. STAR reading assessment consisted of 34 online reading assessment questions covering a broad range of skills in literature, informational text and language skills utilizing a research-based progression of knowledge and skills. Students progressed through a set of questions that changed in difficulty based on their responses. All students in the school were required to take STAR Reading on the Renaissance website monthly for progress monitoring with a goal of at least a one-year gain by the end of the school year.

STAR Reading reports provided various types of information. The data included grade equivalency (GE), instructional reading level (IRL) and the zone of proximal development (ZPD) that guided book selection. When accessing the reports, the report stated that the fluctuation of scores was typical when administered over short periods of time and attention should be paid to the trends in the assessment scores.

Students selected for the study did not have the lowest instructional levels but were the lowest not receiving tutoring or resource support outside the classroom. Class screening scores on STAR reading placed three students at first grade level (one resource support and two receiving school provided tutor support), five students were at second grade level (two in resource and two receiving school provided tutor support). Four
students were at the third-grade level and two students at the fourth-grade level. One student receiving tutoring support was included in the study by parental request because I have known the family and the student responded well to me within the classroom. One of the other students initially scored at a fourth-grade level, but when he retook the assessment at the beginning of October, he dropped to a second-grade level. Because of his drop I wanted to include him in the study in the hope of understanding why he went from a fourth-grade level to a second-grade level. Reports from the test indicated there could be fluctuation in scores, or it could have been the amount of effort he put into answering the questions on the computer. Criterion data for the students participating in the study are summarized in Table 4.1. They were all at or below third grade level, thus they were reading one to two grades below grade level, and all but one were not receiving additional tutoring or attending class with a resource teacher.

Table 4.1 STAR Reading data from beginning of year indicating GE (grade equivalence), IRL (instructional reading level) and ZPD (Zone of Proximal Development).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>IRL</th>
<th>ZPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2-3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1.8-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJ</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5-3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.6-3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After students took STAR reading assessment, several different reports became available to the teacher for analysis. One of those reports was the Diagnostic Report. This report provided a scale score based on the difficulty of questions and the number of
correct responses. The scale score placed the student into one of four groups: at/above the benchmark, on watch, intervention, and urgent intervention. A national percentile rank was given to compare students to others in the same grade nationally. Reports included both a grade equivalent score and instructional reading level for meeting student needs and fostering improvement.

At the beginning of the school year, the assessment was administered to all students in the class to provide benchmark scores for progress monitoring. The four students fell into different benchmark levels with scale scores ranging from 158-471; RS was just at the fourth grade benchmark, AG was on watch, HJ needed intervention and KW was in need of urgent intervention (hence the placement with a school reading tutor). Grade equivalency varied considerably. KW was at first-grade eighth-month; HJ was a second-grade ninth-month, AG third-grade first-month and RS was at a fourth-grade second-month. However, RS took the test again in October and fell to a second-grade fourth-month level while the other three showed some improvement. Because of this drop, he was selected for the study. Instructional levels ranged from Primer for KW to right around third grade for the other three as summarized in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Screening data from STAR reading assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale score</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>IRL</th>
<th>percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KW</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJ</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS (August)</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS (September)</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One additional component of the Diagnostic Report was domain scores ranging from 0-100 that estimated the percent of mastery of fourth-grade skills. Domain scores are summarized in Table 4.3 and full reports can be found in Appendix C. The domain scores were broken into literature, informational text, and language/vocabulary skills that were assessed by the program. Students were given a domain score and a score for 26 different specific sub-skills that should be mastered by fourth graders. After looking at the list of skills, teachers could quickly identify areas of strength and areas that needed support and instruction during differentiated instruction or attention during whole class instruction.

The Diagnostic Report was viewed or printed after each assessment. This range determines the foci of independent and differentiated instruction within the classroom. Student scores were monitored for progress each month. Areas of weakness were addressed before the next assessment.

Table 4.3 screening assessment domain scores from students’ STAR diagnostic report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>RS (August)</th>
<th>RS (October)</th>
<th>KW</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>HJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key ideas and details</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft and Structure</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of reading and level of text complexity</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational text</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>WP</td>
<td>When</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key ideas and details</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft and Structure</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of knowledge</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of reading and level of text complexity</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary acquisition and use</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the beginning of the school year, KW’s STAR reading scores were at a first-grade eighth-month level, well below grade level with test performance. His sub-skill scores were all within a range of 9-21% mastery of fourth grades level skills. His weakest areas included author’s purpose and perspective (9), main idea and details (11) and argumentation of knowledge and ideas (9), all part of understanding informational text. His strength was in vocabulary acquisition and use especially structural analysis (25), figures of speech (23), context clues (22) and word meaning (23). These strengths supported his strategy of sounding out words when reading as illustrated in his Burke Reading Inventory and indicated a need for support and instruction with informational text.

Due to a significant drop in scores from August to October for RS, both sets of domain scores were evaluated. Domain scores in August ranged from 69-90% mastery of grade level skills. In October, they ranged from 27-56%. In October, his scores were about half of what they were in August, so there was a concern. Areas of strength for RS
were author’s word choice and figurative language (56), structural analysis (55), and word meaning in both literary and informational text (52). These strengths supported his emphasis on reading words and being able to tell what words mean in context. His weaknesses were argumentation in informational text (27), informational text key idea and details (31), and author’s purpose and perspective in informational text (27). Weaknesses indicated a need for assistance in comprehending informational text.

HJ’s mastery levels ranged from 42-72% mastery level of grade level skills. His areas of strength were author’s word choice and figurative language in informational text (72), language structural analysis (71), and word meaning (68). HJ read words well and had strategies to break words apart which supported his strengths. His weaknesses were main idea and details in informational text (48), author’s purpose and perspective (43), and argumentation (42). His weakest overall domain was informational text indicating a need to work with him on strategies that would help him understand informational text.

Compared to others in the group AG had the highest overall scores. Her domain scores ranged from 48-76% mastery of fourth-grade level skills. She was strongest in vocabulary acquisition, specifically structural analysis (76) and word meaning in both literary and informational text (74). The strengths supported the strategies she used to read words and self-correct as she read. Her weaknesses were determining the informational text author’s purpose and perspective (49) and argumentation (48). It appeared AG along with the other three students would benefit from instruction and support with informational text with strategies that would improve their areas of weakness.
Dominie

Dominie provided a record of miscues, retelling, and comprehension and criterion scores for accuracy, text comprehension, pace during reading, and fluency during reading. The reader’s ratio of self-corrections to number of miscues produce is also computed as an indicator of the degree to which they monitor their reading for best fit amongst cues. Students orally read a part of a leveled text, retold what they read, and then finished reading the text independently. After completing the reading, they responded verbally to a set of comprehension questions about the text.

Dominie was administered at the beginning of the study in January to provide a benchmark reading level for students, then administered again at the end of the study to measure growth. The focus of the Dominie analysis was on miscue analysis, retelling, and comprehension. In addition, an analysis of pace, fluency and self-correction ratio was completed. During the first two weeks of the study administration of Dominie Reading Assessments occurred. Two student assessments were completed each week. A book level chosen for them used STAR reading assessments, and a previous miscue analysis done using selections from the website Reading A-Z.com.

Early in the school year KW was given a miscue analysis of a short story from the Reading A-Z website at a Fountas & Pinnell level O (third grade) which correlates to Dominie Level 11. He had 13 miscues in 149 words that included “gave” for “given”, “shook” for “shock,” “bicycle” for “bracelet,” “started” for “stared”, and “broke” instead of “burst.” These miscues all had beginning visual/sound information matches and within word features. The miscues were syntactically correct, but semantic information was affected. These semantic miscues affected his comprehension as he scored 20%
acceptability on a written comprehension assessment. His additional miscues were repetitions and dropping of suffixes (-ed, -s, and –or), but included three self-corrections, which means he had a self-correction ratio of 1:8, supporting a determination that he is a moderately effective reader.

At the beginning of the study, he was given the Dominie Bridging level 9A, *Caves and Our Past*, an end of second-grade level book with a grade equivalence of 3.1. His oral reading was slow and quiet which placed him at a fluency level of 1 and a reading rate of 66 wpm. The volume had to be turned all the way up on the iPad to hear the words he read when listening. He made 13 miscues that included substitutions of “covered” for “carved,” “hug” for” huge,” “coker” for “charcoal,” and “moose” for” moss.” The remaining errors were dropping of suffixes including “wall” for” walls,” “flood” for “flooded,” “warm” for “warmer,” “art” for the “artist,” and “end” for” ended.” The criterion for miscues was no more than 16 errors or 92%, and he met that criterion with an accuracy score of 92%. When asked to retell what he read he had difficulty and didn’t want to talk about the story. I prodded him repeatedly, and he only responded with the use of paint and making pictures. He did not want to listen to what he read and did not want to finish reading the book independently making it impossible to check comprehension.

The next day he was asked again to continue reading the book but refused, saying it was too hard. He was not pushed to finish the book but asked if he would consider reading a different book on another day because he had to leave the room in a few minutes to go to tutoring, and he was agreeable. Due to a family tragedy, he missed a full week of school losing the fidelity of the assessment if we tried to continue with the
story. When he returned, he was also unwilling to read a different level Dominie book because he thought he would find it too hard like the last one, so I decided to allow him to read from a classroom library book he chose.

Table 4.4 KW’s Criterion scores for Dominie administered at beginning of study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Text Level</th>
<th>Grade Equivalence</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>SC Ratio</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Pace</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KW</td>
<td>9A</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on analysis of KW’s assessment, I needed to focus his instruction on assisting him in spending less time struggling with words and building confidence. I planned to focus our sessions on identifying what he was doing well especially with word recognition. In addition, I planned to instruct him on finding strategies that would help him be able to retell what he read and remembering details.

In August RS’s STAR Reading Assessment indicated he was reading at an end of the third-grade level, so I decided to administer the Dominie assessment at a fourth-grade level. He chose the level 12A book, *The Dragon Shield: A Portrait of Leonardo da Vinci* that had a grade equivalency of 4.7. He was interested in the book after seeing the cover and glancing at some of the pictures. As he began to read, his miscues within the first fifty words numbered nine including three repetitions of “rose” and “its.” Additionally, he substituted “lamp” for “lump”, “preachment” for “parchment”, “propped” for “propelled” and “covers” for “curving” among others. At the end of fifty words, I stopped him and asked how he felt about the reading because his accuracy level was already 82% below the criterion of 92%. He admitted it was too difficult.

We then looked at 11A, *The Shoemaker of Cobbler Vale*, early fourth-grade level and grade equivalency of 4.1. I asked him if he knew about the story the *Elves and the
Shoemaker and he did not. As he read the passage he made repeated repetitions and only miscued on the words “heritage” (stopping to ask what that word meant), and “Rosenthal” meeting the criterion for errors with a score of 99.5%, above the criterion of 92%. His reading was both syntactically and semantically correct with graphophonemic errors with vowel sounds. RS did not make any self-corrections as he read. His fluency rate was a 2 reading word by word ignoring punctuation and no rise and fall in his voice. His reading rate was 83 wpm. He was able to begin his retell of the story accurately, but he stopped because he said he was confused and couldn’t remember the rest. When he finished reading the story independently, and he responded to the questions, he was only able to score 45% accuracy on the comprehension questions. He could not compare the Dominie story to the story The Elves and the Shoemaker to other fairy tales because of lack of experiences with those stories. With this information, it placed him at an end of the third-grade instructional.

Instructional plans for RS focused on helping him pace his reading so that he recognized sentences as ideas. I felt this would help him with comprehension. I also level that correlates with scores achieved on the initial STAR assessment. I planned Table 4.5 RS’s criterion scores for Dominie administered at the beginning of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Text Level</th>
<th>Grade Equivalence</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>SC Ratio</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Pace</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>11A</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

to use instructional time to help him summarize, recognize key ideas and supporting details, and distinguish important details that support the development of a story.
HJ began the study with a Dominie oral reading assessment at level 11, *The Magic Sword*, which was a beginning fourth grade level with a grade equivalency of 4.0, chosen based on his STAR reading assessment growth to a 3.7 instructional level by December. When looking at the cover of the book, he was interested and wanted to read the book. His miscues were usually syntactically and semantically acceptable. He broke words apart repeating syllables and then saying them as a word and dropping a few ending suffixes. When he came to an unusual name he skipped it but knew it was a name. His miscues included saying “leg-end” for “legend.” He skipped the word, “Uther” and slowed down to read “tournament,” substituted “square” for “squire” (later asking what the word was), and “commented” for “commanded.” His accuracy rate was 98% with a pace of 98 wpm. Even though his accuracy was above the criterion of 92%, his fluency rate was a 1 because he completely ignored punctuation reading word by word and slowing down to problem solve the words he had difficulty pronouncing.

HJ’s retelling of the story was partially correct, but he could not identify the relationship of characters that was key to understanding the story. He included how the king would be chosen, but he could not identify Arthur as the king’s son removed at birth. When he responded to comprehension questions after reading independently, he was only able to respond correctly to five of the eight questions with short responses that provided a comprehension score of 62%. Even he met the criterion for accuracy but not the criterion for comprehension placing his instructional level at a mid-third grade level.

Table 4.6 HJ’s criterion scores for Dominie administered at beginning of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Text Level</th>
<th>Grade Equivalence</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>SC Ratio</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Pace</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HJ</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of HJ’s assessment showed a need to focus on how he reads. He focused on words and had excellent word attack skills. I planned to work with him on comprehension by first slowing his reading to recognize sentences as ideas. Then I planned to work on comprehension skills of summarizing, predicting and characterization.

*She Spelled T-E-A-C-H-E-R*, Level 9B was chosen by AG for her first Dominie assessment because she knew about Helen Keller, and she was interested in the topic. This book was at an early third-grade level that correlated with where she was on the STAR assessment. When reading the story, she read quite fluently with rises and falls in her voice that correlated to a fluency score of 4. As she read, she broke words apart to pronounce them accurately, and all miscues were self-corrected through repetition. She went back to re-read mispronounced words on three occasions, after reading through the rest of the sentence. She slowed down to break the word “Tuscumbia” into parts and said it was like the word “Columbia.” She met the criterion for accuracy with a 98% accuracy score and a self-correction ratio of 1:1.2. As she attempted to retell the story, she was able to recall beginning details, but she got confused even after going back to book as a reference point and could not finish the retell. After she finished reading the remainder of the book independently, her responses to the questions often included “I don’t know,” or she went back to the book to try to find the answer with limited success. She only responded to four of the eight questions correctly scoring 50%, therefore, not meeting the criterion of 75% for comprehension. Her instructional level was indicated to be 9B correlated to a grade equivalency of 3.3, placing her at an early third-grade instructional level.
Planned instruction focused on addressing strategies to help her improve comprehension. She already had excellent word recognition and identification skills self-correcting almost every miscue. In addition, I wanted to find a strategy that would help her locate information in the text. During her retelling and comprehension assessment she went back to the book to find answers she knew were there but could not locate what she was looking for.

All students were again performing below grade level. Oral reading by the students indicated that they focused on words by stopping to break them apart or repeating them until they pronounced them correctly. Retellings by all students were limited and comprehension was weak. Students appeared to pay more attention to the words and less attention to what they were reading. All four students Dominie levels correlated to their STAR reading levels.

4.2 RETROSPECTIVE MISCUE ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY DISCUSSIONS

Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA) and strategy lessons began as an intervention for this study. RMA has flexibility in using a face-to-face conference, small group work, whole class instruction and student-led discussions that include oral reading. The RMA sessions were designed as a conversation about what the reader is doing and thinking as they read.
Because I wanted to provide as much support for my students as possible they were allowed to select the books for oral reading. Research shows that when students have some choice in the books they read they have more desire to learn than when the teacher makes selections for them (Newkirk, 1991; Valencia, Hiebert & Afflerbach, 1994). Texts brought to the sessions for oral reading were books the students had chosen. Therefore, I did not have a copy of the book in front of me to mark as they miscued. The students sat to my left, and I looked over their shoulder as they read from their book noting any miscues on paper. I was able to take the book when students finished reading it before they returned the book to the library to verify miscues recorded on paper by listening to their recorded reading on the iPad.

The purpose of the miscue analysis was to gather information about the reading process used by the students and provide support to the reader as they take the next step. The Taxonomy of Reading Miscue developed by Ken Goodman (1996) was designed to understand the affect on the reading process by previous instruction, strategies used, language and cultural background, opportunities to read, time to read, purpose and motivation to read, situational context, supportiveness of text, and flexibility in reading. Each session with the students included oral reading and retelling followed by listening to the iPad recording of their reading and retelling. Follow-up discussions centered on miscues as well as the accuracy of retelling to enable students to understand themselves better as readers and to identify their next step as a reader as they continue to read.

Each session began with a discussion of what book each student was reading and why they chose the book. I asked if they had started the book, and if they had, they were asked to tell what they had read. Most of the time, they had not read the book because
they had just gotten it from the library. The student then read for two or three minutes
recording their reading on the iPad. They were excited to get to use the iPad because
they are fascinated with the use of technology. After they read, I asked them to retell
what they read, often with prompting. When they finished their retell, we listened to their
reading and retelling stopping periodically to discuss what we heard.

Because KW went out during RTI three days a week with a small tutoring group,
I usually started with him on Monday. When KW began to work with me during this
study, he was hesitant and very soft-spoken. When he was reading, he kept glancing at
the iPad and would lose his place. Our first recorded session was with the book *Five
Minute Spooky Stories* that featured many Disney characters. This book was a fiction
book he chose because it looked interesting. It was also a new book that I added to the
classroom library and the students all wanted to read it. As he read, he made only a few
miscues. He substituted the name “Barbie” for “Bo-Peep” and skipped the word “pelt.”
He listened to the audio recording of his reading, and we had the following conversation.

T: Tell me what you just read.

K: I read that it was, there was a night when Woody and them had the house to
themselves, and . . . . . .(long pause)

Woody asked them what do they want to do, and it started thundering.

T: Tell me do you think this was an easy book for you to read, a just right book or
too hard?

K: It was just right.

T: Why did you say just right?

K: Because some words I knew and some I didn’t.
T: OK give me an example of a word you didn’t know.

(He points to the word pelt)

T: What if I asked you to read that sentence without that word, what would it be?

Read the sentence and leave out the word.

K: Suddenly rain began to ____________ the windows.

T: What does rain do to the windows? Without knowing what the word is, what word would you put in there? Rain began to blank the windows.

K: hit the windows?

T: Does that make sense?

K: Yeah.

T: Rain began to hit the windows. That word is just another word for the word hit. That word is pelt and is a new vocabulary word for you. You made sense of that sentence without knowing that word didn’t you?

K: Yeah.

T: So this is what I want you to focus on as you continue reading on your own. I am going to give you sticky notes. If you come to a word that you don’t know. Say the sentence without that word and see what the missing word might mean. Then say the sentence with something you put in there instead of the word you don’t know that you think makes sense. What I want you to do is write the word you didn’t know on the sticky note along with the word you said in its place. Then we will see if they match in meaning. Do you think you can do that?

K: Maybe. I can try.
T: Let’s do it for the word pelt. You said hit when I asked you to replace the word. See this was an action word and you gave me an action word and that’s a good thing. That’s what good readers do. You showed me a good reader strategy. So when I don’t know a verb I can put another verb in its place. If it is a noun, I can put a noun in its place.

T: You didn’t know this word (I pointed to the word Barbie). What is that – a verb or a name?

K: a name

T: Good it’s a name. You put in there Barbie. Is that ok?

K: Yes

T: Even though that word is not Barbie (Bo Peep) it still made sense. That’s a good reading strategy that you are using, and I want you to continue doing that.

T: Do you think you read ok?

K: (shakes head)

T: I think you did ok. Tell me what you did when you came to words you didn’t know? You did one of the two things. What did you do? Did you notice?

K: No. (We then listened to his reading a second time to find out what he did when he came to a word he was unsure of how to pronounce.)

T: Listening to the recording and following along in the text I noticed that you substituted words and sometimes stopped and tried to figure it out. What helped you read better, stopping and trying to figure it out, or substituting another word?

K: Stopping and trying to figure it out.
T: Stopping helped you. Which strategy helped you keep going and understand the story? Think about it.

K: (puts head down and does not respond)

T: When you substituted you kept going, but when you stopped and tried to figure it out you got kind of lost didn’t you? Yes or no?

K: yes.

T: So instead of stopping and trying to figure it out what can you do? Substitute something and keep going. You are doing that. I want you to keep doing that when you are reading. Substitute and go on or skip a word and go on. Do what we did when we did “hit the window”. Skip the word and read the rest of the sentence then see if you can put something in its place that makes sense. The strategy I want you to practice this week is if you come to a word that you don’t know, skip it and read the rest of the sentence. Put a word in its place that makes sense to you. Just like you did with Barbie instead of Bo Peep. That’s a good thing you are doing. Make note of the words you skip and the words you put in its place and see if it helps you understand what you are reading. Good job!

On two subsequent sessions, he read from Geronimo Stilton’s *Lost Treasure of the Emerald Eye*. Again his major miscue was hesitating to sound out words with long pauses in his reading. We discussed his strategy use and how it affects his understanding of the story along with his confidence.

T: You slow down when get to words you don’t know. What might be something better to do?

K: Skip it
T: You read “is-land” recognizing the parts of the word. Again that’s a good reader strategy. However, the word is “island” with the s silent. That is the only word you missed on the whole page. (I used this response to help him recognize that he did not struggle with words in an effort to build his confidence level.)

T: You also broke down the word “editorial” (ed, it, or,) sounding out the parts of the word. That is a good reader strategy, to breakdown words to sound them out. It seems that you are not confident in your ability to read. You think you are not a good reader. Am I right?

K: Yes.

T: Why do you think that?

K: Because I struggle with words.

T: Do you think I might struggle with words when I read? What’s a good strategy I can use if I struggle with a word?

K: Skip it and go on.

T: I coached you through the first word you stopped on. Later you read cheese puffs – Does that sound like something he wants at nine o’clock in the morning?

K: Not really.

T: You do a lot of good things when you read – You sound out words, you know beginning sounds, you try to put words together with things you already know. You just have to develop confidence because you read
almost every word on those two pages correctly with very few mistakes.

Now tell me what you read.

This conversation highlighted the strategies he used when reading without even recognizing them. It also provided insight into the types of strategies that would benefit him as a reader. As we continued our conversation about what he read he was able to make an inference by identifying details from the story that indicated he was getting ready to go to work. He said he was going to work, not school because he was an adult. KW had good strategies for reading but did not recognize them unless they were pointed out to him. It was obvious that he found importance in reading all words on a page correctly, and that was what makes him a good reader.

On one occasion toward the end of the study I was prepared to have him record his reading with me on the iPad but I was called out of the room to meet with a parent. KW, however, chose to continue to read and record his reading even though I was not there. Reading independently was something he would not have done at the beginning of the study, so I left him with the iPad. When I returned to the classroom, he told me what he read but he had difficulty listening to it because the room was too noisy. For him to take the initiative to read, record, and then listen to his recorded reading without me, was an important step for him. He said he liked to read aloud and listen to himself read because it helped him remember what he read.

After he recorded his reading without my presence and I returned to class, he asked me to help him find another good book to read which I promised to do when we went to the library. When we took MAP testing the following week, he made a point of telling me he was taking his time and reading everything carefully. He wanted to do well
on the test because the last time he took the test he rushed through it just answering questions without reading most of them. He made a major gain on the MAP assessment, and we celebrated that success.

KW showed strengths in trying suggested strategies. He sounded out words, and he used context clues to determine word meaning as he read. Word recognition was his strongest area, and he enjoyed literary text. All the books KW brought to RMA sessions were literary text. When asked why he did not choose informational text his response was there are too many words in them that he does not know. We decided to have him work with a small group of students with informational text to provide him additional support. Reading informational text would not be as difficult for him with a support group because he could talk about the book as he read with the group.

RS was the student that most perplexed me because he started the year off at a high third-grade level and dropped to a mid-second grade level making little gain by December. He liked to read aloud in class but when he did he went back and repeated many words. His state testing scores were as high as some of the students that were in advanced placement class for ELA and his MAP scores were the highest in the class.

For our first recorded session, RS brought the book *Bloodhounds*. He chose the book because he had read other books from the school library on dogs, and he liked dogs. His miscues included omitting the title, saying “gently” for “greatly,” “canin” for “Canidae,” “canes” for “canis,” adding “ly” to “scientific.” He also repeated the beginning sound of “descended,” and self-correcting “12,000” after reading “2,000” then self-correcting an omission. We discussed his difficulty with words but focused on his retelling through the following conversation:
T: As you were reading along and listened, tell me how you read that text. What were your thoughts about your reading? Was it easy? Was it hard?

R: Kind of easy.

T: Did you have trouble with any particular words?

R: I had trouble with this one (points to descended)

T: Which one?

R: (points to “descended”) Well I said it right at least

T: descended why was that difficult for you?

R: I didn’t really know what the word is, and it was hard to sound out.

T: So if I read that sentence without that word… Read the sentence without the word.

R: In fact, many people believe today’s domestic dogs blank from wolves.

T: So what does that mean to you?

R: Come from wolves

T: So – come from wolves. When you come to a word that you do not know, skip the word. Read the sentence without the word then put in a word that makes sense. So if I said came from wolves, would that have been ok?

R: Yes

T: OK, so that’s something I want you to work on when reading independently. When you see a word you don’t know, read the sentence without the word and see what word you would put in there that would make sense. That’s going to help you understand it. Was there anything you thought about your retelling? Do you think your retelling was accurate?
(He shakes his head).

T: You’re saying no. Why? Tell me why you thought your retelling wasn’t accurate?

R: I didn’t give enough details.

T: For instance, what details did you leave out?

R: Dogs can weigh as much as 200 pounds.

T: Did you put in things that weren’t on this page?

R: Yes.

T: What exactly? What did you add that wasn’t there that you remember?

R: (no response) hesitated

T: Where did you think you got those ideas you added?

R: Knowledge

T: Your knowledge, so if I am retelling, I’m telling what’s there. You’re relating it to something you already know which is a good thing. Using what you already know to help you understand a text is good. When you are asked to retell stick to the story. But understanding it involves having some prior knowledge or something to connect it to. So, here’s what I want you to do for the next time. I am going to give you sticky notes. I want you to write down the words that you didn’t understand, but I want you to read the sentence without the word and put in a word that makes sense to you. Write down the word that you put in. So we can see what’s helping you to understand the text.

For the next sessions, RS brought an informational text *Houston Titans*, a football book at a high fifth-grade level. When asked why he chose the book he said he could
read it, and he liked football. He wanted to be a football player and was already on a team. RS spent a lot of time repeating words and reading word by word. Our follow-up discussion focused on his reading rate and repetition of words.

T: You kept going over the words, stopping and repeating words, why?
R: Because I didn’t know the words.

T: If you didn’t know the words were you losing your train of thought?
R: I was losing my train of thought.

T: Why do you think this was happening?
R: It was kind of too loud for me.

T: So you think the classroom environment was interfering with your reading?
That’s an interesting observation. Were you repeating the same things over and over because you were unsure of yourself?
R: Kind of.

T: You didn’t seem to struggle with many words. There was only one that I particularly noticed because you said it every time. Do you know what word that was?

(RS points to the word “oilers”)

T: You can read that word by looking at the parts, and you know how to do that. “–er” at the end of a word stands for what?
R: a person

T: “s” at the end of the word means what?
R: more than one.

T: What’s left?
R: oil. Oh I got it, Oilers. That’s the name of the team.

T: Why do you think they are called Oilers?

R: There’s a bunch of oil there.

T: What I see you do however, is read words instead of reading sentences. You skip over periods and go on reading. I want you to reread just the first sentence of the chapter stopping at the period.

RS continued to read five more sentences stopping at the periods. He then was able to retell what he read with accuracy and included more details. I asked him to write down the strategies he would work on as he read. He wrote down two. “If I get to a word I don’t know, finish the sentence and come back to put in a word that makes sense in the sentence.” “I am going to read by sentences, not words.”

As RS continued to work with me, he brought books to the RMA sessions that were at increasingly higher levels. He brought the book *Blake Griffin* to his final session. The only miscue he made was when he was reading a measurement that had the customary unit and the corresponding metric unit abbreviated in parentheses. He stopped because he did not know what the “m” meant. He had no other miscues and could retell the story with accuracy. We talked about how the number in parentheses was in a different system of measurement, and I asked him if he left it out would it would affect his comprehension. He realized it was just another way of saying the measurement, and he could skip it when he was reading. I reassured him that it was alright because I often skip it myself when I am reading similar information.

Because his final book was at a fifth-grade level, and he made no mistakes, he said, “I can read at a 5.0 level, can’t I!” So if he wanted to challenge himself as a reader,
I asked him what he would do. He wanted to jump to a 6.0 level, and we talked about what he would do if he went to that level and struggled. He knew he would need to go down to a lower level so that he could understand what he was reading. When he ended our session, he went straight to the school library to select a new book and returned with a level 5.4 biography of another football player.

HJ was the most difficult student to work with because he would shut down and get angry if he felt his ability being questioned. Constructive suggestions were not well received by HJ when suggestions were offered to change how he said something or clarify any of his responses. He considered himself an excellent student who should be in advanced classes even though test scores did not indicate that placement. The most profound data on HJ came from his Accelerated Reader reports. He tended to take tests without reading books because he thought he knew the book. However, he failed more tests than he passed. I have discussed this with him on a regular basis, but he continued to take tests on a book he read followed by several he has not read.

For our first session, he brought the book, Zac Efron. He chose the book because he knew who he was and knew a little bit about him. I asked him to begin by reading the title of the book, but he asked me to read it. He was not taking the activity seriously, and we had to talk about why I was recording his reading. I explained how it was designed to help him become a better reader and possibly get him into the advanced placement class he felt he belonged in. This discussion helped him refocus and commit to working with me.

When HJ read, he broke the word “ancestry” into syllables to read it correctly. He had trouble with the name of the city “Arroyo Grande” (tried it twice then skipped it).
There were headings on the page that he completely skipped over, and the only other word he miscued on was the name of a musical, “Gypsy.” When asked to retell what he read instead of retelling he summarized by saying “I read how he grew up and what his favorite things to do were.” When asked for more details he continued “likes to play basketball and he lives between San Francisco and Los Angeles, but he was raised in California”. He read two more pages and his retelling was simply “that Zac liked singing and acting, and that he wanted to be an athlete, and that his mom and dad wanted him to be a professional actor”.

Our follow-up conversation centered on how he was reading. He was in a hurry to read the words on the page, and they often ran together. He did, however, use a good reading strategy of summarizing what he read. We talked about the difference between retelling and summarizing. Because he was able to summarize what he read I wanted him to focus on the details in the story. I gave him sticky notes to write down what he felt were important details found on each page as he read. I wanted him to realize that the details were important in his summary and would help someone better understand the story. We also talked about his Accelerated Reader report and the number of tests he was not scoring successfully. He was taking tests on books he thought he knew but did not read. Sometimes he said he clicked on the wrong book, and I reminded him the program asked him if he was sure that was the book he wanted to take the test on the computer. He needed to check the author and book level carefully before clicking “yes” to take the test.

The next session he brought a chapter fiction book titled Flashpoint. He chose the book because the cover looked interesting, and it was a harder book he wanted to
read. After he read three pages of the book, I had him listen to the recording and discussed how well he did. He thought he did well. What I pointed out to him was how he was reading word by word and ignoring punctuation. He focused on words, hesitating if he came to a word he did not know. He sounded the words out and after reading word parts, did not go back to say the word as a word instead of just the parts of the word.

His retelling again was a summary and our discussion went as follows:

T: Predict what might have caused the fire.
HJ: matches, burned paper

T: Who is the main character?
HJ: Luther?

T: Tell me what you know about him
HJ: He has seen a lot of fires in his life.

T: Is he a child or an adult?
HJ: A teenager.

T: What is he doing?
HJ: Just standing there.

T: Do you think something might happen to him in the story?
HJ: I don’t know; I’ll have to find out.

T: If you could ask a question about what might come next what would you ask?
HJ: I don’t think I have any.

T: What do you think is coming next?
HJ: Another fire.

T: Why do you say that?
HJ: Because they have been having fires for the last few months.
HJ’s responses appeared to indicate he knew what was going on in the story but did not think ahead or make predictions about what may come next. What I asked him to try to do was think about the kinds of questions he sees on reading tests. I wanted him to try to make up one question at the end of the chapter that someone else could attempt to answer after they read the book. He didn’t think he could do that. I suggested that I could provide him with question starters that he could use if that would help and he was willing to try. The strategy that I wanted him also to use was to make predictions about what he thought might happen next as he was reading. I also reminded him to make sure that he stops and pauses when he sees punctuation marks as he reads.

HJ came to the next session with a different book. He brought *Washington Redskins* by Mark Stewart. I was curious why he didn’t return with *Flashpoint*. He responded that he liked football, and the other book was too long. The book was at a high fifth grade level beyond his ZPD, but I decided to let him read it to see how well he did. After reading for less than one minute he had made five miscues and was rushing through words ignoring punctuation again, so I stopped him from reading. It seemed that he had not remembered the importance of stopping at punctuation marks, so we discussed the idea.

T: Stop and tell me how you are reading this.

HJ: Stopping at each period.

T: Are you?

HJ: I don’t know.

T: Let’s see. (Stopped recording and we listened to what he read).
T: This is what you are doing, ignoring punctuation. You are in such a big hurry to read the words. How do you understand if you are racing through the words? Try it again reading one sentence at a time as a sentence stopping at the period.

There was a long pause as he sat pouting about having his reading questioned and being told to reread. When he finally began to read, I had him read six sentences one at a time stopping at the period before going on. He did not have but two miscues in the subsequent reading. He was able to retell everything he read including the details. I pointed out the two miscues “proven” and “uniform”. He was able to take the word uniform knowing the “form” part and using context clues of clean and dirty, he was able to use prior knowledge with the context clues to get the word uniform. When he read proven, he used the long “o” sound because he saw the “e” at the end and knew the rules for vowel sounds.

In a follow-up discussion, I discussed making predictions as a strategy that good readers use when they read. They like to think they know what is going to happen and continue reading to prove their prediction right, but they may find their prediction was wrong or may need to revise as they continue reading. The strategy gave them a purpose for reading and helped them keep track of what was happening in the text. We worked together to make a prediction about what we thought would happen in his book and wrote it down. He was to see if his prediction was correct or not, and it was alright if he decided to change it as he continued to read. He again had to be reminded about slowing down and reading ideas, not words.

In his last session, he was able to record his reading as sentences and ideas instead of words. He stopped while reading to make a quick prediction and explained why he
made the prediction using evidence from the text he read to support his prediction. He thought he was doing better at reading and wanted to record more because he liked listening to himself read. Our follow-up discussion focused on what he was doing as a reader. He responded that he understood more of what he read and didn’t try to sound out every word anymore as he read it. He felt he was a better reader.

AG was excited and anxious to begin working with me one-on-one. AG’s first RMA session was with the book *Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad*. It was a graphic novel she chose because she liked to read about people, and she already knew a lot about Harriet Tubman. Her reading was fluent with only five miscues that were self-corrected. As she was reading, she repeated the word “run: three times in the word “runaway” as she tried to figure out the word, finally reading it correctly. She used the same process with “under” in “underground” and ‘Can” in the word “Canada”. The pronunciation of the word “Southern,” she said with the word “south”. Her miscues did not interfere with the syntactical meaning of the text. However, when she retold the story, it was more a telling of facts she already knew not what she read in the text. When I was watching over her shoulder as she was reading and listening to her, the retelling and text were related but not the same. So the focus of our discussion centered on AG’s retelling.

A: I read about Harriet Tubman. . . Um taking trips to Canada. I mean back to um, um I read Harriet Tubman going back to um….. (Hesitated)

T: Tell me more.
A: Going back to this place, to the place to pick….to um, to rescue, ..well, to rescue her family and taking back to safety, yeah I think safer to keep from getting beat by the slave owners.

T: Can you tell me more of what you read?

AG struggled to retell the story, and we talked about why she was having difficulty.

T: Listen to what you read and your retelling to see if the two match.

A: I know they don’t.

T: You know they don’t? How do you know that before listening to the recording?

A: Because…

T: Tell me why. You know they don’t match.

A: It didn’t tell much about the slave owners.

T: You added that? Why did you add that?

A: because I was confused.

T: Why were you confused? Why do you think you were confused?

A: no response

T: I think you were relying on your previous knowledge about Harriet Tubman and stories you have read and heard about her life. Using prior knowledge to help you understand what you are reading is a strategy that good readers use often. Do you have trouble remembering what you read?

A: Sometimes

T: Even though this was a short graphic novel and you didn’t read that many pages, you had trouble remembering exactly what you read. We need to develop a strategy to help you remember what you read. Right?

A: Um-hmm
T: Think about what you did. You knew what you retold was not correct. So let’s think about how we can do something to help you remember better.

T: Tell me what you think you did well after listening to yourself read.
A: That I stopped at the periods and didn’t put it all into a paragraph.

T: So you stopped at the periods instead of running the ideas altogether. That’s a good strategy that’s going to help you understand. So, I want to find a way to help you remember what you read. What’s something you think I can do? What can you do to help you remember what you read?
A: I don’t know.

T: How many pages did you read?

T: What page did you start on?
A: page 20

T: What could we have done at the end of page 20, to get you to remember what you read?
A: Um, I could reread it.

T: OK that’s one strategy. What else could I do?
A: Go back and look at the passage again.

T: So you suggest rereading. Do you think that makes it clearer for you?
A: uh huh

T: So, what else could we do? Could you write something down?
A: Yeah.

T: So we could use a sticky note to write down everything that’s on the page or just a couple of words?
A: Just a couple of words.

T: So maybe a sentence or two if it’s a full page of text? What I want you to do is put a sticky note on every page and write down a sentence or just a few words to help you remember what you read on that page.

At this point, I went and retrieved a pack of sticky notes and gave them to AG. I asked her to stop at the end of each page and write down what she read and stick the note on the page. After reading five or six pages she was to go back and reread the sticky notes. If any of them were confusing or did not seem to go together she was to try rereading the page and writing a new sticky note. She immediately asked if she could use them as she reread the book we had shared. I was glad to see her eagerness to start using the strategy we discussed and also offered her the suggestion that she take her sticky notes to the computer when she takes the test on the book.

AG was not struggling with reading words and demonstrated several strategies for reading the words correctly. She would break the word down, say part of the word again before finishing the word, and read on coming back and self-corrected after saying a word incorrectly, recognizing her miscues. However, she needed to work on comprehension strategies and ways to remember what she read. Lack of comprehension affected her progress in all subject areas especially Social Studies.

At our next session, AG chose to bring a chapter book she had just gotten from the library. It was a fiction book called *The House of Robots*, and she had read the first three pages. She chose the book because she said it looked interesting and was about robots, it was science, and she liked science. Her only miscue in reading was a repetition
of words, and there were no substitutions, omissions or mispronunciations. Her retelling was accurate and included paying attention to details. Our discussion went as follows:

T: So now tell me do you think you had trouble reading this or do you think you did alright?
A: I did alright.
T: Did you remember what you head?
A: Uh-huh.
T: Is this better than what you did the last time?
A: Uh-huh.
T: Why do you think your retelling was better this time?
A: I stopped at the end of the page and thought about what the page said before I went on. I wrote down some things when I started to read, and that helped me.
T: So you have a strategy that will help you understand what you read?
A: Yes
T: Do you think that you have to read every word correctly to understand what the story is about?
A: No, but I think I did read every word right.
T: So what I want to do now is look at the strategies you used and what new strategy we can try.

Our conversation continued to discuss the strategies she used when reading to help her with words she may not know. We also talked about how she wrote things down to help her remember what she read. She proudly showed me the sticky notes she had put into her reading notebook from a book she read and already returned to the library.
On subsequent sessions, AG brought informational texts including biographies to the table. She said she liked to read about people she knew. She was able to identify it as non-fiction, and she liked to read non-fiction because she can learn more. The biographies were singers and actors that she was familiar with from watching TV. I reminded her that she was able to use her prior knowledge about these people to help her as she read the text and tried to understand the text. When talking about the book, *Vanessa Hudgens* she knew about her playing in *The Wizard of Oz* because she watched it.

Her miscues in subsequent readings were mostly repetitions with a few names of cities or countries she did not know. She attempted to read the names of the cities and was able to get the beginning sounds. Eventually, after several attempts of sounding out the word she said something and went on commenting “or something like that.” She did not worry about saying every word correctly and concentrated on understanding the text. Retellings became more accurate and included details from the text. She often stopped and talked with me about what she was reading either repeating something she read or something she remembered. Additional strategies discussed with her were trying to create a picture of the passage in her head as she was reading, making connections, or writing down a question she had as she read. She even suggested creating a picture on paper of her favorite part of the story.

After working with students individually, I pulled them together for a group discussion about what they learned. I asked them how they felt listening to themselves read was impacting their reading comprehension. The session began with the students sharing the strategies they were using as they read. Strategies included putting sticky
notes on the words they didn’t know, rereading, replacing words with words already known, and using the other words in the sentence to help figure out the word. They realized they were using some of the same strategies. One strategy was the use of sticky notes, but they used them in different ways.

R: I use my stickies when I come to a word I don’t know. I put a sticky down and replace the word or just put it down and remember to come back to this word and figure out the definition.

HJ: I use my stickies to make my inferences.

T: So you are using them for vocabulary, and you are using them for inferences. Does it matter you are using them differently?

R & HJ: No

T: Is it helping?

R: Yes

T: Is that something you had done before you started working with me or after.

R: After

As we continued our discussion about additional strategies, HJ identified one of his strategies as correcting his spelling. I was confused and asked him to explain.

HJ: Correct my spelling.

T: When you are reading?

HJ: Yes. When I don’t know a word, I will go back and correct it the right way.

T: What do you mean? How do you correct spelling when you are reading?
HJ: You remember that word “proven” (says it with a long o sound) I went back and said “proven” (pronounces it correctly) when I was reading. I would go back and say it the right way.

T: So what you did was, you didn’t know what it was when you first saw it. You went back and said it a different way using what you know about letter sounds to say the word.

HJ: Yes.

T: OK that’s not correcting your spelling. We don’t correct spelling when we read. But what you are doing is getting assistance with that word. When you said it, you used the letters that were there right?

HJ: Yes

T: Beginning sounds.

HJ: yes

T: Did you use the ending sound?

HJ: Yes, not really

T: You tend to stick to the beginning sounds don’t you? Are there words that if you know the ending sounds it might help you get to the rest of the word?

HJ & R: Yes

T: So beginning and ending sounds are some things you already use to help you read.

R: The ending could be like a word, and all you have to do is add the rest.

T: Good strategies. So one of the other things you said was, “reread it.” With a new word or without the word?
R: without and with

T: So you read it without the word and put in your own word. Does it have to be the exact word that is there?

R: No

Later in the conversation I brought them back to their major miscue of reading words and ignoring ending punctuation. Both RS and HJ were the two who fell into this miscue category. It was imperative that they realize they were reading for meaning and sentences were ideas that needed to read as ideas.

T: Because what you are focusing on is not the words, but your focus right now is on reading comprehension and understanding what you are reading. One of the strategies that I gave you, and I want you to add this strategy to your notebook, is read it as sentences.

R: Oh, yeah

T: Because what you were doing was reading way too fast and reading word for word for word, forgetting about sentences.

R: OK

T: Didn’t reading as sentences help you understand the words a little better?

R & HJ: Yes.

T: Because you are putting them together and making a connection because that is what a sentence is, words that are connected.

R: So, you’re saying with grown-ups, you know how grown-ups are, our first-grade teachers they be reading really, really fast and we don’t get it and we have
to reread it in or minds to ourselves really slow are they just saying the words or are they reading sentence by sentence?

T: It depends on what they are reading. Some of your real “little kid” books are nothing but words, right?

HJ: Yeah

T: It will say “hop, hop, hop” but there’s an exclamation mark after each of them. So I say, “Hop! Hop! Hop!” I don’t say “hop, hop, hop” really fast.

R: When I read my sister’s book it said words with an exclamation point in between. I didn’t say the exclamation point in between I kept going so I messed up.

T: So if I am stopping at sentence punctuation, I am reading sentences. It tells me I understand what I am reading. So that’s my new strategy.

R: It’s like when you are writing too, you write sentences

T: That’s a great connection you made because aren’t books you read just something someone else wrote?

At a later group session, we focused on what good readers do. One of the primary goals of the study was to get them away from thinking of reading as just reading words and the more words they can read correctly the better their reading is. Constance Weaver (2002) explains that proficient readers use syntactic and semantic context automatically and draw upon their prior knowledge and experiences. She further states, “The goal of reading instruction should not be the accurate identification of every word, but rather the effective and efficient use of reading strategies to construct meaning (p.71).” When we started working together, they were very focused on words, and I wanted to know if they
were moving away from that focus. So I asked, “Do good readers have to read every single word?”

R: No

HJ: Sometimes, sometimes not.

T: A good reader will read for meaning and not for words. One of the things you hesitate to do is you hesitate to go on because you come to a word you don’t know. So good readers are going to skip the word and go on. I do that myself when I read, I skip the word or put in a word that I think makes sense just to get the understanding of the story. A good reader doesn’t have to read every single word.

R: I didn’t know you did that.

T: Because when I read aloud you don’t usually see the text I am reading. Especially when it comes to names. Some of those names are difficult to pronounce if I am unfamiliar with them.

HJ: like those French names.

T: So we can just put in another name as long as we know it’s a name.

In our final group session, I asked them to identify the strategies that they were using that showed they were all good readers. Students working together extend learning through social interaction (Goodman, Martens, & Flurkey, 2014). With this in mind, I wanted the students to share what they have been doing individually and see that they have many common strategies. They also have strategies that the others might not have thought that they might be willing to try.
T: OK let’s review what we talked about, RS what strategies did we talk about today?
R: Put a sticky note and write another word for it.
T: Right so write another word for it. So if I come to a word I don’t know I can skip that word read the sentence and substitute a word I know that makes sense. As we read, there are going to be words I don’t know.
R: I stopped doing it because I am getting better with my reading so. I can understand words better so.
T: Does it still help you? Do you think there will come a time when you know every word in every book?
R: No
T: Do I know every word in every book?
R: No
T: Especially when I’m reading books for college.
R: There’re too many books.
T: It’s not that there are too many books, there are too many words in the English language.
T: So what other strategy have we worked on?
A: I stop and think about what I just read and if I don’t understand it I go back and reread.
T: Does it help you to reread?
A: Yes because I can remember more of what I read.
T: What about you KW?
K: I skip words I don’t know and come back to reread the sentence with a word I think makes sense.

R: I slow down and read sentences. It helped me understand better.

HJ: I do that too!

R: I’m reading harder books.

T: Reading harder books? Is that a strategy or just something we have been able to do?

HJ: If we don’t read harder books we will be babies forever.

T: Not so much that. But when you have the strategies that support your reading, you can read harder books. Think back to the books that you have been reading.

HJ: Fives, fours, and threes.

T: Fives and fours, no more threes. Why?

HJ: I’m getting too good

T: And why are you getting good?

HJ: Because I’m reading bigger books.

T: Yes, but why are you able to read those books now and you couldn’t before?

HJ: Because I read it before, and it’s easier reading it now.

T: So reading it more than once helps your understanding of the book. So if I am reading something I don’t understand, the best strategy is . . .

A: go back and read it again.

T: So the strategy that you are using is rereading, and it is helping.

R: Sometimes I hate doing it: When you read a book and it’s really funny and you keep reading it over and over and over it’s going to get really old, and
somebody will think there’s something wrong with you because you keep reading the same book.

T: So let me ask you this question. If it’s a book you understand and you like, the main reason you are rereading it is because you like it, have you ever looked at who wrote the book?

HJ: NO

R: I have

T: When you write down the books you read, are you writing the author’s name?

R: Yes

T: So if you include the author’s name you need to start looking at books by that author.

The discussion continued with the students naming some of the authors they knew and saying they wanted to find more books by those authors. I supplied the author’s names for the books they enjoyed, and they wanted to go right away to the library to find books by those authors. I promised them we would look for them the next time we went to the library.

The final component of our RMA discussion focused on their confidence level and how they felt as readers.

T: What about your confidence level right now compared with what it was before we started working together?

HJ: Mine is kind of fuller than what it used to be.

T: What do you mean by that?
HJ: Mine was just this much (indicates a small part of a circle on paper), now it’s this much (shows much more of the circle filled in.) A confidence circle was something we regularly used in class to indicate their level of understanding at the end of a lesson. It was a quick way for me to assess their understanding and for them to reflect on their learning.

T: So, you are filling up your confidence circle. Do you think you are a better reader?

HJ: Yes, because I went from this to this to that (indicates the change in shading of confidence circle.)

T: So your confidence level is up. What about you, RS?

R: I feel better reading because of our strategies.

T: You’re more comfortable, HJ?

HJ: Yes.

T: What about you, KW?

K: I like listening to myself read. When I read, I take my time because I want to do better on tests. I took my time on MAP and made a big gain.

T: How did that make you feel?

K: Good.

T: AG?

A: I know I’m better now. I stop and think about what I read, and I get 80s and 100s on my AR tests.

T: It’s not intimidating anymore, is it?
R: Yeah, I used to be scared to read chapter books because they are too hard. All the other kids like to read chapter books.

As we wrapped up our discussion, the students spent time looking at the chapter books in the classroom to find one they would try to read. All of them left the session with at least two books they wanted to read.

4.3 POST STUDY ASSESSMENT DATA

*Burke Reading Inventory*

After working with the students for twelve weeks, the Burke Reading Inventory was administered for a second time to see if the students’ views of the reading process had changed. At the end of the study, I noted considerable changes in students understanding of what reading is. The same questions generated different responses from the students. Their responses were longer and more detailed focusing on understanding what the text was about. They no longer focused on words and moved to a more holistic approach to construct meaning while reading. They focused on comprehension skills such as summarizing, making predictions, rereading, and making connections with pictures to understand what they were reading. Responses included strategies we worked on together such as using sticky notes to help remember what they read, skipping difficult words and coming back to them after reading the rest of the sentence, and rereading to make sure they understood what the author was saying.

After asking what makes a good reader they still talked about words but in a different context. They knew words were necessary, but they needed to talk about what they read along with reading by varying speed and intonation. When good readers come to something they don’t know, responses indicated it is not just saying words but
understanding the meaning when they responded, “look it up in a dictionary,” and use “prior knowledge” to help understand the text.

When asked what you do when you come to something you don’t know the responses were mixed. Three of the students still focused on words but were “skipping and coming back to it” or “reading again.” Only RS said he would “come back and reread to try to understand”.

When asked who was a good reader all of them identified an adult instead of classmates. They said the adults were good readers because of “how they read books,” “tell what new words mean,” and “talk about what they read.” Only HJ stated “adults knew most of the words in the book.” When asked what a good reader does when they come to something they don’t know RS replied that good readers “use knowledge or ask for help,” AG said good readers “sound out word parts,” KW suggested “skipping and rereading,” while HJ suggested “writing it down and looking it up in a dictionary.”

One way they would help someone having trouble reading is by helping them with words by sounding them out. However, most responses focused on understanding the text. If the students knew a person having difficulty reading they would provide help by “reading with them,” “helping them summarize,” “make predictions” and “reread.” KW and AG would help them with words by “sounding them out” and “rereading.”

When asked how teachers help readers, the students included some of the strategies introduced to them in RMA sessions such as “talking about what they read,” “answer questions about the passages,” “read it to someone,” ” use sticky notes,” “reread,” and “make predictions.” The students’ responses to what they want to do better as a reader focused mostly on comprehension when they stated “summarize,” “pay
attention to what reading,”” read aloud,” and “concentrate on remembering what read.” Their complete responses are found in Appendix D. All of their responses indicated a move from an understanding of being able to say all the words on the page and learning how to read bigger words to reading to understand the text.

Putting the students’ responses into Wordle shown in figure 4.2 provided a unique picture of their thinking about themselves as readers. The larger the words in the Wordle, the more often they were used for the responses. Smaller words were provided but not used as often. The most prominent words from their responses included read, reread, reading, and understand. It is also interesting to see that the word skip and try were also dominant as the students discussed what they did when they read and what good readers did when they read. Word and words were still present but were not the most important part of their reading process. There was a greater variety of words found in the post Wordle when compared to the class Wordle at the beginning of the year. Additional words indicate that the students relied on a variety of strategies as they read.

The Burke Reading Inventory was also readministered to other students in the class at the end of the school year. Responses to the questions by students not included in the study were similar to the responses they provided at the beginning of the year. The only students who provided any changes were the two additional students who recorded their reading on the iPad and we listened to it together. Time only permitted two sessions with each student and did not allow for additional students to participate even though they wanted to participate.
Figure 4.2 Wordle of follow-up responses to Burke Reading Inventory by students participating in the study.

KW made progress towards becoming a better reader building towards being effective in constructing meaning from text. He started to pay attention to what he read and tried to understand more of what he was reading. KW progressed to a subskill level of learning to read. He continued to focus on words by skipping over words, and he went on without spending time trying to sound them out. He recognized the importance of understanding what he was reading by rereading for meaning. When he responded to what a teacher would do to help, he was relying on what we did in the study that has helped him as a reader. He recognized the importance of paying attention to what he was reading and rereading for understanding. The biggest difference in his responses was that he now feels like he is a good reader, not a “so-so” reader because he was learning from what he was reading.
RS has grown into an effective, efficient reader who saw the importance in reading for meaning. His personal responses indicated a move towards using a variety of strategies including using personal knowledge to understand and summarize what is being read. Helping others would include “talking about what he read” and understanding the text. Nowhere did he indicate reading individual words, sounding out words, or getting help with words. He focused on comprehending what he read. He felt he was a good reader because he was “reading higher level texts” and understood them well enough to answer questions about the text.

HJ continued to talk about the importance of reading words, however, not just sounding them out but understanding what they mean by the end of the study. He recognized the importance of rereading for understanding and has slowed down to make sure he made sense of the text. It was interesting to note that he wanted to “speak clearly” when he read indicating his desire to read out loud and record, so it was easy to understand what he was saying. His speaking clearly statement also reflected his need to slow down to read ideas, not just words to develop an understanding of what he was reading.

By the end of the study, AG’s responses indicated a moderately proficient reader, effective in constructing meaning, but not as efficient in the time it took to construct that meaning. She continued to try to say words correctly, but focused on understanding what she read. She recognized that reading involves making predictions along with reading and rereading for understanding. Making the connection between reading and writing was an interesting comment because her writing has continued to develop throughout the
year along with her reading. She has learned to organize her writing and add details to elaborate what she wants to express.

**STAR Reading**

STAR Reading was designed to monitor the progress of students even though their scores might fluctuate from time to time. Monthly progress monitoring was completed using the STAR Reading assessment on the computer. As the students completed the assessment, they did not see their score, but teachers could access it immediately and the students quickly came to me to check their score. Data were presented in a variety of formats including lists, graphs, and diagnostic reports. I have found the best way to share the data with the students was to show them the graph, because they could easily see their progress. They might have dropped down a little one month, but tended to pick back up the next. Every time the students finished the assessment, I provided them with their grade equivalency scores so that they knew what their reading level was and if they had made progress. They asked for their graph because they were better able to compare their score to previous data. Final STAR Assessment data is included in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8 STAR reading data from the end of year assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>IRL</th>
<th>ZPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0-4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KW</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8-3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJ</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.1-4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.9-4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KW started the year at a first-grade eighth-month grade equivalency and an instructional reading level of Primer. At the end of the study, he had moved to a grade equivalency and instructional reading level of second-grade ninth month. He showed steady growth throughout the year.

In the beginning of the year, KW finished the test quickly in ten minutes or less. When he took the test the final time, he almost ran out of the time allowed for most questions as he examined each answer before making a selection. At the end of the assessment, he thought he did well because he read carefully and took his time. Results supported his self-confidence level. KW’s ZPD range increased from 1.8-2.8 to 2.8-3.5 which encouraged him to choose books more carefully when he went to the library.

The progress monitoring graph in figure 4.3 shows that KW made progress all year. Scores tended to increase throughout the year with most scores on or near the trend line that went from a low scale score of 150 to a high of almost 350, gaining 150 points.

Figure 4.3 KW’s progress monitoring graph of STAR Reading assessments from Renaissance Place teacher reports. (Graph is obtained from Renaissance Place web site teacher report entitled Student Progress Monitoring found at the website https://hosted20.renlearn.com/44498/SR/SRReportController.rli).
RS began the school year at a fourth-grade level but dropped just over a month later to a second-grade fourth-month grade equivalency and instructional reading level of second-grade second-month. At the end of the study, he was able to increase his assessment level to a fourth-grade equivalency and third-grade eighth-month instructional reading level. His growth level for the year based on his October assessment indicated an increase of one year and six months in grade equivalency and instructional reading level placing him back at the level he achieved in August. ZPD in August was 3.1-4.7, in October it dropped to 2.2-3.2 and was back up to 3.0-4.5 in April. However, RS was able to take books with reading levels of 5.0-5.4 and found reading them by scoring 80-100% accuracy on Accelerated Reader tests.

After making the extreme drop in October I became concerned, but he continued to show progress on follow-up assessments. His progress line shown in Figure 4.4 showed a steady increase across the year and his scores were near or on the trend line. His trend line went from a low scale score of about 350 to just over 400, a gain of 100 total points. By the end of the study, he was able to bring his STAR Reading score back up to the level at which started at in August. If RW had been given a few more months, he might have been at a fifth grade level. The STAR assessment is set up to begin a follow-up assessment at a level just below where the student was on the previous assessment. If RS had not dropped so drastically in October he would probably gotten to a much higher level on STAR that correlated with his Dominie assessment. Even though his data showed he was at a fourth grade equivalency he felt he was better than that and continued to choose books at fifth grade level. Accelerated Reader assessments supported his book choices when he scored 80-100% on his tests.
Figure 4.4 RS’s progress monitoring graph of STAR Reading assessments from Renaissance Place teacher reports. (Graph is obtained from Renaissance Place web site teacher report entitled Student Progress Monitoring found at the website https://hosted20.renlearn.com/44498/SR/SRReportController.rli).

HJ was the most inconsistent of the group. His STAR Reading scores were all over the graph as shown in Figure 4.5. At the beginning of the school year, HJ’s STAR assessment indicated a grade equivalency and instructional level of second-grade ninth-month. On his final assessment, HJ showed a grade equivalency of fourth-grade three-months and instructional reading level of fourth-grade. Scores indicated a growth of one year four months in grade equivalency and one year one month in instructional reading level meeting school expectations. His trend line went from a low of 400 to a high of just over 500, showing a gain of 100 total points. Even though his trend line was showing a general increase in scoring ability, his assessment scores varied, increasing then decreasing with no consistency. When he looked at his graph shown in Figure 4.5 showing his score had dropped, he got upset and shut down for a day or two. He often took Accelerated Reader tests above his ZPD and often failed them.
AG was also inconsistent when taking the STAR Reading assessments. She began the year at a third-grade first-month grade equivalency level and instructional reading level. By the end of the study, her grade equivalency was third-grade eighth-month and her instructional reading level was third-grade sixth-month, showing a growth of seven months in grade equivalency and five months in instructional reading level. The instructional reading level gain was below school expectations. She made significant gains, but usually followed that by making a significant drop as illustrated in the graph in Figure 4.6. Her trend line indicates growth, but it only ranges from a low scale score of about 350 to a high of just over 400. Her final assessment scale score was 64 points higher than her first assessment, lowest of the study group.
After students finished testing a Diagnostic report was also available for analysis by the teacher for each student. The report indicated the skills tested and the students’ progress toward mastery of fourth-grade skills. Teachers used the data to identify strengths and areas still needing additional instruction and support. The overall scores for the students in the study are summarized in Table 4.9. Scale scores provided an indication of how much intervention was needed by each student to master grade level skills based on a grade level benchmark. Students’ scale scores indicated, based on a school benchmark, KW was at an intervention level up from urgent intervention, RS and AG were on watch, and HJ was at or above grade level up from intervention level in August. On watch means they are close to mastery. Intervention shows a need for additional support. Three of the four students still need additional support to reach
mastery of grade level skills, however, the amount of support was less than at the beginning of the school year. Complete Diagnostic Report are found in Appendix E.

Table 4.9 Summary of STAR domain scores from the end of year assessment included on Students’ Diagnostic Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>KW</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>HJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key ideas and details</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft and Structure</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of reading and level of text complexity</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informational text</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key ideas and details</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft and Structure</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of knowledge</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of reading and level of text complexity</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary acquisition and use</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at domain scores for all students in the group their common weakness was in the integration of knowledge with informational text. All other domain scores were relatively consistent for each student. These scores represented the percent of mastery on skills at the fourth-grade level.

An analysis of KW’s Diagnostic Report for his STAR assessments indicated considerable growth. In literature, he showed a 35% increase in mastery level in all
areas. Mastery level on Informational text increased by an average of 31% with the highest increase in craft and structure of 41%, and lowest level of increase in integration of knowledge at 18%. However, vocabulary acquisition and use dropped from 68% to 54% that was reflective of the difficulty of words he was encountering. During the final assessment, he asked for assistance with words four different times that I could not supply. STAR testing was a timed test allowing students a limited amount of time to respond to a question before going to the next question. Three of the questions, for which he asked for help on during the final test, timed out before he responded.

KW’s domain scores in April ranged from 42-72. His strengths were informational text author’s word choice and figurative language (72), structural analysis of language (70), and literary text word meaning (68). His weaknesses were all in informational text and included argumentation (42), author’s purpose and perspective (42), and main idea and details (48). KW still needed support with informational text. Final complete diagnostic reports are included in Appendix E.

RS’s final STAR assessment placed him on watch because his scale score was below the school benchmark. His domain scores ranged was 61-85. His areas of strength included structural analysis of language (85), informational text author’s word choice and figurative language (86), and word meaning in both literary and informational texts (83). His weaknesses were informational text argumentation (61), author purpose and perspective (63), and main idea and details (68).

An analysis of RS’s Diagnostic Report for his STAR assessments indicated average growth from October to April of 38% in all areas. However, comparing August to April, RS showed a small drop in all areas of 2-3%. RS had a growth of 9% in
informational text craft and structure, but an 18% drop in the integration of knowledge. When RS took the final assessment in April, he wanted assistance and kept saying it was hard. RS didn’t know some of the words and did not answer several questions in the allotted time. It was common for RS to give up and get frustrated when he came upon a word he was unsure of in terms of pronunciation or meaning.

HJ’s Diagnostic Report began the year with a range of 42-63% mastery level. By the end of the study, his mastery levels increased to 72-88%. His growth was an average of 26% mastery with the largest gain of 30% in the integration of knowledge in informational text. Growth was consistent with literary text, informational text and vocabulary acquisition. Diagnostic scores for HJ placed him above the school benchmark. His domain range was 71-91. His strengths were informational text author’s word choice and figurative language (91), structural analysis of words (90), and literary word meaning (89). He showed additional strengths in context clues and synonyms (88). His weaknesses were informational text argumentation (71) and author’s purpose and perspective (73) along with author’s purpose and perspective in literary text (79). These data suggested that HJ needed instructional support in identifying author’s purpose.

AG’s Diagnostic report in August range of mastery was 48-69% and in April her mastery range was 57-78% with an average growth of 7-9%. There was a significant increase of 23% mastery in craft and structure of informational text, but a decrease of 9% in the integration of knowledge. She showed consistent growth with literary text and vocabulary acquisition, but informational text did not indicate the same results. Since AG tended to make connections with text, the questions might have been ideas she could not connect to her prior knowledge and the text might have been insufficient for her to build
a connection. AG’s domain range on STAR reading was 61-86. Her strengths included word choice in informational text (86), structural analysis of language (85), and word choice in literary text. Her weaknesses were argumentation of informational text (61), author’s purpose and perspective in informational text (63), author’s word choice and figurative language in literary text (71).

Overall all students showed increases in grade equivalency with three of the four showing over one-year growth on the Star Reading assessment. When analyzing specific skills, students shared several strengths including word choice and figurative language, structural analysis, and word meaning. There were also common skill weaknesses for all students that included argumentation and author’s purpose and perspective. KW and RS were both weak in identifying the main idea and details. AG was weak in author’s word choice for informational text. The results suggested that all students would benefit from continued small group work on weaknesses using Retrospective Miscue Analysis. Keeping the group together and having them talk about what they read may provide an essential link to continue to assist them in improving comprehension.

**Dominie**

At the end of the study, KW chose to read Dominie level 11, *The Magic Sword* which was an end of the third-grade level text with a grade equivalency of 4.0. His miscues were limited to skipping words like “legend” and “wizard” along with the name ‘Sir Ector,’” which he did go back and reread. When he came to the word “tournament”, he broke it down and sounded it out. He did leave off a few suffixes but read most of them. As he was reading, he stopped and asked what the word “squire” was and what it meant. When he finished, he asked to listen to himself before he did his retelling. His
retelling was not complete but included the main points of the story. The criterion was no more than 27 errors, and he only made 14 which were mostly dropping of suffixes which gave him an accuracy of 95%. His reading pace improved to 72 wpm with a fluency level of 3. This time he was willing to take the book back to his seat and finish because he wanted to know what happened.

After finishing the story independently he returned to respond to questions about the book. Comprehension met criterion when he was able to respond to six of the eight questions correctly with a score of 75% comprehension. He missed the questions that asked him to compare Sir Ector and Merlin’s care of Arthur and describing Arthur. He attempted these questions, but responses were insufficient to earn credit. The criterion for the level was met making him ready for fourth-grade level instruction. Therefore, KW made a full year growth during the twelve week study based on Dominie results.

Table 4.10 KW’s criterion scores for Dominie assessment at end of study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Text Level</th>
<th>Grade Equivalence</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>SC Ratio</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Pace</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KW</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>1:7</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KW’s willingness to complete the assessment was a big change in behavior. It showed his willingness to work on improving his reading and even an interest in reading he did not have early in the year. Being able to talk about his reading showed him that he was a better reader than he thought and encouraged him to spend more time reading. The biggest change was in his fluency going from a level 1 to a level 3.

RS chose to read Level 13 *Wolves in Review* at the end of the study. There were no miscues made by RS as he read the text aloud. However, RS did spend time repeating
words which affected his reading pace of 81 wpm. He did the same thing when he talked about things he knew during classroom and small group discussions. He then read the remainder of the story independently over a two-day period. His comprehension was 80% meeting criterion for the level indicating placement in level 13A for instruction that is a beginning fifth-grade equivalency level of 5.1. There was a one year growth in reading level based on pre/post Dominie testing. Fifth-grade placement for RS was an appropriate instructional level for his current grade. He felt he could work in advanced classes and probably would benefit from the challenge of reading higher level text.

Table 4.11 RS’s criterion scores for Dominie assessment at end of study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Text Level</th>
<th>Grade Equivalence</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>SC Ratio</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Pace</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the end of the study, HJ wanted to read a difficult book and was looking at the level on the back of the book, not the book itself when choosing a book to read. He chose to read Benchmark level 15 Ancient Lake Dwellers because it was the highest level I had taken out of the kit. He made 15 miscues including repetition of words as he broke them into syllables to pronounce on eight different occasions self-correcting all after his repeated attempts. He omitted two words and did not stop at three different periods. His miscues were grapho-phonemically correct as well as syntactically and semantically correct. His miscues included breaking words apart to sound them out: “arch-long e-ologists” (4 times), “art-long i-facts” (4 times), “found-long a-tions” and “Swit-zer-land.” He attempted to read “Neolithic” giving the beginning sound and skipping the rest. When he came to “Colletiere” there was a mark over the first “e”, and he asked why it was there. He pronounced the word as “collector” on two occasions. He skipped over
several periods running sentences together for a total of 14 errors scoring 96% accuracy that met the criterion.

His retelling was mostly accurate leaving out just a few details. When he went back to his seat to finish reading the book he sat and read through the book, and as soon as he finished he wanted to talk about it and answer questions. He answered the comprehension questions with 75% accuracy. Referring to the story is something he did not do early in the study, but he went back to the story on three occasions when responding to the comprehension questions. HJ met criterion placing him at an end of the fifth-grade instructional level. This was two full years above his placement at the beginning of the research study.

Table 4.12 HJ’s criterion scores for Dominie assessment at the end of study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Text Level</th>
<th>Grade Equivalence</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>SC Ratio</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Pace</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HJ</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>1:7</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AG was given the Dominie assessment level 12 *Eat Not the Meat of the Hare*. She had limited miscues that included repetitions of parts of words, attempts at two words she asked for help with, and one self-correction. She mispronounced the word chaos (new word to her) and Nuchal twice each. She remembered seeing the pronunciation of Nuchal on the inside cover and went back to it to help her pronounce it correctly after making two attempts. Her miscues were within the range for meeting criterion with an accuracy score of 98%. Her retelling was reasonably accurate, and she even pointed out information in the book to support her retelling. AG’s pace was 105 wpm and she had a fluency level of 4.
After finishing the book, she responded to the comprehension questions with 80% accuracy placing her at a 12A instructional level that is mid-fourth grade. AG showed a growth of over a year using the Dominie assessment, but she remains slightly below grade placement for end of fourth grade.

Table 4.13 AG’s criterion scores for Dominie assessment at end of study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Text Level</th>
<th>Grade Equivalence</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>SC Ratio</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Pace</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>1:7</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Dominie assessment all four students showed a full year growth or more of their instructional reading level over a twelve week period. Miscues were usually semantically and syntactically correct. Students all had repetition miscues as they tried to pronounce words correctly and self-corrected during post assessment. Retelling improved on post-assessment along with comprehension levels indicating improved reading ability for all students involved in the study.

When comparing growth on STAR to growth on Dominie it was interesting to note a few differences. Dominie had students reading an entire story with 10-12 questions for comprehension, and STAR had short passages for each of 34 different questions. Dominie growth occurred over a twelve week period and STAR growth occurred over the school year. Two students made a larger growth on STAR and two made a larger growth on Dominie. However, the growth for the time frame for Dominie was greater than that for STAR. Comparisons are shown in table 4.14 and left me wondering what the impact could have been if the study was begun in September instead of January.
4.14 Comparison of STAR and Dominie data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>STAR</th>
<th>STAR growth</th>
<th>Dominie</th>
<th>Dominie Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KW</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJ</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, HJ, RS, and AG brought more informational books than literary books to RMA sessions. KW was the only one who brought only literary books on a regular basis. However, they were usually short picture books. HJ and AG each brought a chapter book to an RMA session, but they never finished reading the book before returning it to the library. Their reasoning was it was too long. HJ tended to bring sports books because his father played college football, and his uncle is a professional football player. AG liked to read biographies about people she knew from history or television because she already knew about them. RS was just interested in books that he could learn something from so he often had informational text. The level of book that they brought to the sessions increased over the study period. Two of the boys were interested in being able to read harder books so intentionally looked at book levels. AG continued to choose books she found interesting and had prior knowledge of the subject. KW continued to read fiction he found interesting but was able to work in a small group with informational text and contribute to group discussions.
CHAPTER 5

Discussion and Implications

The findings summarized here were the result of assessing the reading process and reading comprehension of fourth-grade students through engagement with Retrospective Miscue Analysis (RMA) during Response to Intervention (RTI) sessions within the classroom. The study’s implementation occurred within a regular fourth-grade classroom of 19 students where four students received direct classroom intervention using the RMA model. The length of the study was 12 weeks (January to April) during the 2014-2015 school year. Data were collected in two different contexts: one-on-one sessions with the teacher and individual students; and small group sessions with the teacher and the four students who participated in the study. RMA sessions and group discussions were recorded on an iPad and transcribed. Data collection occurred for a collective total of 19 books, 8 Dominie assessments, and 2 group discussions.

Specifically, this study was designed to answer the following question: What was the impact of a Response to Intervention instructional program utilizing Retrospective Miscue Analysis for fourth-grade students reading below grade level?

There were three areas of focus for this research study that were:

1. Focus on students’ reading strategy use and improved strategy instruction.

2. Increased engagement in meaningful reading based upon student interests
3. Engaging students in conversations about reading and provide feedback to students about their reading strengths.

The organization of this chapter is summarized into the two components that impacted student reading comprehension, which were:

a. Book selection and reading engagement

b. Reading strategies

5.1 BOOK SELECTION AND ENGAGEMENT

RTI sessions focused on the use of RMA by having the students record their reading, listen to what they read, and discuss their strengths. Students brought the book of their choice to the session, usually a book they recently checked out from the school library. “When we allow our students to have more control over their learning and use their own strengths and talents, they are more invested and engaged learners,” (Anderson, 2010). By allowing the students to bring books they chose to the RMA sessions they were more willing to read, record, and discuss their book.

There was an extensive classroom library with a wide variety of books. However, the students very seldom took a book from the classroom library. Too many book choices seemed to overwhelm them and they had difficulty choosing books. My personal library was extensive and I enjoyed adding to it by ordering new books. I kept my personal books separated from the classroom library, but I allowed the students to read them. A box of new books was kept near the teacher desk, and that was where the students went when they needed a book. Because the students always went to the new book box, every few weeks I would change the books in the box using books from the classroom library. Rotating the books into a smaller box made the students more
interested in looking through them to choose a book. To keep the students interested in
the books I had several students choose books from the classroom library to put in the
box.

I also observed the students in the library when they were choosing books and
noticed a pattern. There were certain places they usually went to when getting books.
The first place they went was the cart of returned books that needed to be shelved. The
second place they went to were the sections of the library they visited almost every time.
These were the biography section, sport section, or specific book series such as *Wimpy
Kid* or *Dork Diaries*. When the students came to RMA sessions they always brought
library books with them.

As I paid attention to the books the students were checking out of the library, I
added similar books to the “new” book basket near my desk. I often heard the students
say, “Let me have that book when you finish.” I knew I had chosen the right books.
There were several books from the basket that I never saw again until the end of the
school year when I was getting ready to pack up for the summer.

Over a ten week period, students read and recorded a total of 19 books
collectively including nine literary text and ten informational texts of which six were
biographies. KW was the only student who brought only literary text to RMA sessions.
He did not check books out of the library because he owed for lost books, so his first
books came out of the classroom library. His first book was a Disney book of stories he
had experience with from movies. The Disney book was also one of those books the
students kept passing around and never saw its way back into the basket. Follow-up
books came from the school library when I made arrangements for him to check out
books in my name. KW chose books at the low end of his ZPD until after he became more confident in his reading. The books he chose at the end of the study were above his ZPD level and I observed him reading more often in class. He continued to read and record with the iPad even when the study was over.

Two of the students, HJ and AG, brought a chapter book that they had just checked out from the library to a session. They read and recorded a selection from the book, but they did not finish the books before returning them to the library. The chapter books they chose had over two hundred pages in them. They were interested in them, but they felt they were too long to read and returned them to the library. Both students found out that there were plenty of informational books within their ZPD they could read in a day or two. They both chose informational books on topics that interested them as well as challenged them as readers. Both students chose books from the classroom book basket between library visits. The books they chose were graphic novels or informational books on topics we were studying in science or social studies. AG found she needed books on topics she had prior knowledge about in order for the text to be interesting and help her to understand the text. Rhodes and Shanklin (1993) stated that opportunities to read were key to students’ progress. After placing appropriate leveled books and books on topics the students were interested in, based on observations of the students, in a special place, the students engaged with a greater volume of books independently.

RS always brought informational texts to RMA sessions. He chose books that he could learn something from, and he seldom checked out literary books from the library. When I needed books rotated in the box of books I often had him gather books from the classroom library to put in the box. He was selective, but he always chose a wide-variety
of books that would interest the entire class. My main reason for allowing him to select books was to make sure he found several books in the classroom library that interested him when he finished his library books.

Overall the students needed little guidance in book selection. HJ was the only one who I needed to watch the level of books he chose. Observations of him when he was reading at the beginning of the year noted that he spent time looking around and flipping through pages. I began to pay attention to the books he had out and his behaviors. When he had a book above his ZPD he spent time looking around and turning pages. When he had a book within his ZPD he spent time reading. Because of this behavior, I checked his book choices from the library before allowing him to check out books until he began to choose appropriate level books.

Marzano and Pickering (2011) claimed that if a student thinks they can do something they are more likely to engage in the activity. This was evident with the four students who participated in this project. At the beginning of the year they did classify themselves as good readers. When given time to read in class, they did very little reading. At the end of the study all four students felt they were good readers and spent much more time with books. This was especially evident with KW when he slowed down and took both STAR and MAP testing. He knew he could do well if he took his time and put forth the effort. He had not done that at the beginning of the year because he thought he was not a good reader, he would quickly respond to questions on assessments believing he was not going to do well anyway so why put forth the effort. Towards the end of the study, KW would always have a book and would read after finishing his work.
5.2 READING STRATEGIES

Research makes it clear that when readers use evidence from evaluating their miscues they become aware that what they considered their problems involved reading strategies all readers engage in. Once they realized this they developed self-confidence and engaged with literacy (Goodman, Martens & Flurkey, 2014). When we began talking about strategies, especially identifying those they already used, students began to realize what they were doing well as readers. They also realized that their struggles were common and easy to fix once they knew how by using additional reading strategies.

In addition to reading the story, students were asked to retell what they read while they recorded their retelling. The focus of the recording and listening to their reading was to identify strategies that they used while reading and offered suggestions to correct miscues heard as they were listening to themselves read. One of the best ways that helped the students understand the reading process was to engage them in discussion about their reading miscues and retellings providing evidence of the language system at work (Moore & Seeger, 2010).

When working with KW, he was using many strategies that he was unaware he used. However, most of his strategies were focused on reading words correctly. There were several strategies that he initially used well that included breaking words apart to sound them out, using beginning sounds and making syntactically acceptable substitutions. However, he was reading word by word and did not make connections in order to understand the text he was reading. Moore and Seeger (2010) further explained that RMA moved students away from relying on phonetic decoding and they became more metacognitive about their reading process by increasing strategy use and changed
their views about themselves as readers. Retrospective miscue analysis drew on the value of classroom talk. This was extremely true for KW. Once he began to talk about his reading and retelling and learning how to make predictions and inferences he became less dependent on sounding out words and more dependent on reading for understanding.

Several strategies were introduced to him to help him understand the text. The first was to read sentences without the word he did not know and substitute a word that made sense in the sentence. When trying this strategy together, he was able to make a syntactically acceptable substitution that was also semantically acceptable. After doing this several times, he was asked to retell what we read together and was entirely satisfactory. Because he continued to have difficulty with retellings, he was given the strategy to stop after reading a page or small part of the text and retell just that part. Again we practiced until he was able to do it independently. The most important strategy introduced to him was reading the words as a sentence without stopping until he got to a period or other end punctuation. When he first tried this, he hesitated when he was unsure and had to be prompted to continue. This strategy was practiced over two sessions until he applied the strategy during the third session without prompting. The final strategy introduced to him was stopping to make inferences as he read and using those inferences to make predictions about what might happen next. Post-it notes would have been helpful for him here if they were provided to enable him to write down what he was thinking.

KW was easy to work with and willing to please me with his reading. As we worked together during the study, he became more relaxed with his reading and his voice level increased. He also volunteered to read in class especially when we were in small
groups. He also assisted others in reading unknown words which is something he did not do before we began this study.

RS was using a large number of strategies comfortably as we began working. His primary strength was strategies for reading words; he would sound them out, break them apart, and use context clues to determine the meaning of unknown words and go back and self-correct. He was concerned about not knowing what some words meant as he read even though he could figure out how to pronounce them accurately. Additionally, RS was able to apply prior knowledge to understand and retell text.

Strategies introduced to RS focused on improving comprehension. Because he repeatedly asked what certain words meant we worked with a strategy that might help him. He would read the sentence without the unknown word and substitute a word he thought that made sense. He then wrote both words on a sticky note and could use a dictionary or thesaurus later to see if they both had the same meaning or were synonyms. After he finished a book he wrote the new words in his reading journal along with a short definition or synonym. In order to help him with comprehension, RS was asked to use a summarizing strategy by writing down the most important information at the end of every page. He reread what he wrote down when he finished the book. This strategy not only helped his reading comprehension, but also helped him as he worked on his writing assignments, making him able to keep ideas organized as he wrote his compositions.

The most significant miscue RS was making was reading words rapidly with little intonation. He omitted punctuation marks as he was reading. I practiced with him stopping at periods by reading one sentence and then restating what he just read. By making him read a sentence and stop to restate he was able to slow his reading down and
worked on being able to read sentences instead of just words. By doing this, he was better able to retell what he read, and he even recognized the fact that what he was reading was making more sense.

When RS was reading informational text, he always skipped the titles, subtitles and captions reading only the main text losing some valuable information about what he was reading. To correct this miscue, I had him read all the titles and subtitles in the book then read all the captions before reading the actual text. He then explained to me what he thought the book was about before reading the main text of the book. Also, he was given the strategy to reread a paragraph or even a page if he was confused about what he was reading. He applied these strategies during his final session with me and felt confident enough to try to read a book at a higher level than what he was currently choosing.

When working with HJ, he was overly confident about his reading ability. However, the only strategies he used when reading were those related to reading words. He used chunks to help him read words as well as sounding them out. He explained that he used beginning and ending sounds to help him figure out new words. When retelling he remembered only the beginning and end of what he read and little else.

I introduced strategies to HJ that focused on how he read as well as on remembering what he read. When HJ read he sped through the passages reading word by word without phrasing or intonation, and not as complete thoughts. He completely ignored punctuation, so the first strategy he had to work on was reading the text as sentences that had meaning. We practiced this strategy for two sessions by having him read a sentence, stop then retell what he read without referring to the text. At first he was hesitant to retell but as we continued to practice he recognized the fact that by reading
sentences he was able to connect ideas in sentences to help make sense of the text. Once we accomplished this, I introduced strategies of making inferences and predictions. He was able to apply prior knowledge to the text he chose, so we used that to make our inferences about what he was reading. When he made inferences we used them to predict what the next part of the text would be about and continued to read to verify his prediction or make new predictions. When he was able to apply all these strategies, the final one presented to him was to verbalize or write a summary of each section of an informational text or chapter in a literary text. He refused to write summaries because he said it took too long, but he was willing to verbalize them with me and he tried to summarize in his head before he continued to read.

AG had difficulty retelling what she read, but she relied heavily on prior information to help her make connections to the text she was reading. Also, she was the only student who would turn back to a section in the text to find an answer or to try to remember what she read. She often reread a sentence or short passage to make sure she understood. Very seldom did AG have difficulty with reading words, but when she did she was able to break them into chunks or use a word she already knew with a similar spelling to help her say the word correctly.

Strategies used with AG focused on helping her remember what she read without having to go constantly back to the text. The first strategy introduced to her was writing a summary of each page as she finished reading on a sticky note so that if she became confused or couldn’t remember she could read her sticky notes. She found this strategy helpful and used sticky notes in all her textbooks along with the books she was reading independently.
Additional strategies used with AG included creating a picture either in her mind or on paper to help her visualize what the text was about. When she used this strategy, she described a picture using vivid details from the text and showed me exactly where those details were in the text. When she struggled with an informational text, I suggested doing a book walk by looking at pictures, reading titles, subtitles and captions to become familiar with what the topics addressed within the text. She could use that information from prior knowledge to assist her in understanding the text and help her remember what she read. AG applied the strategies as she continued to record her reading.

When AG took Accelerated Reader tests on the books, her comprehension was excellent as she scored 80-100% on all her tests. Dominie assessment used complete text to check comprehension, and she became more proficient in responding to questions. However when taking STAR reading, she struggled to show the same amount of growth made on Dominie. This indicated to me that she might have a need for a complete text to improve comprehension instead of short passages used in STAR.

When AG read during RTI sessions her fluency level was high, she had rises and falls in pitch. Her rate was 93 wpm at the end of the study and the criterion for end of fourth grade was 130 wpm. Her reading rate could be what was making it difficult to understand text because it was taking longer to read a passage.

One strategy introduced during group discussion came up when they began talking about books they read that they enjoyed most. I immediately recognized the author of those books and asked them if they paid attention to the author of books they are reading. Some said “yes” and others said “no.” So, I suggested they make sure they wrote down all authors of the books they read. When they found a book they enjoyed,
they should go to the library and look for additional books by that author. One student immediately made the connection to the *Wimpy Kid* books because he had read all the *Wimpy Kid* books in the library.

Constance Weaver (2002) stated it best when she said, “The goal of reading instruction should not be the accurate identification of every word, but rather the effective and efficient use of reading strategies in order to construct meaning.” (p. 71) Helping the students move away from their focus on reading words was the main goal of this study after analysis of their Burke Reading Inventory responses. Based on the above findings, it appears that the use of RMA during RTI in a fourth-grade classroom was an effective strategy for improving student reading comprehension. It provided strategy instruction to the students on an individual basis to address their personal needs. After I brought the group together and talked about their experiences, they realized they had much in common and continued to support each other.

Listening to their reading was a good vehicle for self-reflection and self-assessment by using text the students could handle, and they could talk about the strategies used when trying to comprehend the text. (Rhodes & Shanklin, 1993). Three major factors that affected their comprehension including the reader, the text, and the situation. The use of the iPad was the original motivation, but it quickly moved away from that to the idea of listening to their reading to learn more about themselves as readers. The three boys in the study learned more about their reading just by listening to themselves. They recognized their reading rate and discussed how it affected their comprehension. It was obvious to them that RMA was making them better readers when
they all began to choose higher level books and found that they were able to talk about
the books and take Accelerated Reader tests on the books scoring 80-100%.

5.3 PERSONAL REFLECTION

By engaging in this study I also learned a lot about myself as a teacher and about
the students. The most important fact that I learned about myself was that I was a
kidwatcher and responded to the students’ needs. Being a kidwatcher and documenting
findings did take time, but it was worth it (Rhodes and Shanklin 1993). I was very
cognizant of what the students liked to read as well as how they were reading. Allowing
them to choose texts for RMA sessions assisted me in making sure there were books in
the classroom that they were willing to read. Keeping a special basket of books near my
desk motivated all the students in the class to read. I even had discussions with two other
teachers on how we could rotate books within and between our classes to keep them fresh
and inviting to the students.

After completing the analysis of the RMA sessions I noticed that on several
occasions I led the students into conversations about words. I explained how to replace
the words as well as strategies to pronounce the words. This was done most often with
KW. When I revisited these conversations, I realized that I was focused on words with
him, but I was trying to build his confidence and encourage him in believing he was a
good reader. If I was to continue with KW I would focus more on the comprehension
skills using Jeffrey Wilhelm’s steps for instructing strategies. Jeffrey Wilhelm (2001)
identified six steps of explicit instruction that included the teacher explaining the
strategy, explaining why the strategy was important, when to use the strategy, modeling
how to use the strategy within text, guiding the learner’s practice, and finally encouraging
the students to independently use the strategy. As I reviewed the conversations of the other three students, I realized I was only doing five of the steps. The step I most often left out was explaining why the strategy was used and how it helped comprehension. This was something I noted for use as I start a new school year.

By engaging in conversations with the students I also identified a few misconceptions I had about the students within my school. I originally generalized that they had little interest in reading and parents did not support their reading. I quickly found out the support the students I worked with had from their parents. Two of the students went to the library regularly and checked out books. All the parents wanted their child to read better and be successful. Parents even spent time reading to their child or reading with their child as they got older.

At the end of the study I realized how important books were for these students. At the end of the year the State Department of Education provided books for the students to take home for summer reading. The students who participated in the study were the ones who were most careful about their book selection and selected their books before the other students. In the past, when the students received these books they put them in their cubbies and ignored them until I had them put them in book bags to take home. The four students who I worked with took their books to their desk when they returned to the classroom. They all took one of the books out of their bag and began reading. It was a pleasant sight! They put a few of the books in their book bags to take home, but most importantly they put several in their desks to read at school.

One other observation made after completing the study was how the students interacted with books and with their classmates. Since state testing was completed I
pulled out several sets of books that we had not used in class. The students selected a book to read and formed groups to read together. Each of the students in the study chose a different book. As they read with their groups they became group leaders by engaging the others in conversations about what they were reading. I even heard them say “Don’t interrupt them by saying the word for them, let them read.” This was something I had constantly reinforced in the classroom, but students had difficulty stopping correction of pronunciation when others read aloud.

One additional observation made after the study was done when finalizing report cards. All four students showed a major increase in grades across subjects. KW’s grades from third grade had him failing all subjects, but he was not retained. His grades for the fourth quarter were all Cs. Two of the other students made the honor roll for the first time. Assisting them with their reading through RMA not only improved their self-confidence in reading, it helped increase their success in all academic areas. I was excited to see their state testing scores.

5.4 FURTHER IMPLEMENTATION AND RESEARCH

During the study, discussions were held with fourth-grade teachers to share what I was implementing and how the students were responding. Both teachers were interested in the strategy with one of them downloading the voice recorder app to allow her students to record themselves reading. In further discussions we focused on how we could implement the RMA strategy as an intervention tool as a grade level team next year. A possible schedule was suggested to administration that includes a 45 minute daily ELA RTI time. A common RTI time would allow us to regroup students based on need and have additional teacher support assisted by the resource teacher, Advanced Academic
Program teacher, and reading tutors during the shared time. Students would be grouped by need across teachers so group sizes might vary. We would discuss students’ progress monitored on a regular basis during grade level meetings to make decisions about appropriate placement changes for RTI groups.

Implementation of the strategy with fourth-grade students next year will focus on the use of Dominie for assessing reading levels and progress monitoring. As a result of the growth rates of the students over a ten week period, it appears that the use of this assessment would be an appropriate assessment tool. The remaining team members will have to be trained in the use of Dominie at the beginning of the school to ensure fidelity of its use. A standard record keeping method for regrouping will need to be established as students make progress, thereby implementing an accurate RTI model. School administration is open to the idea and willing to support the process depending on staff decisions made by the district.

Because the students respond positively to the use of technology an additional component to the plan for the next academic year might be the use of electronic devices by students to read books. There are several websites available that provide books for children, and the local public library allows patrons to borrow books by downloading to electronic devices. The school district is working towards one-to-one technology for all students which would be helpful in providing this service to students. A study question could be: Would having students read on electronic devices along with the use of RMA during RTI increase their time spent reading and the number of books they read, and improve their reading comprehension? An additional question could also be, Is there a way to utilize RMA with an entire class?
One additional component I would like to add to my curriculum next year is the concept of inquiry circles. This would allow students to engage in more conversations about books and reading strategies as they make sense of text. I feel that this will not only improve their reading comprehension, it will also encourage them to engage with a wider variety of books. Students will also support each other with those difficult sections making them less dependent on an adult to do it for them.

With the statewide goal of every child reading at grade level by the end of third grade, this research could be significant. The use of RMA at the third-grade level could assist students that are reading below grade level achieve success allowing them to advance to fourth grade reading on grade level. It could also be implemented as part of a summer remedial program for students who did not reach grade level expectations at the end of the school year. The model could assist them in achieving appropriate gains allowing them to progress to fourth grade when the school year begins without repeating third grade.

5.5 SUMMARY

Reinforcing effort and providing recognition increased motivation, but children do not realize the influence of their effort on their success (Marzano et al, 2001). Marzano also stated that providing an objective and offering feedback gave students direction and an opportunity to think about their learning. Feedback provided to students needed to be timely and specific that identified what the student was doing well along with an area of weakness. This was the focus key idea behind the use of RMA.

Based on Dominie assessment all four students showed growth ranging from one to two years of their grade equivalency level within a twelve week period as shown in
Table 4.14. Miscues collected at the end of the intervention were usually semantically and syntactically acceptable. Students all had repetition miscues as they tried to pronounce words correctly but self-corrected more frequently during post assessment. Retelling improved on post-assessment along with comprehension levels indicating improved reading ability for all students involved in the study.

The study appeared successful in achieving the goals. First, it positively affected student reading levels and the time they spent reading independently. All students in the study showed growth in reading levels using two different sets of assessment data. KW had the largest gain and would continue to benefit from continued one-on-one instruction. Secondly, the students became aware of the strategies they were using with automaticity and acquired additional strategies that increased their comprehension of text. Thirdly, the students became more efficient in self-monitoring their reading. They were able to identify their miscues and express their misunderstandings and areas they needed assistance with to make improvements. Finally, the students were more engaged with the text, made better book selections and enjoyed talking about their reading. All students in the study were more attentive to the level of books they were reading and were more selective of the types of books they checked out of the library. Overall the study indicated that the use of Retrospective Miscue Analysis during Response to Intervention benefited students who were reading below grade level by bringing them up to or closer to reading on grade level in a short amount of time.
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APPENDIX A – BURKE READING INVENTORY

The following list of questions was used to discover students’ attitudes and understanding of the reading process. Where appropriate, the interviewees were asked to expand upon their answers. Questions come from Burke Reading Inventory as cited in the paper.

1. When you are reading, and you come to something you don’t know, what do you do? Do you ever do anything else?
2. Who is a good reader that you know?
3. What makes ________________ a good reader?
4. Do you think that ________________ever comes to something s/he doesn’t know?
5. (Yes) When ___________comes to something s/he doesn’t know, what do you think s/he does?
   (No) Suppose ___________ comes to something s/he doesn’t know, what would s/he do?
6. If you know someone was having trouble reading, how would you help that person?
7. What would a teacher do to help that person?
8. How did you learn to read?
9. What would you like to do better as a reader (Paraphrase: What do you think you need to do to be a better reader?)
10. Do you think you are a good reader? Why?
## Appendix B – Student Responses to Initial Burke Reading Inventory

Student responses to initial Burke Reading Inventory questions found in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>HJ</th>
<th>KW</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 1</strong> What do you do when you are reading and come to something you don’t know what do you do? Follow-up What else?</td>
<td>Move on and come back to it. If I don’t know the word, I’ll see what next word is and guess the word.</td>
<td>Go on. Keep reading and go back to word to figure it out. Read the whole sentence and then go back, it helps me sound it out.</td>
<td>Break it up into small pieces and pronounce it. There is usually a part of the word I know and try to break it up.</td>
<td>Stop and think and sound it out. Try to get the word out.</td>
<td>Focus on reading words and sounding them out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 2.</strong> Who is a good reader you know?</td>
<td>My mom.</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Ja’Nya and Kaylyn</td>
<td>Mothers and classmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3.</strong> What makes ________ a good reader?</td>
<td>She helps me when I read. She helps me with words. She _____ that’s it.</td>
<td>He helps people say words.</td>
<td>When she’s reading a big chapter book, she pauses at the end of a sentence and goes on.</td>
<td>Read a lot and doesn’t mess up on words. She never stops unless it’s a period. She can read chapter books.</td>
<td>Read lots of words again focus on words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4. Do you think _____ ever comes to something he/she doesn’t know?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 5. When _____ does come to something he/she doesn’t know, what do you think he/she does? Or Suppose _____ comes to something he/she doesn’t know. What would he/she do?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>She’ll probably just guess what the word is.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6. How would you help someone having trouble reading?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read the book with them. Help them sound out words.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7. What would a/your teacher do to help that person?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Might just have the whole class read with them on Smartboard. Pull them back to the table and help them with words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8. How did you learn to read?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the summer, my mom had me read a whole book and write a paragraph about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By sounding words out using what I know about words and read to figure out words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t remember but when I was four, I read the book, <em>If you Give a Mouse a Cookie</em> and I was able to pronounce the words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I was four, my mom taught me to read by asking what a word was, and I sounded it out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Began reading by sounding out words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 9. What would you like to do better as a reader?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like to get word pronunciation better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read hard words and figure it out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read bigger words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could study words or when I open books look at every page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on reading more words or harder words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 10 Do you think you are a good reader? Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kinda because when I read I just … I don’t know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So-so because when I come to words I don’t know I need help and sometimes sound it out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, because I know how to break words into syllables and pronounce them the right way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, because sometimes I stop and think about stuff. I stop and think about main ideas and I try to sound out words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider themselves good readers based on how well they read words.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C – SCREENING DIAGNOSTIC REPORTS

Diagnostic reports provide GE, IRL, SS, and PR. It also offers a percent of mastery of fourth-grade skills for informational text, literary text, and vocabulary for each student.

HJ’s Diagnostic Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Benchmark - Grade 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urgent Intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STAR Reading Scores

- **SS: 339 (Scaled Score)**
  - **Intervention**: Hallah-Jwon’s Scaled Score is based on the difficulty of questions and the number of correct responses.
- **PR: 22 (Percentile Rank)**
  - **Intervention**: Hallah-Jwon scored greater than 22% of students nationally in the same grade.
- **GE: 2.0 (Grade Equivalent)**
  - **Intervention**: Hallah-Jwon’s test performance is comparable to that of an average second grader after the ninth month of the school year.
- **IRL: 2.9 (Instructional Reading Level)**
  - **Intervention**: Hallah-Jwon would be best served by instructional materials prepared at the second grade level.
- **Est. ORF: 78 (Estimated Oral Reading Fluency)**
  - **Intervention**: Hallah-Jwon can likely read 78 words per minute correctly on grade level appropriate text.

### Domain Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading: Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Ideas and Details: 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft and Structure: 03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity: 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading: Informational Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Ideas and Details: 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft and Structure: 03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Knowledge and Ideas: 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity: 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary Acquisition and Use: 62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reading Recommendation

- **ZPD: 2.5-3.5 (Zone of Proximal Development)**
  - **Intervention**: Hallah-Jwon’s ZPD identifies books at the right level to provide optimal reading challenge without frustration. Enter Hallah-Jwon’s ZPD in [www.ARBookFind.com](http://www.ARBookFind.com) to find appropriate books.
Skill Details
Skill Area Scores, ranging from 0-100, estimate Hallah-Jwon’s percent of mastery of skills in each skill area. Use Core Progress learning progressions to find teacher activities and sample problems for skills in each skill area.

### Reading: Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Domain Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 Character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Plot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Inference and Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Theme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Craft and Structure</th>
<th>Domain Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Structure of Literary Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Word Meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Author's Word Choice and Figurative Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Domain Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68 Range of Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reading: Informational Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Domain Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Inference and Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Prediction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Main Idea and Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Sequence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Compare and Contrast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Cause and Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Craft and Structure</th>
<th>Domain Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Word Meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Author's Word Choice and Figurative Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Author's Purpose and Perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Student Diagnostic Report**  
**Enterprise Test**  
Printed Sunday, May 10, 2015  2:05:09 PM

School: Thomas Elementary School  
Test Date: August 22, 2014  9:11 AM  
Test Time: 11 minutes 53 seconds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Knowledge and Ideas</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentation</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Reading</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary Acquisition and Use</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Analysis</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context Clues</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary in Context</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-Meaning Words</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synonyms</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figures of Speech</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AG’s Diagnostic Report

**STAR Reading Scores**
- **GD:** 367 (Scaled Score) **- On Watch**
  - Alexa’s Scaled Score is based on the difficulty of questions and the number of correct responses.
- **PR:** 29 (Percentile Rank)
  - Alexa scored greater than 29% of students nationally in the same grade.
- **GE:** 3.1 (Grade Equivalent)
  - Alexa’s test performance is comparable to that of an average third grader after the first month of the school year.
- **IRL:** 3.1 (Instructional Reading Level)
  - Alexa would be best served by instructional materials prepared at the third grade level.
- **Est. ORF:** 85 (Estimated Oral Reading Fluency)
  - Alexa can likely read 85 words per minute correctly on grade level appropriate text.

**Domain Scores**
- **Reading: Literature**
  - Key Ideas and Details: 67
  - Craft and Structure: 69
  - Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity: 66
- **Reading: Informational Text**
  - Key Ideas and Details: 67
  - Craft and Structure: 64
  - Integration of Knowledge and Ideas: 48
  - Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity: 66
- **Language**
  - Vocabulary Acquisition and Use: 68

**Reading Recommendation**
- **ZPD:** 2.6-3.7 (Zone of Proximal Development)
  - Alexa’s ZPD identifies books at the right level to provide optimal reading challenge without frustration. Enter Alexa’s ZPD in [www.ABBookFind.com](http://www.ABBookFind.com) to find appropriate books.
Skill Details
Skill Area Scores, ranging from 0-100, estimate Alexia’s percent of mastery of skills in each skill area. Use Core Progress learning progressions to find teacher activities and sample problems for skills in each skill area.

Reading: Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Domain Score: 67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Plot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Inference and Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 Theme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Craft and Structure</th>
<th>Domain Score: 69</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Structure of Literary Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 Word Meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Author’s Word Choice and Figurative Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity</th>
<th>Domain Score: 66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Range of Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reading: Informational Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Domain Score: 67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Inference and Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 Prediction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 Main Idea and Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Sequence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 Compare and Contrast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 Cause and Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Craft and Structure</th>
<th>Domain Score: 64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 Word Meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 Author’s Word Choice and Figurative Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Author’s Purpose and Perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domain Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Knowledge and Ideas</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Argumentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 Range of Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary Acquisition and Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 Structural Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Context Clues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 Vocabulary in Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Multiple-Meaning Words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Synonyms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 Figures of Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RS's Diagnostic report
**Skill Details**
Skill Area Scores, ranging from 0-100, estimate Rontae’s percent of mastery of skills in each skill area. Use Core Progress learning progressions to find teacher activities and sample problems for skills in each skill area.

### Reading: Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Domain Score: 84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 Character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 Plot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Inference and Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Theme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Craft and Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Score</strong></th>
<th>Domain Score: 84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83 Structure of Literary Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 Word Meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Author’s Word Choice and Figurative Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Score</strong></th>
<th>Domain Score: 83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83 Range of Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reading: Informational Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Domain Score: 84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Inference and Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Prediction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 Main Idea and Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 Sequence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 Compare and Contrast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 Cause and Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Craft and Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Score</strong></th>
<th>Domain Score: 81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88 Word Meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Author’s Word Choice and Figurative Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 Author’s Purpose and Perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Integration of Knowledge and Ideas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Domain Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Argumentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Domain Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range of Reading</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Language

#### Vocabulary Acquisition and Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Domain Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary in Context</strong></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple-Meaning Words</strong></td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synonyms</strong></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Figures of Speech</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Student Diagnostic Report**

**Enterprise Test**

**School:** Thomas Elementary School  
**Test Date:** August 26, 2014 9:55 AM  
**Test Time:** 19 minutes 0 seconds

**Report Options**  
Use Trend Score: Use trend score for student's suggested skills

---

### School Benchmark - Grade 4

- **Urgent Intervention**
- **Intervention**
- **On Watch**
- **Above Benchmark**

---

### STAR Reading Scores

- **SS:** 158 (Scaled Score)  
- **PR:** 2 (Percentile Rank)  
- **GE:** 1.8 (Grade Equivalent)  
- **IRL:** P (Instructional Reading Level)  
- **Est. ORF:** 42 (Estimated Oral Reading Fluency)

---

### Domain Scores

**Reading: Literature**
- Key Ideas and Details: 18
- Craft and Structure: 20
- Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity: 16

**Reading: Informational Text**
- Key Ideas and Details: 18
- Craft and Structure: 18
- Integration of Knowledge and Ideas: 9
- Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity: 16

**Language**
- Vocabulary Acquisition and Use: 21

**Domain scores, ranging from 0-100, estimate Kharonn's percent of mastery on skills in each domain at a fourth grade level.**

---

### Reading Recommendation

- **ZPD:** 1.8-2.8 (Zone of Proximal Development)

Kharonn's ZPD identifies books at the right level to provide optimal reading challenge without frustration. Enter Kharonn's ZPD in [www.ABBookFind.com](http://www.ABBookFind.com) to find appropriate books.
## Skill Details
Skill Area Scores, ranging from 0-100, estimate Kharoon's percent of mastery of skills in each skill area. Use Core Progress learning progressions to find teacher activities and sample problems for skills in each skill area.

### Reading: Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Domain Score: 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Plot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Inference and Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Theme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Craft and Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Score: 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Structure of Literary Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Word Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Author’s Word Chooe and Figurative Language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Score: 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Range of Reading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reading: Informational Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Domain Score: 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Inference and Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Prediction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Main Idea and Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Sequence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Compare and Contrast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Cause and Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Craft and Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Score: 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Word Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Author’s Word Chooe and Figurative Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Author’s Purpose and Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Student Diagnostic Report

## Enterprise Test

**School:** Thomas Elementary School  
**Test Date:** August 26, 2014  9:59 AM  
**Test Time:** 19 minutes 0 seconds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Integration of Knowledge and Ideas

**Score:** 9  
**Domain Score:** 9

- Argumentation

## Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity

**Score:** 16  
**Domain Score:** 16

- Range of Reading

## Language

### Vocabulary Acquisition and Use

**Score:** 21  
**Domain Score:** 21

- Structural Analysis
- Context Clues
- Vocabulary in Context
- Multiple-Meaning Words
- Synonyms
- Figures of Speech
APPENDIX D–STUDENTS RESPONSES TO POST- BURKE READING INVENTORY

The table provides student responses to the questions in the Burke Reading Inventory. Follow-up inventory given to students participating in the study. Question number five was omitted from the follow-up inventory. It asked how they learned to read, and I did not feel a need to ask that question again. Again an oral administration was completed by the students, and the responses were recorded on paper. Responses are the actual words of the students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RS</th>
<th>KW</th>
<th>HJ</th>
<th>AG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>What do you do when you are reading and come to something you don’t know what do you do? Follow-up What else?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use sticky notes, write in the book if it is mine, skip it and come back to after reading the sentence to try to understand what the author is saying.</td>
<td>Skip over it and try to sound it out. Come back to it when I figure out the word at the end of the sentence. Reread the sentence when I know the word. Sometimes it is too hard.</td>
<td>Go to a different page. Try to read it again.</td>
<td>Skip it and come back to it, don’t take the time to stop. Come back to reread and try to understand what I am reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2: Who is a good reader you know?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mom and brother</td>
<td>You, indicating teacher, are a good reader</td>
<td>Mom and Dad</td>
<td>You, indicating teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3. What makes __________ a good reader?</td>
<td>By the way they read the book – fast or slow, make guesses, stop and talk about the book with someone.</td>
<td>When you read to us, you stop and tell us what new words mean and talk about what you read.</td>
<td>They know most of the word in the books they read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4. Do you think _____ ever comes to something he/she doesn’t know?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5. When ____ does come to something he/she doesn’t know, what do you think he/she does? Or Suppose _____ comes to something he/she doesn’t know. What would he/she do?</td>
<td>They try to use knowledge of what they know and ask for help if they don’t get it or ask for something that might help them understand</td>
<td>Rereads or skips it going on. Don’t know if make mistakes when reading to us because I understand what you read.</td>
<td>Reread, write the word down and look it up in a college dictionary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6. How would you help someone having trouble reading?</td>
<td>Have them work alone in a quiet place, Help them summarize or tell what they read.</td>
<td>Help them with words. Tell them to sound words out when it is too hard.</td>
<td>Read with them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7. What would a/your teacher do to help that person?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pull a group daily and have them to tell what read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do small group. Make them read to you, study words, read passages and answer questions about the passages.</td>
<td>Ask what having difficulty with, have them read it back to the teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach them how to use sticky notes while reading, try to predict what’s going to happen, have them reread.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8. How did you learn to read?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not reassess this question because did not anticipate any changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 9. What would you like to do better as a reader?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summarize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To pay attention to what I am reading. Not skip over a lot of words because it gets confusing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak clearly when I read aloud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: Why do you say that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HJ: I like to read aloud and record what I am reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to concentrate on reading and remembering what it was about. Want to become a writer and write stories, so I need to understand how they are written when I read.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 10 Do you think you are a good reader? Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, because I am reading a higher level book than I was earlier. I talk about what I read and remember what I read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, because I read, and it helps me learn it will help me with problems I understand more of what I am reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, because I read for a good majority of the time. Reading is my favorite subject at home and school. I learned new strategies and read without rushing like I used to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little bit. I am reading faster and understanding more of what I read. I can answer questions about what I read better than I could before.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E–POST STUDY STAR DIAGNOSTIC REPORTS

Reports have students’ names and identifying information blacked out and initials used to correlate with data and discussion in previous chapters.
**Student Diagnostic Report**

**Enterprise Test**

Printed Sunday, May 15, 2016 2:29:32 PM

**School:** Thames Elementary School

**Test Date:** May 15, 2016 8:40 AM
**Test Time:** 25 minutes 8 seconds

---

**Skill Details**

Skill Area Scores, ranging from 0-100, estimate Hallah-Jean’s percent of mastery of skills in each skill area. Use Core Progress learning progressions to find teacher activities and sample problems for skills in each skill area.

**Reading: Literature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Domain Score: 86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 Character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 Setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Plot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 Inference and Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 Theme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Craft and Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Score: 86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 Structure of Literary Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Word Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 Author’s Word Choice and Figurative Language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Score: 86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 Range of Reading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reading: Informational Text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Domain Score: 86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 Inference and Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 Prediction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Main Idea and Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 Sequence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 Compare and Contrast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Cause and Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Craft and Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Score: 82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Word Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 Author’s Word Choice and Figurative Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 Author’s Purpose and Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Integration of Knowledge and Ideas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Score: 71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71 Argumentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Score: 86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85 Range of Reading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Language

#### Vocabulary Acquisition and Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Score: 84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90 Structural Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 Context Clues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Vocabulary in Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Multiple-Meaning Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Synonyms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 Figures of Speech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AG’s Diagnostic Report

Student Diagnostic Report
Enterprise Test

School: Thomas Elementary School
Printed Sunday, May 10, 2015 2:26:32 PM

Test Date: April 23, 2015 11:07 AM
Test Time: 21 minutes 20 seconds

Report Options
Use Trend Score: Use trend score for student's suggested skills

School Benchmark - Grade 4

STAR Reading Scores
SS: 431 (Scaled Score) On Watch
Aloisa's Scaled Score is based on the difficulty of questions and the number of correct responses.
PR: 31 (Percentile Rank)
Aloisa scored greater than 31% of students nationally in the same grade.
GE: 3.8 (Grade Equivalent)
Aloisa's test performance is comparable to that of an average third grader after the eighth month of the school year.
IRL: 3.6 (Instructional Reading Level)
Aloisa would be best served by instructional materials prepared at the third grade level.
Est. CRI: 100 (Estimated Oral Reading Fluency)
Aloisa can likely read 100 words per minute correctly on grade level appropriate text.

Domain Scores
Reading: Literature
Key Idea and Details: 79
Craft and Structure: 79
Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity: 77
Reading: Informational Text
Key Idea and Details: 79
Craft and Structure: 79
Integration of Knowledge and Ideas: 81
Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity: 77
Language
Vocabulary Acquisition and Use: 79

Reading Recommendation
ZPD: 2.9-4.3 (Zone of Proximal Development)
Aloisa’s ZPD identifies books at the right level to provide optimal reading challenge without frustration. Enter Aloisa’s ZPD in www.ABookFinder.com to find appropriate books.
### Skills Details

Skill Area Scores, ranging from 0-100, estimate Alora's percent of mastery of skills in each skill area. Use Core Progress learning progressions to find teacher activities and sample problems for skills in each skill area.

#### Reading: Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Domain Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 Character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 Setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Plot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Inference and Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Theme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Craft and Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Domain Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77 Structure of Literary Text</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Word Meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 Author's Word Choice and Figurative Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Domain Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77 Range of Reading</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Reading: Informational Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Domain Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Inference and Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Prediction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 Main Idea and Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 Sequence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 Compare and Contrast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Cause and Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Craft and Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Domain Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83 Word Meaning</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 Author's Word Choice and Figurative Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 Author's Purpose and Perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Student Diagnostic Report

## Enterprise Test

**School:** Thomas Elementary School  
**Test Date:** April 20, 2016 11:07 AM  
**Test Time:** 21 minutes 20 seconds

### Integration of Knowledge and Ideas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain Score</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score:**

- 01 Argumentation

### Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain Score</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score:**

- 77 Range of Reading

### Language

#### Vocabulary Acquisition and Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain Score</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score:**

- 05 Structural Analysis
- 82 Context Clues
- 76 Vocabulary in Context
- 75 Multiple-Meaning Words
- 82 Synonyms
- 80 Figures of Speech
# STAR Reading Report

**School:** Thames Elementary School  
**Printed Date:** May 10, 2018  
**Test Date:** May 1, 2018  
**Time:** 2:26:32 PM  
**Test Time:** 24 minutes 21 seconds

## STAR Reading Scores

**SS:** 431 (Scaled Score)  
- **On Watch**

**PR:** 29 (Percentile Rank)

**CE:** 3.8 (Grade Equivalent)

**IRL:** 3.8 (Instructional Reading Level)

**Est. CRI:** 100 (Estimated Oral Reading Fluency)

**Domain Scores**

- **Reading: Literature**  
  - Key Ideas and Details: 78  
  - Craft and Structure: 79  
  - Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity: 77

- **Reading: Informational Text**  
  - Key Ideas and Details: 78  
  - Craft and Structure: 75  
  - Integration of Knowledge and Ideas: 81  
  - Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity: 77

**Language**  
- Vocabulary Acquisition and Use: 79

**Reading Recommendation**

- ZPD: 2.9-4.3 (Zone of Proximal Development)

**Domain scores, ranging from 0-100, estimate Rontae's percent of mastery on skills in each domain at a fourth grade level.**

**Use Trend Score:** Use trend score for student's suggested skills.

**Report Options**

- Uniform Intervention  
- Intervention  
- On Watch  
- At-Grade Benchmark

**RS’s Diagnostic Report**
## Skill Details

Skill Area Scores, ranging from 0-100, estimate student's percent of mastery of skills in each skill area. Use Core Progress learning progressions to find teacher activities and sample problems for skills in each skill area.

### Reading: Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Domain Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 Character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 Setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 Plot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Inference and Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Theme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Craft and Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Structure of Literary Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Word Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 Author's Word Choice and Figurative Language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Range of Reading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reading: Informational Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Domain Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Inference and Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Prediction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 Main Idea and Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Sequence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 Compare and Contrast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Cause and Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Craft and Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Word Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89 Author's Word Choice and Figurative Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Author's Purpose and Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Knowledge and Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Integration of Knowledge and Ideas
- **Score:** 61
  - Argumentation

### Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity
- **Score:** 77
  - Range of Reading

### Language
- **Score:**
  - 85 Structural Analysis
  - 82 Context Clues
  - 76 Vocabulary in Context
  - 75 Multiple-Meaning Words
  - 82 Synonyms
  - 80 Figures of Speech
### STAR Reading Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SS: 3.30 (Scaled Score)</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PR: 13 (Percentile Rank)</td>
<td>Karamm scored greater than 13% of students nationally in the same grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE: 2.9 (Grade Equivalent)</td>
<td>Karamm's test performance is comparable to that of an average second grader after the ninth month of the school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL: 2.9 (Instructional Reading Level)</td>
<td>Karamm would be best served by instructional materials prepared at the second grade level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. ORF: 77 (Estimated Oral Reading Fluency)</td>
<td>Karamm can likely read 77 words per minute correctly on grade level appropriate text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Domain Scores

- **Reading: Literature**
  - Key Ideas and Details: 61
  - Craft and Structure: 63
  - Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity: 59

- **Reading: Informational Text**
  - Key Ideas and Details: 69
  - Craft and Structure: 58
  - Integration of Knowledge and Ideas: 42
  - Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity: 59

- **Language**
  - Vocabulary Acquisition and Use: 62

### Reading Recommendation

Karamm's ZPD identifies books at the right level to provide optimal reading challenge without frustration. Enter Karamm's ZPD in [www.ARBookFind.com](http://www.ARBookFind.com) to find appropriate books.
### Reading: Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Domain Score: 81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 Character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 Plot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Inference and Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Theme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content and Structure</th>
<th>Domain Score: 83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Structure of Literary Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Word Meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Author’s Word Choice and Figurative Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity</th>
<th>Domain Score: 89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Range of Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reading: Informational Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Domain Score: 80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Inference and Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Prediction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Main Idea and Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 Sequence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Compare and Contrast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 Cause and Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content and Structure</th>
<th>Domain Score: 88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Word Meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Author’s Word Choice and Figurative Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Author’s Purpose and Perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Knowledge and Ideas</td>
<td>Domain Score: 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Argumentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity</th>
<th>Domain Score: 69</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Range of Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Domain Score: 62</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary Acquisition and Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Structural Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 Context Clues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Vocabulary in Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Multiple-Meaning Words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 Synonyma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 Figures of Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>