

Analyzing Student Data  
Noel McDowell  
Michigan State University  
TE 842  
Summer 2013

Student Analysis Summary  
Case Study One: William

Analysis of Assessment Data

*Informal Phonics Inventory*

This inventory provides the instructor with the knowledge the student has regarding the pronunciations of single sounds, blends, digraphs etc. The main focus is on the specific phonemes and phonemic blends; not the entire word. Phonological awareness is the awareness that words are created by a combination of phonemes. This inventory tests first the simple phonemes and then moves to blends and then into full words. The Rule of Silent-e portion of the test is the most difficult because it takes direct thought about the skill and rule of reading. This section relies on a higher order of thinking where the child needs to be cognizant of how to decipher the word. (McKenna & Stahl, 2010)

Based upon the data gathered in this inventory William is in the Review stage of development, marginally. This stage is for students mastering 60-79% of the answers (56-74 correct answers) and William scored a 61% with 57 correct answers. By looking closely at the data, it is evident that there are some portions of the inventory that need systematic instruction. The start of the assessment (sound only) William does fairly well on and review would be all necessary. However, once we move to full words the scores really trickle downward. William needs further awareness of sounds in context and the ability to sound out words properly. Systematic instruction in Silent-e is the most important aspect to focus on at this point in his reading development.

*Fry Sight-Word Inventory*

The Fry inventory is slightly different from other assessments and inventories because there is no overall, comprehensive score. This inventory takes a list of high-frequency words

(words students will encounter often in first reading) and tests the student's ability to read each of them. All of the words have different decoding and phonemic structure and oftentimes they are an exception to a commonly taught rule or system of decoding. These are the kinds of words that students must know by sight in order to read fluently and accurately. (McKenna & Stahl, 2010)

Based on William's test he has a very strong awareness of his sight-words. With the exception of 'been', William's miscues were similar- not in the words choices but how he incorrectly decoded. Looking at the words he had the correct initial phoneme and (usually) the correct end phoneme but the middle of the word was incorrect. William does not quite have the automaticity for these words. Further review and practice of the sight-words will improve his abilities but not much review is necessary for this first 100.

### *Spelling Inventory*

This spelling inventory was taken from *Words Their Way* and assesses not only the students accurate/inaccurate spellings of the words but also the skills that they have/have not achieved. Students are given the test in the traditional spelling test format but the grading of the test is done very differently. Using a feature guide the teacher marks specific consonants, digraphs etc. that were written correctly and also if the words was spelled correctly.

William only spelled one word correctly, however, he achieved all of the points for beginning and ending consonants but began to falter at the assessing of short vowels. I did find it interesting that he did very well with blends but struggled with digraphs. Based on the assessment data, William places at the middle of the Letter-Name Alphabetic Stage. He seems to be slightly behind the intended placement for beginning second graders (Late Letter-Name Alphabetic Stage) but with some direct review and instruction he should be capable of achieving grade-level skills. (McKenna & Stahl, 2010)

*Qualitative Reading Inventory*

The reading inventory assessments gauge multiple skills of a reader. It begins by assessing prior knowledge of the information that will be in the passage. The passage is a short story that the student is expected to read aloud in order to assess the oral reading fluency rate. Words are marked as miscues, self-corrected, repetitions, substitutions or omissions. With this information the assessor may then decipher a words per minute score as well as a correct words per minute score. These scores can be compared to a guideline of where a child should place on an oral reading fluency scale for their grade level. Comprehension may be tested with this test as well through a re-tell, explicit and implicit questions. The inventory data needs to be used with careful consideration to the individual child and text used.

Based upon William's data I would consider this level to be borderline between frustrational and instructional. He achieved a 78% on the concept questions prior to the reading indicating that he was familiar with the topic of the upcoming story. The actual scoring of his miscues was more difficult because of the level of subjectivity in the assessment data. Discounting repetitions, William had 11 miscues; 4 of them being meaning-changing. With 181 words and William reading them in 119 seconds his words per minute rate is 91 (third grade level) and his correct words per minute rate is 86 (third grade level.) While his fluency rate appeared above grade-level, William's scores went downhill for comprehension. His retell was very lower-level processing and only included four of the thirty one main ideas from the story. He answered 3/4 of the explicit questions accurately and 1/2 implicit questions. Based upon his answers of these questions, this text is at his instructional comprehension level. William needs further work with comprehension and understanding the material that he is reading.

### Goals for Instruction

The two main goals set for William are comprehension and stronger phonological awareness in the second half of the phonics inventory; final consonant blends and ng, short vowels in CVC words, Silent-e, long vowel digraphs, diphthongs and r-controlled vowels and -al.

#### *Goal 1: Phonological Awareness*

I chose phonological awareness as a goal based upon Common Core Standard ELA-Literacy.RF.2.3 which reads “Know and apply grade-level phonics and word analysis skills in decoding words.” (“Common core state,” 2012) This standard is broken down farther into individual areas, some of which William has mastered and some of which he needs further assistance. Looking at William’s Informal Phonics Inventory we can see that he does fairly well on the sounds but when decoding the full word he begins to struggle. When we get to the ‘Silent-e’ William does not understand the skill and reads all of the words incorrectly. With further explicit instruction in phonological decoding skills William will have much more success with his reading fluency. Phonological Awareness is the first step in the Modified Cognitive Model. The basis of all further reading skills and development are based off of this first essential skill and so we must work to ensure that William has this basic function of reading.

#### *Goal 2: Comprehension*

Comprehension is another goal that William has because comprehension leads to all understanding of the material read. William struggles to retell a story because, despite his automaticity in reading, he is not thinking and comprehending the passages. There are multiple portions of the Common Core Standards that emphasize comprehension but the standard that I feel is most applicable is RL.2.7 stating that the student should be able to “Use information

gained from the illustrations and words in print or digital text to demonstrate understanding of its characters, setting, or plot.” (“Common core state,” 2012) With further development and practice in comprehension, William will improve his abilities by reading with automaticity and being able to recall and use the information within the text. Looking once again at the Modified Cognitive Model we can see that Reading Comprehension is the ultimate goal of reading. Comprehension is the direct goal that all students and teachers strive for and so by developing higher-order thinking skills to improve comprehension we are improving the ultimate end result of reading.

### Instructional Strategies

#### *Instructional Strategy: Phonological Awareness 1 (Picture Sorting)*

Picture sorting is a task that involves a child looking at pictures and sorting them into categories based upon the sounds that they are using. (McKenna & Stahl, 2010) William struggles in particular with the middle sounds and the ‘Silent-e’ so we would want to focus on those types of words in the picture choices. If we placed pictures of words such as “cap” and “cape” William would learn to use the concept of the long and short vowel in accompaniment with the silent-e and more effectively use this skill in his daily reading. This type of activity could be used as a center activity during any literacy block. It is an activity that William could work on independently or with a partner; the thinking and discussion with a partner at first could prove beneficial to both students.

#### *Instructional Strategy: Phonological Awareness 2 (Manipulation Activity)*

While researching further methods for developing phonological awareness I came upon the program “Reading First In Virginia.” (“Reading first in,” 2003) They recommended manipulation activities to improve reading skills. The activity that I thought would help lead us to William’s goal involved the use of alphabetic tiles. To begin we would spell a word; “boat”

for example. From there, we would ask him to change the word to “bat” or “coat.” We would continue to manipulate the word by changing the phonemes. This activity allows gain of fine motor skills along with higher-order thinking skills. William has shown the need to work on blends also and so those could be incorporated into the activity. Change “limp” to “list” etc. Manipulation activities such as this are a great idea because they can be adapted to fit the needs of particular students. The activity can also be done in a variety of formats; small groups, whole group, use of a smart board etc.

#### *Instructional Strategy: Comprehension 1 (Graphic Organizer)*

Most teachers are familiar with the concept of graphic organizers. These tools allow students to sort out their thoughts/ideas in an organized manner. (Morrow & Gambrell, 2011) William seems to struggle with retelling the story with any amount of detail; his retell only showed four of thirty-one events being told. With the use of a graphic organizer William could approach it in two ways. I would begin William with the graphic organizer at the start of his reading and allow him to fill in the setting, characters, plot etc. as he was reading. This would help William to make connections and understanding throughout his reading. Once William is able to successfully complete this task and provide a more detailed retell I would give the organizer at the end of his reading. He could read all of the material and only use the organizer to aid in sorting his thoughts to give the retell. This would show his recall of the characters, plot etc. after his reading is complete.

#### *Instructional Strategy: Comprehension 2 (Story Line-Up)*

Researching further activities for comprehension retell development led me to The Florida Center for Reading Research. ("Florida center for," 2007) While they had an abundance of activities, I felt that “Story Line-Up” would be the most effective for William. This activity

calls for the choice of a familiar text, story sentence strips and a sentence chart. In the example the student was using the narrative “Jack and the Beanstalk.” The main ideas to the story is written on sentence strips and given to the student. That student is then responsible for placing the sentences in the correct order of the story. This test of comprehension recalls a students memory of familiar text and also assesses the ability of the child to put a story into a logical sequence of events. This activity can be done during center time also. I have used this as a center activity and found it to work very well. Students can work independently and ask for teacher assessment when they feel they have completed the assignment accurately.



Student Analysis Summary  
Case Study Two: Sarah

Analysis of Assessment Data

*Spelling Inventory*

Taken from *Words Their Way*, the elementary spelling inventory consists of twenty-five words using various foundational skills. Students are given credit, not only for accurately spelling the word, but for correctly using specific phonemes, blends, suffixes etc. (McKenna & Stahl, 2010)

Sarah did very well on the elementary spelling inventory. She correctly spelled 18 of the 25 words and correctly used 49 of the 62 feature points. With these scores, Sarah placed into the Late Syllables and Affixes Stage. She only missed one feature point in this stage and so it could be argued that she actually be placed higher; Derivational Relations Stage. Sarah is now at a point where she can use strategies to achieve the spellings of multisyllabic words. (McKenna & Stahl, 2010) Looking ahead to the Derivational Relations stage we also want to begin Sarah's work with words that have related roots but may be pronounced differently. While comparing Sarah's test scores with that of the average student Sarah placed right on track with her peers, if not slightly ahead. The ultimate goal for the end of 4th grade is to achieve Middle Syllables and Affixes Stage. Sarah, tested at the start of 4th grade, readily surpassed this stage.

I had one concern with this assessment. Looking at number 20, cellar, I feel as though there is some confusion. Being that there are two words of the same pronunciation, cellar and seller, the sentence provided needs to clarify which word is intended. However, the sentence also had some vagueness and Sarah correctly spelled 'seller.' The sentence reads, "I went down to the cellar for the can of paint." This sentence could be true for either form of the word. I

would urge test creators to look at this and create a change in the sentence that shows more clearly the correct word choice.

*Qualitative Reading Inventory (Expository)*

This reading inventory is an assessment of a child's reading fluency, prior knowledge and comprehension. It is an overall skills assessments that helps us identify the reading level of the student and what facets of reading need the most instructional guidance. Expository texts are generally informational and revolve around one main idea and supporting details. (Morrow & Gambrell, 2011)

Sarah's prior knowledge to this text was very low; 50%. Prior knowledge is a careful consideration because background knowledge to a topic can aid students in deciphering words and comprehending the text. Sarah's fluency rate was very high and only registering 8 miscues. These miscues were often confusions in numbers; the year and the number of miles. She also struggled with the word 'locomotive'; and important term for this text. Sarah's fluency rate was 76 words per minute and 74 correct words per minute which placed her at grade level for fourth grade. Fourth graders are expected to read 56 to 104 words per minute and thus Sarah falls in the middle of the guidelines at the start of her fourth grade year.

Comprehension was difficult for Sarah. She was able to recall only the main idea of the story. With only 3 details recalled she has a 5% comprehension rate on this level of text. Her questions to answer (a combination of explicit and implicit) also was very low; 4.5 correct answers. This text varies in her ability level; based upon fluency it would be near independent level but based upon her comprehension, it would be frustrational. I would reassess her at this same level using another expository text that she may be more familiar with. While this takes

more time, it is important to get the most accurate assessment measurements as possible for increasing her reading abilities.

*Qualitative Reading Inventory (Narrative)*

The second reading inventory that Sarah was given had a narrative premise. This narrative was slightly different because it was told as an autobiography. Narratives are often a chain of events that create the plot of the story. (Morrow & Gambrell, 2011) This narrative told the story of Johnny Appleseed and so was considered an informational narrative.

Sarah did much better on the assessment of prior knowledge for this text. She scored a 67%, placing her in the 'familiar' category. I believe that being familiar with the details and ideas in the text helps her understand and comprehend the text better. Sarah also had a very high fluency rate on this text; nearly identical to that of the expository text. She had 10 miscues but only 2 of them were meaning changing. Most of her miscues were the result of Sarah adding words to the text such as 'to the' and 'side' when discussing Johnny going West. Sarah had a 71 words per minute rate and 69 correct words per minute rate, again placing her in the middle of the fourth grade level. With 97% accuracy Sarah is considered instructional but very close to being very independent for this level of text.

I am concerned because Sarah's comprehension level was not much higher on the retell for this text, despite her familiarity. She continued to only mention the very basic of details, remembering 6 of 47 ideas. Looking at the explicit and implicit questions, Sarah did much better. She answered 6 out of the 8 questions correctly, placing her at an instructional level once again.

### Goals for Instruction

While analyzing Sarah's assessment data there were a few areas of particular instructional concern. The first goal for her would be to continue to improve her spelling and understanding of multisyllabic words. She is close to achieving success in this level but needs more review and strategy awareness. Sarah is ahead of her grade level in this strategy and so it is important to continue her learning and not only cater to the other students' needs. The second strategy that I would focus on is comprehension retelling. Sarah has strong fluency and can also answer many explicit and implicit questions pertaining to the text. However, she struggles with recalling more than the main ideas of the reading.

#### *Goal 1: Multisyllabic Word Knowledge*

Sarah is doing well with spelling and is progressing as necessary through the Spelling Inventory Feature Guide. When we get to the more difficult words (20-25) she struggles with both the harder suffix and root word portions. She has some difficulty with the Unaccented Final Syllables also. According to the Common Core Standard L.4.2d students should be able to "spell grade-appropriate words correctly, consulting references as needed." ("Common core state," 2012) Continuing improvement with Sarah's stage of spelling development will make her a very strong speller and thus show accomplishment of the aforementioned standard.

#### *Goal 2: Story Retell (Comprehension)*

Sarah has a very high fluency rate and a decent rate of correct answers when being asked explicit and implicit questions. However, she really struggles with recalling plot events or supporting details in a text. The same problem was noted in the narrative text as the expository text. Common Core Standard RI.4.2 calls for a student to "Determine the main idea of a text and explain how it is supported by key details, summarize the text." ("Common core state," 2012)

Sarah is struggling to meet this standard currently and we must give her chances to develop this ability. She is currently able to find the main idea of the story but giving the supporting details or other plot events becomes more difficult. With direct instruction in these strategies for comprehension Sarah should be able to give a direct recall with more information and ideas.

### Instructional Strategies

#### *Instructional Strategy: Multisyllabic Word Knowledge 1 (Making Words)*

An activity found in the text entitled “Making Words” seemed like an activity that could help Sarah with suffixes and roots of words. (McKenna & Stahl, 2010) By providing her with a list of letters Sarah is then asked to create a word. The key is to start simple and increase the difficulty. If I were to provide the letters “L F U W O D R N E” I would first ask Sarah to move the letters to make the word ‘on.’ I would increase the difficulty until asking for the intended word (using all of the letters) ‘wonderful.’ This activity is a beginning activity for root word practice because it provides the student with all of the necessary letters but forces them to think and manipulate the letters into the right combination. This activity can be done one-on-one with an instructor or with partners. To challenge a child’s thinking you can reverse the activity. Provide the child with all the letters necessary and ask “Can you show me a 2-letter word?” Continue in the same way until they are asked to make a word with all of the letters. This adaptation is more challenging because, despite being given the letters, the child must manipulate the letters into a word and understand the spelling of the word.

#### *Instructional Strategy: Multisyllabic Word Knowledge 2 (Link Spelling and Vocabulary)*

Nevada Department of Education; Reading provides a handout with very clear details of the varying stages of spelling development and activities to incorporate at each level. ("Stages of orthographic," 2004) While looking for activities that would improve Sarah’s skills, I came across

the concept of linking spelling and vocabulary. By doing so, Sarah can see the development of the spelling of the word and make meaningful connections to the word. A great way to link these are with the use of a graphic organizer as shown in the text “Academic Vocabulary” as introduced by Dr. Marzano. (Marzano, 2013) The graphic organizers shown allow the student to write the word, give an example, give a non-example and draw a picture. The linkage of vocabulary and spelling gives the student more opportunity to use the word and understand the spelling. If the word is ‘musician’ the student can make the connection that the word is related to music and thus the root is ‘music’ and the suffix ‘ician’ means a person doing the root. This skill will let them apply the concept to other words such as politician.

*Instructional Strategy: Story Retell Comprehension I (Reading Guides)*

Sarah struggles to retell information after the story has been read. (McKenna & Stahl, 2010) A reading guide would require her to answer questions or complete short assignments as she is reading, creating more connections with the text and giving her more meaning and understanding of what she is reading. This is a great activity to have for guided reading; students can read the text at their seat while answering questions and later discuss with the teacher. The guide should be different for each text and include questions, charts, diagrams, essays etc. The questions should combine implicit and explicit questions and give students more to think about while reading. This reading guide would help Sarah because she would analyze the information more and look at the supporting details throughout the story in greater length. Ultimately, she should then have a greater ability to recall these supporting details in an oral retell or summary of the story.

*Instructional Strategy: Story Retell Comprehension 2 (Think Aloud)*

A previous text that I have used for assistance in guide reading discusses the strategy of Think Aloud. (Schulman, 2006) To Think Aloud means that you talk through everything that you are thinking throughout the text. Generally you read a paragraph and then add in your own questions or comments. By having Sarah participate in this activity you can see her thought development throughout the story. She is also being forced to think deeper and create an understanding of the text rather than just reading it and not fully comprehended the material. As the story concludes, Sarah should continue to think aloud about ongoing questions that she has, what she thinks happens next, her opinions etc. Think Aloud will provide Sarah with a stronger understanding of the story and give her more information to provide a detailed retell. If you are reading aloud and critically analyzing each aspect and detail, you are more likely to remember those details to retell later.

## References

*Common core state standards initiative*. (2012). Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/RI/4>

*Florida center for reading research: Comprehension*. (2007). Retrieved from [http://www.fcrr.org/curriculum/PDF/G2-3/2-3Comp\\_1.pdf](http://www.fcrr.org/curriculum/PDF/G2-3/2-3Comp_1.pdf)

Marzano. (2013). *Marzano research laboratory*. Retrieved from <http://www.marzanoresearch.com/academic-vocabulary-workshop>

McKenna, M. C., & Stahl, K. A. D. (2010). *Assessment for reading instruction*. (2nd ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.

Morrow, L. M., & Gambrell, L. B. (2011). *Best practices in literacy instruction, fourth edition*. (4th Edition ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.

Nevada Department of Education, Reading. (2004). *Stages of orthographic development*. Retrieved from website: [http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:tuW0FaKo2OkJ:reading.nde.learningoptions.net/leadership/managementteam/academymaterials1.attachment/301145/Stages\\_of\\_Orthographic\\_Development\\_handout.doc+stages+of+orthographic+development&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us&client=safari](http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:tuW0FaKo2OkJ:reading.nde.learningoptions.net/leadership/managementteam/academymaterials1.attachment/301145/Stages_of_Orthographic_Development_handout.doc+stages+of+orthographic+development&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us&client=safari)

Reading first in virginia. (2003). Retrieved from [http://www.readingfirst.virginia.edu/prof\\_dev/phonemic\\_awareness/introduction.html](http://www.readingfirst.virginia.edu/prof_dev/phonemic_awareness/introduction.html)

Schulman, M. B. (2006). *Guided reading in grades 3-6, everything you need to make small-group reading instruction work in your classroom*. New York: Teaching Strategies.