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CHAPTER ONE: Introduction

My mission as a teacher and advocate is to create a stronger educational system and improve the lives of my students. In alignment with my goals and values, I designed a research project aimed at strengthening instruction for struggling readers. The research project is titled, “Is a single or multicomponent reading intervention program more effective at enhancing outcomes for struggling readers in intermediate grades?” In this paper, I will explain the process of learning to read, identify best reading intervention practicing, discuss the plan created to implement reading interventions, and analyze the results of the program.

Introduction

Chapter One explores the personal and professional experiences that brought this research question to fruition. Reading and teaching were not always my passion. Over the years, a deep-rooted devotion for teaching reading to underserved communities has developed. I will discuss obstacles I faced as a developing reader, the importance of education later in my life, and my professional experiences teaching in Mississippi and Colorado. When tied together, these events ignited the drive to dip into uncharted waters and execute an intervention model.

The Word is Gorilla

My passion for reading grew out of heartfelt disgust and distain. I grew up in Ely, Minnesota, a small rural mining town near the Canadian border. The town had one elementary school and one high school. The class sizes were small and personal. My first vivid memory of reading occurred in fourth grade and remains fresh in my subconscious. Fourth grade holds the award for the worst and best year of my educational career.
Picture a fourth grade classroom during the 1990’s. We still had traditional wooden desks that sat in rows that opened to reveal our treasures. There were no computers, smartboards, or fancy learning aides. We used a chalkboard.

The moment etched into my mind, starts with me staring at the chalkboard aimlessly. My teacher had just written one of our new spelling words and proceeded to introduce it to the class. I honestly had no idea how to pronounce the word. I stared and stared at the word. As I mentioned earlier, I disliked reading and naturally words too. As my luck would have it, the teacher called on me to pronounce the new and unexciting word. I stuttered and then remained silent, tongue-tied with embarrassment. I had no clue how to pronounce the word.

My mind raced. I thought about lunch, recess, and anything else that was not related to the word on the board. The teacher took my behavior as defiance and yelled, “Say the word!” I attempted to say the word, but jumbled the letters and mispronounced it. My teacher apparently thought I was trying to make the class laugh because she said, “Stop playing. Say the word.” I tried again and failed miserably. Finally, my teacher pronounced the word. She said, “The word is gorilla.” A few classmates chuckled and then the class moved on with the spelling lesson. Although years have passed, I still remember that jarring and embarrassing moment. I remember what it feels like to not know how to read.

I continued to perceive reading as the most daunting task asked of humans for several more months. Reading was the worst and I mean the absolute worst. I found it overwhelming, frustrating, and debilitating. However, a breakthrough occurred later that year. My relationship with reading changed drastically. Instead of going down in the books at the worst year ever, fourth grade transformed into the worst, best year of elementary school.
The *Harry Potter* series honestly saved me from illiteracy. Instead of avoiding reading, I happily hid under my blankets with a flashlight into the early hours. My mother still recalls several late nights where she found me huddled under a comforter trying to finish one of the *Harry Potter* books. Reading became my escape from reality. I devoured book after book and eventually learned to read through the Whole Language approach. My memory of fourth grade is sharp, vivid, and painful. It is a reminder that reading has the potential to make or break a child’s spirit and love of learning.

**Teaching in a Trailer**

I never envisioned myself becoming a teacher until my senior year of college when reality hit me. In 2011, my student loans were real and jobs were scarce. In an effort to gain work experience, I decided to follow my mother’s footsteps and enter into education. Teaching had always appealed to me. I sincerely enjoyed learning myself and assumed teaching would be a professional where I could serve others while finding joy in the work.

I taught for two years in rural Mississippi at Williams-Sullivan Elementary, a historically failing school. Teaching in Mississippi taught me about the disparities in education and literacy crisis in middle schools. I remember the day I stepped on campus excited about the prospect of seeing my very own classroom. It was a dilapidated doublewide trailer with the number five painted on the door. The second step to my trailer was a broken wooden board. Several windows were cracked, and the doorframe was bent, which prevented the door from fully closing. My classroom was part of a line of connected mobile units that made up the elementary school. My classroom had a few books, pencils, and sometimes toilet paper. The first day in my classroom brought meaning to the phrase, “educationally underserved.”
My fourth grade students struggled to read. A majority of the students read two to three years behind grade level. Reading and learning were a low priority for them. I sympathized with their struggle. As a child, I found reading difficult as well. However, the level of illiteracy in my classroom was startling. Some could not identify the letters of the alphabet. This reality forced me to figure out why students were not learning to read and how to address the issue.

Teaching in Mississippi taught me the importance of reading interventions. I identified factors such as home life, access to books, and reading instruction. Staying within my locus of control, I chose to focus on providing high quality individualized reading interventions based on proven best practices. My undergraduate degree was political science, not education. As a result, I poured over dozens of instructional manuals and books to better support my students. I slowly started implementing literacy best practices and running small groups. Students read a text at or below their grade level to build confidence and progressed on their individualized reading plans by systematically addressing skill gaps. During my first year of teaching, students grew on average two and a half years in reading. Given all the challenges my students and I faced, I considered this a tremendous accomplishment. My students learned to read because of individualized reading interventions.

I continued to teach in Mississippi for another year to fulfill my commitment with Teach for America. My years in the Delta illustrated the power and disparities in education. Students who were traditionally two or three grade levels behind performed on grade level in my class. My experiences taught me that quality instruction was a significant factor in a student’s reading development. Regardless of socioeconomic standings, all children can learn
with excellent instruction and interventions. I learned that reading had the potential to make kids enjoy and thrive in school.

The Mississippi Delta stole my heart and lit a fire within me. I enjoyed working with children and loved teaching reading. I found working with students fulfilling and meaningful. I decided to continue teaching in Colorado the following year.

**A Problem Exists**

Mountains, lakes, and endless adventures brought me to Colorado where I joined my first KIPP charter school. I landed a position as a fifth grade reading teacher at a well-known charter school. KIPP’s mission of serving educationally underserved communities aligned with my mission and goals. Given that Mississippi is ranked 49th out of 50 in education, I thought my experience was an anomaly. I expected students in Colorado to arrive at my door reading near grade level. The opposite was true.

On average in August, my fifth grade class was reading on a third grade level. Again, the students struggled to develop the skills required to read fluently. Relying on my knowledge from Mississippi, we started the year off running. Each student read on in leveled small groups. Reading interventions focused on developing foundational thinking and literacy skills. By June 2014, my students grew on average just under three years in reading. This type of reading growth fueled my passion for reading and made every day meaningful. My time in Colorado reinforced my belief that individualized reading interventions make a difference.
Solution: Law School

Success in the classroom highlighted the fact that students can learn to read with the right instruction and environment. I knew I could make a difference on an individual level helping each student that passes through my door learn to read. However, I wanted more change faster. I applied to law school in the fall of 2014. My personal statement stated, “I want a law degree to represent families in litigation cases and drive education reform through legislation.” If the education system was not going to respond to the needs of my students, I felt implored to take part in a larger mission. Off to law school, I went.

Every teacher I have ever met believes that teaching is the hardest job on earth. Holding the attention of thirty ten year olds for nine hours a day is an art and a science. Law school pushed me intellectually and physically, but it always felt a little more manageable than teaching. My thoughts often drifted to my former students as I sat in the library late at night reading law cases. Memories of stories, smiles, laughs, and growth, pulled me through most of the first semester of law school.

I missed the joys of the classroom. I missed teaching reading. I missed serving my students. With this realization in mind, I chose to leave law school and return to the classroom. I knew I would address the deficiencies of the education system and reading instruction through another avenue.

Research Rationale

I chose to research reading interventions for two main reasons. First, students in fifth through eighth grade are struggling to learn to read. Our middle school classrooms are more focused on executing Common Core lessons than teaching students how to read. As a result, developing readers are not receiving the literacy instruction needed to make significant gains.
The second reason for this research is my students are not alone. Results from the 2013 National Assessment of Educational Progress indicated that just 35% of fourth graders and 36% eighth graders are reading at or above a proficient level. This research aims to identify determine whether matching the emphasis of reading interventions with student needs leads to greater academic gains.

**Summary**

My experience as a developing reading and teaching reading in Mississippi and Colorado are not isolated. I learned that learning to read is a challenge for a majority of students, but hurdles to reading are temporary with individualized reading interventions. The purpose of this paper is to create a reading intervention program based on student needs at my school-site. The paper will review the existing research in Chapter Two and explore how students learn to read. It will discuss the process of reading development and the best reading intervention practices. Then, the research will narrow and focus on one school in Chapter Three. I will utilize the research to design a reading intervention program aimed at addressing the literacy crisis my middle school. The end goal is to create a turnaround model for struggling readers.
CHAPTER TWO: Literature Review

This chapter explores the literature related to learning to read, reading to learn, and reading interventions in middle schools. It aims to identify best intervention practices for students in Grades five through eight with the goal of preventing regression and promoting development in reading. This chapter is broken down into four main sections: Learning to Read; (Not) Learning to Read; and The Recipe. Each section of the literature review drives at the research question: “Is a single or multicomponent reading intervention program more effective at enhancing outcomes for struggling readers in intermediate grades?”

Introduction

The first section, Learning to Read, discusses models behind the complex process of reading. “A reading model is a theory of what’s going on in the reader’s eyes and mind during reading and comprehending” (Davis, 1995, as cited by Skudiene, 2002, p. 59). This section is broken down into Word Reading and Comprehension, the two fundamental prongs of reading. Each section discusses various reading models based on the component. The first section will delve into the intricacies of learning to read. Rather than focusing on the methods of instruction, this section looks at the cognitive and linguistics processes central to all components of reading.

The second section explores the reasons and consequences of (Not) Learning to Read in early elementary grades. This section will look at internal and external factors that lead to delays in reading. Internal factors include cognitive and linguistic processing, while external factors include elements like curriculum and environment.

The third section explores the multicomponent recipe to effective reading interventions. The goal of this section is to hold other variables besides the emphasis of the
reading intervention constant. Readers in middle school are not homogenous. Each student arrives to class with different reading strengths and weaknesses. This section seeks to identify the research-based formula for reading in upper grades. Beyond isolating key components to reading, this section also explores the structural elements of reading intervention programs such as group size, time, and the number of sessions. Using this research based formula will help isolate the effect of condition based interventions.

**Learning to Read**

The research project seeks to identify the best practices for reading interventions in middle school. Before discussing research-based interventions, it is critical to understand the process of reading development. According to Houston (2014), “learning to read is protracted developmental process supported by the parallel development of cognitive and linguistics skills including fluency, accuracy, and phonological awareness” (p.347). Knowledge about how students learn to read will lay the foundation for spotting literacy skill gaps and remedying the deficits.

The academic community often categorizes the act of reading into two distinct phases, “learning to read” and “reading to learn.” Essentially, a student must learn to read words and then comprehend the text as a whole. Inherent in this dichotomy is an insight into the reading process. The process of translating symbols into meaning is not innate (Houston, 2014, p. 347). Reading encompasses a two-pronged framework: word reading and comprehension. This section explores the cognitive and linguistic processes associated with word reading.
Part One: Reading Words

The alphabet, a 26-letter system of symbols, gives humans the ability to express astonishment, depression, love, and heartache. The alphabet provides an expedited avenue to transfer information and share opinions. The alphabet forms the fabric of society. Even though most adults rely on this system effortlessly, children explicitly learn the alphabet early. Nation (2008) comments that it is easy to forget that reading words is a highly skilled activity, which takes a significant amount of time to master (p. 1122). Thus, this section attempts to explain the first step in reading through review of the research.

Two popular models of reading development exist. These models include Ehri’s phase model and Share’s phonological and self-teaching model. Ehri’s and Share’s models have numerous overlapping commonalities. Both models focus on the importance of word reading. In addition, Ehri and Share recognize the importance of phonological decoding and orthographic knowledge. With these two fundamental elements in mind, the models are explored below.

Ehri’s Model. Ehri’s phase model describes the development of word reading in five phases: (1) the pre-alphabetic phase, (2) the partial-alphabetic phase, (3) the full alphabetic phase, (4) the consolidated-alphabetic phase, and (5) the automatic-alphabetic phase (Ehri, 1995, p. 140). The pre-alphabetic phase is typically when preschoolers to kindergarteners learn basic alphabetic knowledge. However, their awareness of the alphabet is not utilized to read words phase (Ehri, 1995, p. 140). Rather pre-alphabetic readers use visual clues such as logos, pictures, the length of the word, and sequence of letters to create meaning phase (Ehri, 1995, p. 140). Without visual clues, pre-alphabetic readers will not recognize the word
because they do not understand that letters correlate to vocal sounds. At this point, the readers only recognize that letters convey some unknown meaning.

According to Ehri (1995), the second stage is the partial-alphabetic phase where readers from kindergarten to first grade begin to connect letters to sounds (p. 145). During this phase, readers rely on some letters as well as context clues to identify a word. Readers in this stage benefit from phonological instruction, the individual sounds made by letters. Along with Ehri, Hulme et al. (2002) found that phonemic awareness during the beginning stages of reading is the most reliable predictor of learning to read (Nation, 2008, p. 1122).

After learning parts of the alphabet, the full-alphabetic phase is next (Ehri, 1995, p. 149). This is where beginning readers start to rely on their alphabetic knowledge to decode unfamiliar words using various strategies (Ehri, 1995, p. 149). Readers normally greatly increased their internal library of sight words at this time. The key to moving to the next stage is to read, read, and read some more. Developing readers need to practice slowly decoding unknown words to strengthen their word reading skills.

Ehri holds the fourth stage is the consolidated alphabetic phase, also known as the orthographic phase (p. 154). Readers start to recognize distinct spelling patterns in words and their pronunciation (Ehri, 1995, p. 154). With extensive practice, readers move from slow, laborious reading of multisyllabic words to more fluent reading. The final stage of reading development is the automatic phase where translating letters to sounds is unconscious and natural (Ehri, 1995, p. 154). Readers in this phase spend very little energy decoding words. This is the point where the alphabet is part of cognitive systems of the brain.

Ehri argues that these five phases describe the stages developing readers pass through as they learn to read words. Ehri’s model predicts that phonological awareness is the
key to the first three phases, while orthographic knowledge remains the crucible for the last two stages. Nation (2008) supports Ehri’s characterization of phonological awareness and holds it is the most important factor during early stages of reading (p. 1123). If this theory holds, students taught phonological and orthographic knowledge through direct instruction will learn to read.

**Share’s Model.** Another competing model of reading is Share’s phonological recording and self-teaching model. According to Share (1995), word learning is not a stage-based process as supported by Ehri’s model. Rather, Share argues that learning to read words is item-based (p. 155). As readers encounter more words their phonological recording, their ability to translate printed words into their oral language counterparts develops and strengthens over time (Share, 1995, p. 155). Each new word teaches the reader a different pattern of orthographic representations. Share’s word-specific type of learning facilities learning to read.

Share holds there are three key elements to his self-teaching model. First, developing phonological recording or decoding is based on the number of words the reader translated from print to sound. The more words readers successfully decode, the more word-specific orthographic knowledge they retain (Share, 1995, p. 155). Second, Share argues that as readers successfully decode words, their ability to decode becomes “lexicalized.” Readers begin to learn the relationships between print and sound. Also, beginning readers start to learn irregularities, which deviate from the traditional alphabet. Third, the model recognizes the importance of phonological and orthographic knowledge. Share (1995) holds these two processes contribute to reading development independently, but they are indispensable (p. 98).
The difference between Ehri’s and Share’s model is their description of the process and emphasis on phonological awareness. Ehri holds that reading is a phase-based process where a reader moves from one stage to another as their reading skills mature. Share, on the other hand, argues that reading development is item-based. The more words readers successfully decode the better reader they become over time. Next, Ehri and Share hold overlapping, but distinct views regarding the importance of phonological awareness. According to Roman (2009), Ehri’s (1995) hypothesis is that reading development in the early phases is reliant on phonological awareness, but this emphasis shifts in later reading development where orthographic knowledge becomes a higher priority (p. 98). In contrast, Share’s model holds that phonological awareness is continuously the foundation of reading development regardless of the stage. Share (1995) recognizes orthographic knowledge as secondary (p. 156).

Ehri and Share also hold unique views regarding the role of educators. Ehri purposes that teachers can help students learn to read through direct instructional methods. Share disputes this hypothesis and argues that only students can teach themselves to read. However, Share does recognize that teachers play a role in the development of reading by providing scaffolds for young readers.

Although the two models of reading seem to operate as islands, Ehri’s and Share’s models align on two critical points. Both models of reading recognize the importance of phonological awareness and orthographic knowledge. As Roman points out, Share’s model (1995) and Ehri’s model (1995) both equate reading development with phonological decoding and orthographic knowledge (2009). This intersection of the models is the key to
understanding the reading process. To ensure young and struggling readers learn how to read, it is necessary to identify the elements at the center of reading development.

Ehri and Share concluded that developing readers shift from reading single words with phonological decoding to reading automatically relying on orthographic knowledge. Researchers tried to pinpoint this moment. However, most of the research, including Ehri’s and Share’s model, suggests a slow shift from reliance on one word phonological decoding to automatic reading (e.g. Backman, Bruck, Hebert & Seidenberg, 1984; Doctor & Colthear, 1980; Ehri, 2005; Firth, 1986, Morton, 1989; Sprenger-Charolles, Siegel, Bechennec, & Sernicles, 2203 from Vanessen (2010) p.213) These findings were recently supported by Vanessen in 2010 who isolated two fundamental cognitive skills, phonological awareness and rapid automatized naming (RAN) of visual items (p. 214). The findings supported the theory that learning to read is a continuous process. However, the research was conducted in Dutch rather than English. Thus, Vanessen’s findings only serve as generalizations.

Neither Ehri nor Share included RAN in their theory of reading. RAN is a measurement of the accuracy with a certain time that a reader can identify stimuli such as letters (Denckla & Rudel, 1976). RAN essentially measures whether a reader can read with automaticity. Although conflicting research exists regarding RAN, researchers tend to agree that RAN plays some role in reading developing (Roman, 2009, p. 99). In 2013, Norton and Wolf reviewed the research and supported the conclusion that RAN and fluency are indicators of an individual’s reading ability (p. 428). If readers can accurately determine words, then they are entering the second prong of reading, comprehension. Thus, modern
theories of reading development include RAN and rely on it as an indicator of laborious or automatic reading.

Reading words is one part of the two-pronged framework for reading. The ability to read words is critical for comprehension, the second prong of reading. However, the “acquisition of good word-reading skills does not guarantee successful comprehension” (Miller, 2013 p. 59). Once readers master basic literacy skills, then making meaning is the next step. Readers must not only decode printed words, but also comprehend the message behind the symbols.

**Part Two: Comprehension**

The purpose of reading is to gain understanding. Reading without understanding is only decoding. Readers must make the connection between letters and meaning (Norton, 2008, p. 1130). The purpose of this section is to explore the process of comprehension and the components required to understand. Knowledge from this section is essential to developing effective reading interventions for middle school. In the intermediate grades, comprehension is king. To better serve delayed readers, one must understand how readers learn to comprehend.

Making meaning from the text is an active, complex and interactive process. Comprehension includes knowing the meaning behind words, but also sentences, paragraphs, and the text as a whole. Similar to word reading, four models describe the cognitive and linguistic processes behind reading comprehension. These models include the psycholinguistic model, the bottom-up model, the top-down model, and the interactive
model. Over the years, the interactive model emerged as the dominant model. Review of these models attempts to explain how readers think during reading.

**The Psycholinguistic Model.** The psycholinguistic model suggests students must test their perceived understanding against what the text says. According to Smith and Goodman (1971), the psycholinguistic model is the intersection of psychology and linguistics (p. 178). This model of reading outlines the psychological process readers experience when using language. The psycholinguistic model holds that “reading is not processes of combining individual letters into words, and strings of words into sentences, from which meanings spring automatically” (p. 179). Rather, Smith and Goodman hold that children learn to read by a continuous process of testing the text (p. 180). The psycholinguistic model claims that the reading process does not need to be broken down into key components such as phonological decoding or orthographic knowledge. Readers learn to comprehend the language simply by accepting or rejecting predictions about the text. Reading is a psycholinguistic guessing game (Goodman, 1967).

**The Bottom-Up Model.** The bottom-up model suggests that various levels of analytical thinking support comprehension. The visual representation of the bottom-up model is a triangle. To reach the pinnacle, comprehension, readers must have a foundation of lower level language skills. According to Dole, Roehler, and Pearson (1991) comprehension occurs after the reader acquires the independent sequential set of hierarchically skills (p. 225). The bottom-up model hypothesizes that readers use linguistic clues to build comprehension (Carrell, 1988; Swaffar, 1991 as cited by Skudiene, 2002, p.94). The bottom-up model proposes that readers first make meaning from words and sentences. Then, readers utilize
information from these sentences to comprehend the text as a whole. According to Paran (1996), readers must process lower levels of visual information before understanding the text globally (p. 28). For example, Paran argues that readers are incapable of reading entire sentences or chunks without processing the individual words and the constructing meaning from the sentences first. Thus, the bottom-up model necessitates a hierarchy of processing before comprehension.

The bottom-up model is not perfect. Babashami (2013) holds that one disadvantage of the bottom-up model is its emphasis on words and structure to explain comprehension (p. 151). The theory is limited in explanation of higher-level skills such as activating background knowledge, inferencing, and metacognition. This model fails to articulate how readers cognitively bridge word reading and comprehension.

**The Top-Down Model.** The top-down model is the complete inverse of the previous explained model. In the top-down model, readers rely on their overall understanding of the text to decode words. According to Paran (1996), the top-down model proposes that readers utilized background knowledge, context, and task to overcome the lack of lower level linguistic skills (p. 29). Readers rely heavily on contextual clues and activating the knowledge of the world to create meaning. Fatemi (2014) explains the top-down model appeals to global learning styles where the readers analyze the text from a whole to part perspective (p. 686).

The top-down model is shortsighted in its description of comprehension. Although the top-down model tries to explain the last few processes involved in comprehension, it fails to identify factors relied upon at lower levels. Skudiene argues that this model is only
applicable to higher levels of reading instruction, not elementary because it requires the knowledge of at least 5000 words (Carrell, 1988; Swaffar, 1991 cited in Skudiene, 2002, p. 94). Students must have a developed vocabulary to determine the meaning of unknown words using their background knowledge and context. Thus, comprehension requires the intersection of lower and higher order language skills.

**The Component Model.** The comprehension model holds that readers constantly leverage different components while reading. The component model of comprehension designed by Perfetti and later refined by Compton et al. (2013) identifies four components of comprehension (p. 59). This model is hierarchical in nature similar to the bottom-up model but also allows for elements to interact with each other. Compton (2013) holds that comprehension includes parsing, text representation, and situation model, and inferencing (p. 64). During parsing, the reader takes words, sentences, and paragraphs and parses the information to make meaning (Compton, 2013, p. 64). After parsing, the reader creates a mental representation of the text.

Most theorist hold that two types of representation exist: text representation and situational model (Kintisch & Rawson, 2005; Perfetti et al., 2005 cited in Compton et al. (2013, p. 64). Text representation is the literal meaning of the text. Perfetti (1997) argues that sentence and text processing work together to help the reader build meaning (p. 351). The situation model goes beyond the text includes external information like background knowledge and linguistic clues (Perfetti, 1997, p. 351). The last component is inferencing where readers make connections and apply knowledge from the text and beyond. The model suggests that the prongs of word reading and comprehension are not mutually exclusive.
Babashami (2013) believes that proficient readers decode and comprehend at the same time (p. 151). Thus, a reader makes meaning by continual shifting and leveraging between these four components.

The psycholinguistic, bottom-up, and top-down model help illustrate the work behind the component model. Rather than isolating various elements of reading, modern theorists combine elements of models to create a more holistic representation of the comprehension process.

**Components of Comprehension.** Researchers have identified several predictors of reading comprehension. The main components of comprehension include background knowledge, vocabulary, working memory, and sub-skills. According to Harvey and Zemelman (2014), background knowledge is the most important determinant for comprehension (p. 32). Readers must activate and connect prior experiences to the text. To understand the text, readers must know what the words mean. According to Lui and Nation (1985), readers must know the meaning of 95-98 percent of the words in the text for comprehension to occur. Another predictor of comprehension is working memory. Cain et al. (2004) defines working memory as the ability of the reader to hold information from recently read texts, while simultaneously integrating information from long-term memory with current learning (p. 31). Working memory enables the reader to store and process information (p. 32). Additional sub-skills of comprehension include inference making, comprehension monitoring, and story structure knowledge (Cain et al., 2004, p. 31). These predictors influence a reader’s ability to make meaning from the text.
Understanding the process of word reading and comprehension is critical for further examination of reading difficulties. Word recognition skills, background knowledge, vocabulary, working memory, inferencing, monitoring comprehension, and text structures all contribute to the process of reading. Knowing the elements involved in reading provides a starting point for identifying and treating reading difficulties.

With a solid foundation of the theories of reading, the next section will explore the research behind reading delays and difficulties in middle school grades. The purpose is to identify the reasons for struggling readings in grades fifth through eighth, and the impact reading interventions can have on their academic trajectory.

(Not) Learning to Read

Reading is a complex multi-faceted process that involves a number of factors. Educators around the country are paying attention to the growing number of struggling or delayed readings in the intermediate grades, despite effective instruction in elementary school.

Hundreds of reasons exist for the increasing number of delayed readers middle schools. However, this paper will only explore a few. According to Gelzheizer (2011), the main reasons include increased classroom focus on comprehension, limited background knowledge or vocabulary skills, low engagement, and lack of skilled instruction (p. 286).

In middle school, reading expectations change. Classroom instruction shifts away from beginning reading skills towards advanced skilled reading (Chall, 1983, p. 6). However, this prioritization creates a real challenge for readers still developing basic, low level reading skills such as decoding and word recognition. Chall and Jacobs (1983) note that this instructional turning point often leads to a phenomenon known as the “fourth grade slump”
where struggling readers actually regress in reading (in Wanzek, 2013, p. 891). As a result, struggling readers continue to fall further and further behind their peers.

Limited background knowledge or vocabulary skills may also contribute to the persistence of reading difficulties in middle school. Activating background knowledge plays a significant role in reading. Students with developing background knowledge may not actively combine information from the text with their own knowledge (Gelzheizer, 2011, p. 292). In addition, part of comprehending is making meaning from discrete words. Students with developing vocabularies may stumble through numerous unknown words, which fractures comprehension.

Few adults who have survived through middle school remember it fondly. Middle school is a time when the rigor of school increases and hormones fly. It is a turbulent time. As a result, many struggling readers disengage from school and complex learning activities. This low engagement hurts developing readers even more than the average reader (Gelzheizer, 2011, p. 292). Thus, personal motivation is another factor attributing to delayed reading.

Developing readers also suffer from the lack of skilled instruction by trained educators. If students have not learned to read by fourth grade, then additional instruction and support may be required to prevent a persistent decline in reading ability. The trend in education is to assign teachers the task of performing interventions for developing readers. However, research by James-Burdumy et al. (2009) shows that teacher-led interventions had no effect on comprehension measures (p. 13). Thus, additional programs and methods with specialized personnel must be established to address the needs of developing readers in upper grades.
Roadblocks to learning to read are not permanent. Teachers can positively influence the trajectory of developing reading by seeking advanced training and advocating for specialized personnel to provide reading instruction. Students can choose to engage in their education. Low engagement is a personal decision made by the student. With proper counseling and guidance, participation may increase. Furthermore, additional investment in reading may enhance a student’s background knowledge and sharpen their vocabulary skills.

Reading interventions are one research-supported method of addressing reading deficiencies. According to the Gelzheiser (2001), if developing readers in intermediate grades enroll in reading interventions with research-based methods and intensive sessions, then it is predicted they will make reading growth and overcome delays (p. 280). Rather than allowing reading gaps to continue, interventions would address the lower and higher language skill needs of the reader.

The next section will explore the research behind effective reading interventions in intermediate grades. Interventions were traditionally implemented only in elementary grades because a convincing amount of research shows that interventions are highly effective during this time (Wanzek, 2013, p. 183). However, increasing interest in interventions in intermediate grades spurred a new era of research. The former research on elementary students is often not applicable to middle school readers who arrive with a patchwork of literacy skills. The next section explores the research behind effective reading interventions for developing readers in middle school.

**Effective Reading Interventions**

Middle school readers are expected to perform by relying on foundational and higher order processing skills to comprehend the text. With this expectation as an overarching goal,
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effective reading interventions tailor instruction to the student’s need. According to Norton (2012), multicomponent interventions offer the most promise for reading growth by addressing each reader’s weaknesses (p. 447). Norton found that students with multicomponent interventions grew more in comprehension, the ultimate goal of reading, than other intervention groups (p. 447). Furthermore, students who received targeted individualized literacy instruction grew even more than their counterparts in the classroom (McDonald Connor et al. 2009. p.78). This research questions the effectiveness of single component and multicomponent interventions.

Multicomponent interventions strive to acknowledge the readers limited basic literacy skills, while simultaneously developing higher order processes with simple text. Edmonds et al. (2009) examined the reading growth of students in grades sixth through twelfth who received reading interventions with one or a combination of reading components (as cited by Wanzek 2013, p. 165). According to Edmonds et al. (2009), evidence suggested that multicomponent interventions which include decoding, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension led to improved comprehension among struggling readers (as cited by Wanzek 2013, p. 165). Similarly, Scammacca et al. (2007), investigated whether reading interventions, single or multicomponent, increase reading comprehension for developing readers in grades sixth through twelfth. Scammacca et al.’s (2007) research supported Edmond’s et al. (2009) findings. They found that the biggest gains in reading comprehension were from the multicomponent or comprehension interventions (as cited by Wanzek 2013, p. 165). All the multicomponent interventions provided a combination of fluency and reading comprehension instruction. Some multicomponent groups also received vocabulary
instruction. Thus, multicomponent interventions influence whether struggling readers will gain the requisite skills needed to increase their comprehension.

The type of instruction greatly influences the outcome for developing reading. A one-size fits all approach is not effective for reading interventions in intermediate grades. Rather, trained educators must design multicomponent interventions to fill the skill gaps through individualized instruction.

The structure of reading intervention programs also significantly affects learning outcomes for students in middle school. Group size, the length of time, the number of sessions, curriculum, and personnel contribute to the effectiveness of the program. The next few paragraphs discuss the various structural features involved in running a reading intervention program.

Decreasing group size positively impact readers in elementary interventions. However, the same does not hold true for middle school interventions. Vaughn and Wanzek, et al. (2010) investigated the effect of group size on reading outcomes for grades fourth through twelfth. They found no statistical difference between one-on-one, small group, or large group interventions. Similarly, Vaughn’s research (2010) supports this conclusion. Vaughn researched struggling readers in seventh and eighth grade and found no statistical difference for reading growth based solely on the size of the group (p. 952). Thus, reading interventions for intermediate grades can include small or large groups.

Studies on elementary interventions found that struggling readers improve more the longer they receive interventions. The opposite is true for students in middle school. Wanzek et al. (2013) found the shorter intervention programs, 40 sessions, were more impactful than longer interventions, 100 sessions or more. (p. 188). Wanzek confirmed that, intensive
interventions over a short period of time produce better results. Wanzek et al. (2013) hypothesized that the additional time or newness of the intervention increased its effectiveness (p. 188).

The buzzword of the twentieth-century classroom is individualized. Although many educators use the word frequently in speech, its importance should not be weighed based on its usage. Vaughn (2011) research the overall effect of individualizing intervention programs compared to standardized intervention program. Seventh and eighth grade students with reading disabilities were selected to receive interventions for a year in a small group for 50 minutes a day (p. 391). Some received individualized interventions while others engaged in more generic interventions. Vaughn’s (2011) results showed that readers in the standardized intervention outperformed those with specific literacy plans (p. 404). Thus, reading interventions should rely on standardized programs rather than creating individualized curriculums.

Middle school reading interventions are the most effective when they are multicomponent, short, intensive, and standardized. Struggling readers in middle school have a patchwork of skills that fall short of achieving automaticity. Running a multicomponent program will help address and fulfill the needs of most struggling readers. In addition to reading components, interventions structured after research based findings hold the most promise. The critical structural element of interventions is their length of time. To hold the attention of students and maintain investments, interventions should last around six weeks. Designing a reading intervention program with research based components and structure will enhance the initiative’s effectiveness.

Summary
The field of research behind learning to read is ever growing and developing. Reading is complex series of interactions between the reader and text. Reading is typically broken down into learning to read and reading to learn. Within these two phases, students must constantly draw on various skills and continually update their understanding of the text. This continuous movement of information creates opportunities for reading gaps and deficiencies. Student with continued deficiencies may need specialized instruction in the form of a reading intervention. This project aims to test the effectiveness of single component and multicomponent reading interventions.

The next chapter will outline the methods, participants, interventions, and protocols followed for this research project. Relying on research, various interventions will be proposed and tested for effectiveness. The overall goal is to determine if interventions with instructional emphasis based on student needs are more effective than multicomponent interventions for struggling middle school readers.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

The research project aimed to address the reading deficiencies of struggling readers by identifying the best intervention model for intermediate grades. The project used an experimental approach to answer the question, “Is a single or multicomponent reading intervention program more effective at enhancing outcomes for struggling readers in intermediate grades?”

The project was comprised of three distinct phases. In the first phase, reading diagnostics were administered to determine which students needed reading interventions. These students were then grouped by deficiency and placed in the control group, the single component group, or the multicomponent group. In the second phase, students received direct instruction for approximately sixty minutes a day, four to five times a week, for eight weeks in their designated intervention model. The control group did not receive instruction. In the last phase, quantitative data was collected through the post-assessments. The change between pre and post assessments was used to calculate reading growth and determine the effectiveness of the model. This experimental project served to find the best methods for ensuring middle school students can read.

Introduction

An experimental approach was chosen for this research project. According to Creswell (2014), “the purpose of an experimental design is to test the impact of a treatment on an outcome” (p. 201). This project selected a sample group to draw inferences about the general population to ultimately decide the most effective reading intervention for middle school students. Lexile levels and grade level equivalents were the two types of quantitative data collected. Two instruments provided the quantitative data to determine the effectiveness
of interventions. *The Scholastic Reading Inventory* (SRI) and i-Ready assessments. Treatments of each group varied by the instruction offered. The single component group only received phonics instruction. The multicomponent group received instruction in decoding, word recognition, vocabulary, and comprehension. The control group did not receive any interventions. The project aimed to evaluate the impact of the treatments utilizing three groups.

The next section will explore the four main elements of an experimental research project. Creswell (2014) identified these parts procedure, participants, materials, and measures (p. 214). A detailed discussion of these elements will supply a firm understanding of the research project.

**Participants**

This study focused on a single school-site. This school is a fifth through eighth grade middle school in a western state. According to the Enrollment Snapshot by the district, the school serves approximately 510 students from around the area. Most students travel from outside of the Choice Boundary, approximately 64.2 percent (Enrollment Snapshot (2016) p. 2). In addition to a geographically diverse school, the school serves students from various economic and linguistic backgrounds. A majority of students come from economically disadvantaged homes with almost 90 percent of the student body qualifying for Free or Reduced lunch (Enrollment Snapshot (2016) p. 1). The school is linguistically diverse with 54.4 percent English Language Learners. Although a large portion of the student body is ELL, this study does not intent to determine the effect of English proficiency on reading growth (Enrollment Snapshot (2016) p. 1). Furthermore, the unique sample size, the results of the study should only be generalized if applied to other local schools or regions.
Student participants were determined by their Lexile score and i-Ready results. Two reading screeners identified struggling readers based on reading deficits, SRI and i-Ready. Classroom reading teachers administered SRI to all enrolled students. SRI is a computer-based assessment designed to assess a student’s reading comprehension on the Lexile Framework for Reading (Scholastic Reading Inventory, n.d.). Students reading at or below a 500 Lexile took a secondary reading assessment, called the i-Ready. Curriculum Associates created the i-Ready diagnostic in 2010 for students in kindergarten through middle school to assess mastery of the multiple components of reading. This assessment is an online, adaptive, sub-domain diagnostic. The adaptive assessment responds to student answers and evaluates student mastery of grade level.

Unlike SRI, i-Ready assesses sub-domains of reading such as phonological awareness, high frequency words, phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension (Houghton Mifflin Court, 2014, p. 5). Data from the i-Ready test served to place students into intervention groups based on reading deficiency. Of the 103 students, 68 students scored on a Level K or Level 1 phonics level. Two interventions groups and a control group were created.

In total, the three groups included forty-three students. In terms of learning ability, all students were in general education. Furthermore, all students were English Language Learners (ELL). The majority of students identified demographically as Hispanic, 97.4 percent. The remaining percent identified as African American. The researcher or another classroom teacher administered the pre-assessments and post-assessments.

The research project also included one highly-qualified teacher, the researcher. The researcher had six years of experience in education and holds bachelor’s degrees. The
researcher received significant training in phonics through a series of trainings with Really Great Reading. In addition, the researcher also received professional development in phonological awareness, phonics, orthographic knowledge, and comprehension.

**Materials**

The project relied on two reading intervention curriculums: *Phonics Boost* and *The Wilson Reading System*. The Really Great Reading designed the *Phonics Boost* curriculum, which served to address phonics deficits. Another curriculum called *The Wilson Reading System* addressed decoding and spelling gaps. The intervention treatments relied on specific curriculums to emphasize their targeted component. The single component intervention group utilized the *Phonics Boost* curriculum, while the multicomponent group received instruction from two distinct curriculums and authentic novels.

Each curriculum selected proved effective in past research as having high effects on reading growth. The multicomponent intervention split time between various skills and strategies. According to Edmonds et al., evidence suggested that multicomponent interventions which include decoding, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension led to improved comprehension among struggling readers (in Wanzek 2013 p. 165).

**Procedure**

The single component intervention focused solely on phonics. Those students assigned to the phonics emphasized intervention treatment group scored at or below a first grade level in phonics according to i-Ready results. These students struggled to translate letters into sounds. According to Ehri (1995), readers must first “identify the sounds of individual letters, hold them in the mind, and then blend them into pronunciations that are recognized as real word” (p.137). To remedy this issue, the selected students received
extensive instruction in phonological awareness and sight words through the Really Great Reading, *Phonics Boost* curriculum. Students learned to identify individual sounds in printed words as well as recognize and identify vowel sounds. The main focus of this intervention was to strengthen student understanding of the relationship between letters and sounds in the English language.

Students in the multicomponent groups received instruction in decoding, word recognition, vocabulary, and comprehension. The *Phonics Boost* curriculum provided the foundation for the decoding element of the intervention. Following the research, selected students received focused additional phonics and word recognition instruction through *The Wilson Reading System*. Barbara Wilson (1996) originally developed *The Wilson Reading System* for adults with dyslexia (p. 1). The curriculum systematically taught decoding and spelling skills. The Wilson (1996) curriculum differed from phonics because it is a total word construction program (p. 1). The program taught the seven rules of syllabication and explicit spelling rules. Students learned to encode while also learning how to decode (Wilson, 1996, p. 1). Word knowledge assisted students in moving from slow laborious reading to more automatic reading. Ehri (1995) holds that reading becomes automatic when translating letters to sounds flows naturally and without significant interruption (p. 154).

The multicomponent intervention groups also received informal vocabulary and comprehension support. Teachers embedded vocabulary instruction into everyday instruction. Rather than explicitly teaching vocabulary, instructors assisted students as they used background knowledge and context clues to determine the meaning of the unknown word while reading a novel. Vocabulary instruction generally occurred orally and as needed.
The comprehension component was achieved through authentic texts. Each intervention group read a novel on their Lexile level. These novels include *The Fantastic Mr. Fox* and *The Magic Finger* by Roland Dahl, *The Invention of Hugo Cabret* by Brian Selznick, and *The Misadventures of Max Crumbly* by Rachel Russell. Students selected their novels, which improved investment and motivation. Compton et al. (2013) held that comprehension includes parsing, text representation, and situation model, and inferencing (p. 64). Student read the novel for ten to fifteen minutes daily. The researcher asked literal and analytic comprehension questions. The literal questions required students to describe the setting, characters, and events. These literal questions changed as students refreshed their situational models of the text. The analytical question asked students to make inferences about character motivation based on their words, actions, or thoughts. Students answered the questions orally in a small group setting. If comprehension needed repair, students reread the text.

The control group did not receive direct instruction. This group served to determine the true influence of reading interventions. Creswell (2014) indicated that researchers need to compare the results of the experimental group to the outcomes of the control group (p. 188). Thus, the control groups serves as a measuring stick for the other two groups.

**Research Instruments**

The project relied on two instruments to identify readers for the project based on reading gaps. These instruments were *The Scholastic Reading Inventory* (SRI) and i-Ready. SRI is a computer-based assessment designed to assess a student’s reading comprehension on the Lexile Framework for Reading (Scholastic Reading Inventory, n.d.). The MetaMetrics developed The Lexile Framework for Reading to represent a student’s reading ability on a universal scale (MetaMetrics, 2009). The scale ranges from below 0 Lexile to 2000 Lexile.
Students scoring a 500 Lexile read at approximately a third grade level (MetaMetrics, 2009). This Lexile served as the cutoff because it identified students reading two or more years below grade level. Out of 510 students, 103 students scored at or below a 500L.

The i-Ready diagnostic is an online, adaptive, sub-domain diagnostic created by Curriculum Associates. The adaptive assessment responds to student answers and evaluates student mastery of grade level. Unlike SRI, i-Ready assesses sub-domains of reading such as phonological awareness, high frequency words, phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension (Houghton Mifflin Court, 2014, p. 5). Data from the SRI and i-Ready assessments served to place students into intervention groups based on reading deficiency. The i-Ready data was reported on a zero to five grade level equivalency. Zero indicates students who scored at or below a kindergarten level. One refers to students reading on a first grade level, while five correlates to a fifth grade level. i-Ready’s floor is zero and the ceiling is five. The average growth was calculated by adding the change between the pre-test and post-test and then dividing by the number of students in the intervention group.

**Measures**

Quantitative data collection was the primarily method of measuring reading growth and its subcomponents for various reasons. First, the English language was inherently quantifiable. Each paragraph is made up of sentences, each sentence is made up of words, and each word is made up of letters. Whether a student can identify 26 letters of the alphabet is a quantifiable measure. Second, qualitative measures such as motivation, knowledge, and experiences are extremely difficult to measure consistently and vary widely among students. Lastly, the purpose of this project is to determine if interventions with specific emphasis lead
to greater reading gains. This objective does not seek to measure qualitative factors involved in reading.

Lexile levels and grade level equivalents were the two quantitative measures used to place participants into intervention groups and determine reading growth. The SRI assessment assesses a student’s comprehension level and determines a Lexile score. The Lexile scale score measures a student’s reading ability on a development scale. The i-Ready test provided another data point using grade level equivalents. The grade level equivalents measure the student’s reading ability compared to grade level norms. Data from i-Ready is used to generally identify the working level of a student’s phonological awareness, phonics, high frequency words, vocabulary, and comprehension. The data from the SRI and i-Ready assessments were not analyzed together, but rather as two separate data points. These measures support each other but provide slightly different insights into a student’s performance.

**Human Subjects Protocol**

All participants were protected under the guidelines set by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Hamline University. Research conducted for this capstone project followed the procedures outlined by the (IRB). The project was submitted to the Hamline IRB and received approval. The principal of the middle school signed a letter of informed consent granting permission for the research project to take place at her school. Following school-site approval, parents and guardians of students signed a letter of informed consent to allow their child to participate in the study. Parents and guardians received a consent form in both English and Spanish. Only students willing completed consent forms participated.
Summary

Knowing, understanding, and mastering the components of reading is the key to helping struggling readers in middle school. This project aimed to identify whether interventions with emphasis in a specific component are more effective than multicomponent reading interventions. This chapter described the school-site and participants, methodology, and measures for data.

The next chapter will discuss and analyze the results of the eight-week interventions on student achievement at the middle school. The differences between pre-assessment and post-assessment will be explained for each intervention with emphasis. The gains will be compared and contrasted to determine the effects of reading interventions with instructional focus.
CHAPTER FOUR: Results

In 2015-2016, the selected school-site realized that reading instruction needed to change for the bottom quartile of readers. On the state assessment, students who scored a one the previous year remained at the same level the following year. In addition, students reading two or more grade levels behind their peers made the smallest gains throughout the school. Struggling readers in grades five through eight were not accessing the content due to their reading deficiencies, and leveled direct instruction was nonexistent.

Introduction

The research project was designed to address the needs of developing readers, which utilized research-based best practices. This paper posed the question, “Is a single or multicomponent reading intervention program more effective at enhancing outcomes for struggling readers in intermediate grades?”

For eight weeks, two groups of students selected by their The Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) and i-Ready results received either a single component or multicomponent reading intervention. Data collected showed that both groups, on average, grew base on their post SRI and i-Ready results. However, the multicomponent group outperformed the single component and control groups. Thus, the data revealed that multicomponent interventions are more effective than single component interventions for middle school readers.

Data Analysis

Average Lexile levels and grade equivalents were analyzed to determine the effectiveness of the intervention. The average Lexile or grade level equivalent was determined by adding up the total score and dividing by the number of students in the intervention. The average growth was calculated by finding the change between the average
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pre-test and post-test scores. An average Lexile or grade equivalency provided an overall picture of the group’s performance and reading ability.

Two instruments provided the quantitative data used to determine the effectiveness of interventions: The Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) and i-Ready assessments. The SRI provided the Lexile level of each participant. A Lexile level represents a student’s reading ability on a universal scale (MetaMetrics, 2009). The scale ranges from below 0 Lexile to 2000 Lexile. The i-Ready measured the student’s reading ability compared to grade level norms. A student’s grade level equivalency on data was reported on a zero to five scale. Zero indicates students who scored at or below a kindergarten level. One refers to students reading on a first grade level, while five correlates to a fifth grade level. i-Ready’s floor is zero and the ceiling is five. The data from the SRI and i-Ready assessments were not analyzed together, but rather as two separate data points. These measures support each other but provide slightly different insights into a student’s performance.

**SRI Results**

The multicomponent intervention program proved more effective based on student achievement results from both SRI and i-Ready. As shown in Figure 1, students in the single component intervention grew, on average, 52 Lexile points on their post SRI assessment, while students in the multicomponent intervention grew on average 88 Lexile points (see Table 1, Table 2). In addition, students in the control group fell from a 333 Lexile to a 314 Lexile on average, dropping 18 Lexile points (see Table 3). The 36-point Lexile difference between the intervention groups is significant. Although some students in the single component group made 80 points or more growth, a clear trend does not exist.
In an effort to provide additional insight, another series of interventions were performed to determine the effectiveness of multicomponent interventions on the control group. The original control group contained eight students. However, only six of the eight students received interventions in the second round. These students were the farthest beyond their peers and presented significant reading deficiencies. The two outlining control group students did not need multicomponent interventions, but rather motivational support. The original control group dropped 18 Lexile points without interventions. However, as shown in Figure 2, the six students grew 82 points when included in multicomponent interventions (see Table 3). This 64 point difference clearly illustrates the power of research based interventions and provides hope for struggling readers.

*Figure 1: Average SRI Lexile scores for intervention groups on the pretest and posttest.*
The next section will analyze the i-Ready results of each group by component. The results mirror the results of the SRI data. These components include phonological awareness, phonics, high frequency words, vocabulary and comprehension. The components will be explored in the order of development. Following Compton’s (2013) research, we will focus on components associated with word reading and then reading comprehension (p. 56).

**i-Ready Results**

The i-Ready diagnostic is an online, adaptive, sub-domain diagnostic created by Curriculum Associates. The adaptive assessment responds to student answers and evaluates student mastery of grade level. Unlike SRI, i-Ready assesses sub-domains of reading such as phonological awareness, phonics, high frequency words, vocabulary, and comprehension (Houghton Mifflin Court, 2014, p. 5). The next sections will explore the sub-domain results of the i-Ready assessment tool.

**Phonological Awareness.** Ehri (1995) and Share (1995) highlighted the importance of phonological awareness for learning to read. Phonological awareness is the ability to orally recognize letter sounds within a word. Phonological awareness does not include written
letters and is only focused on the sounds at the word level. i-Ready data shows that students in middle school are generally proficient at understanding that letters are the subcomponents of words. The intervention and control groups illustrated mastery prior to interventions by scoring on average a five in phonological awareness. All students maintained a five on the post-assessment. As a result, the component of phonological awareness did not reveal learning trends.

**Phonics.** The next step in a reader’s development is mastering the written translation of sounds to letters. Phonics is the ability to convert sounds into letters in an alphabetic system. Phonics interventions focus on the associations between phonemes and orthography (Suggate 2016, p. 78). The single component group received only phonics instruction daily, while the multicomponent group learned phonics once a week. Although the multicomponent group experienced less direct instruction in phonics, their phonics growth out paced the single component group. As shown in Figure 3, the single component group grew half a year by increasing from a beginning first grade level to an end-first grade level (see Table 4). The multicomponent group made almost double the growth by increasing from a kindergarten to a mid-first grade level (see Table 5). The multicomponent group most likely grew more due to the numerous opportunities to practice their phonics skills in various settings. The control group decreased in phonics mastery. These students started at a kindergarten level and ended at a kindergarten level (see Table 6).
i-Ready Phonics Component

![Graph showing the comparison of single component intervention, multicomponent intervention, and control group in terms of grade level scores on the pretest and posttest.]

Figure 3: Average i-Ready grade level scores on the pretest and posttest.

**High Frequency Words.** The next stage after pre-alphabetic and alphabetic is automatic alphabetic stage. According to Ehri (1995) and Share (1995), readers sharpen their decoding skills and move to automaticity with more exposure to words. Readers transition from slowly decoded words to effortless process of letter recognition. High frequency words indicate a student’s automaticity at grade level words. As shown in Figure 4, the single component group made significant gains in high frequency words by growing five months in eight weeks, which is double typical growth (see Table 4). The multicomponent group surpassed the growth of the single component group. Students in the multicomponent group achieved greater mastery of phonics, which then most likely led to increased knowledge of high frequency words (see Table 5). The control group regressed in their knowledge of high frequency words by decreasing from a mid-fourth grade level to an early fourth grade level (see Table 6).
The next two sections transition from word reading to comprehension. Both vocabulary and comprehension are critical for making meaning of the text. Once students automate their word reading and learn to read, then reading to learn takes place.

**Vocabulary.** Vocabulary instruction occurred implicitly through class. The single component group had limited opportunities for vocabulary instruction with the Phonics Boost Curriculum. However, the multicomponent group read an authentic novel, which provided fertile ground for learning new words.

The results align with each groups’ exposure to new words. As shown in Figure 5, the single component group made typical gains (see Table 4). The multicomponent group made two times the amount of growth (see Table 5). This limited data may indicate that students in the multicomponent group not only learned more words, but also developed skills to determine the meaning of unknown words using background knowledge and context clues. However, limited evidence for vocabulary and informal instruction does not provide enough basis to draw informative conclusions.

*Figure 4: Average i-Ready grade level scores for high frequency words*
Comprehension. The final component of the reading process is comprehension. Comprehension is the ability to make meaning of a text. Comprehension is the category with the most surprising data. As shown in Figure 5, the single component group grew two months in comprehension (see Table 4). The control group achieved better results by growing from a late first grade level to almost a second grade level (see Table 6). In contrast, the multicomponent group grew four months (see Table 5). Given that the multicomponent group had more opportunities to improve their comprehension, a correlation may exist between the reading intervention and growth in comprehension.
Additional Influences

**Group Size.** Limited data exists to suggest group size significantly contributed to overall results. The single component group had fourteen students, while the multicomponent intervention had nineteen students. Although smaller group sizes tend to achieve better results, the data showed the larger group outperforming the smaller group. This result is similar to Wanzek’s (2002) research, which concluded that a smaller group size does not necessary increase the intensity and effectiveness middle school reading interventions (p. 199). Furthermore, Wanzek found that the importance of group size decreases with the grade level (Wanzek, 2002, p. 1999). Thus, the data is inconclusive as to whether group size influenced student outcomes.

**Length of Time.** The amount of time spent in an intervention has been shown to positively affect growth. Both intervention groups attended class for 45 minutes, five days a week for eight weeks. Although each group achieved positive results, additional time may lead to increase reading growth. Torgensen et al. (2001) found that longer intervention led to increase student results (p. 33). Similarly, Wanzek (2002) suggested increasing intervention

*Figure 6: Average i-Ready grade level scores for comprehension.*
time beyond twenty to forty minutes, three to five times for struggling students (p. 200). Given that both groups remain significantly below grade level, additional time for interventions may prove beneficial.

**Motivation.** Students in the multicomponent group were more motivated to read than the single component group based on the number of skipped classes. In her research, Gelzheizer (2011) identified motivation as one contributed factors to delayed reading. She noted reading interventions need to help struggling readers develop the mindset that reading is an activity within one’s ability that bring pleasure and knowledge (p. 292). Middle school is defined as a time of disengagement. During the project, students in the single and multicomponent intervention groups skipped class. However, students in the single component opted out of class twice as frequently as the multicomponent students. Students defended their behavior by claiming the class was not engaging. One possible reason for less skips in the multicomponent group may be student voice and choice. Students in the multicomponent group read an engaging novel and participated in group discussions.

**Implications**

The main purpose of this paper has been to determine if single component or multicomponent interventions are more effective in a middle school setting. The data illustrates that multicomponent interventions are not only effective for overall reading growth, but also the sub-components. These results align with the finds of Compton (2013), Wanzek (2013) and Suggate (2016).

Compton’s (2013) research found that interventions that focus on “context-independent” decoding rules leave students without the skills to utilize the decoding rules in context (p. 56). The phonics intervention offered to the single component group taught “context-
independent” rules and provided limited opportunities to integrate the rules into typical reading scenarios. The extremely narrow focus of the intervention may have distorted the reading process. Conversely, the multicomponent intervention group participated in a holistic intervention by providing avenues for self-teaching and exploration. Students practiced decoding rules in natural settings until they systematically make connections between discrete phonics rules and words.

Wanzek (2013) studied the effect of multicomponent interventions against single component interventions with fourth and fifth grade students. Wanzek found that multicomponent intervention offer promising outcomes for older students and lead to increase comprehension (p. 909). The data in this paper reflects Wanzek’s findings. The multicomponent intervention doubled the growth of the single component and control groups in comprehension. Regular word instruction combined with comprehension instruction proved beneficial for the multicomponent group.

Suggates’s research also supports the findings of this paper. Suggate (2016) concluded that phonemic awareness interventions led to better results in elementary students, while comprehension interventions proved more effective for older students (p .90). The data shows that phonics skills did not effectively transfer to comprehension for the single component group. Students in the single component intervention made typical comprehension growth, which matched the control group’s growth. As a result, the data is inconclusive as to whether the intervention or external influences led to higher comprehension rates for the single component group. As for the multicomponent group, their reading comprehension was double typical growth. This shows that multicomponent interventions may lead to higher student achievement than single component interventions.
Summary

Research on reading interventions over the last twenty-years has created an expansive source of knowledge. Although some data conflicts, a trend exists. Reading is a complex process that requires lower and higher cognitive skills. When taught in isolation or out of order, students struggle to make connections and integrate learning. Norton, Component, and data from this research project suggest designing interventions with various components that support students towards the ultimate goal of comprehending. Multicomponent interventions address the lower level literacy skills while simultaneously developing higher-level skills.
CHAPTER FIVE: Conclusions

My personal experience served as the initial catalyst for this research project. In Chapter One, I shared my challenges and successes with reading. Feelings of shame, inadequacy, and vulnerability led me to pursue the research question, “Is a single or multicomponent reading intervention program more effective at enhancing outcomes for struggling readers in intermediate grades?”

Introduction

Struggling to read in elementary school is one thing, but continued hardship with the most fundamental form of communication is another. I chose this project to improve my reading intervention practices and better serve students with reading deficiencies. The initial phases of this project included exploring the current field of research, learning about intervention models for middle school students and designing an intervention program for my school-site. The knowledge and awareness gained throughout the project is instrumental in providing highly effective reading interventions.

This final chapter is focused on reflection. I will review the literature, discuss the lessons learned, identify limitations, propose next steps, and outline areas for future research. The purpose is to gain deeper insight into the data and personal journey required by this project.

Literature Review

Reading is one of the most fundamental types of communication. Yet, 64 percent of fourth grade students nationwide are not reading at proficient levels (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2015). Even more troubling is the percent of students with basic literacy skills in eighth grade. According to the National Report Card released by the
Department of Education, 42 percent of eighth grade students read with a basic understanding (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2015). When compared to 2013 results, there is a higher percentage of eighth grade students reading at or below a basic reading level today than two years ago (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2015). Rather than allowing this trend to continue, educators must act proactively by establishing middle school reading intervention programs aimed at addressing reading deficiencies.

Reading is complex, multisensory process that requires both lower and higher order thinking skills. According to Houston (2014), this process is not innate and must be learned systematically (p. 347). The education community agrees that the act of reading occurs in two distinct phases: learning to read and reading to learn.

Students must first learn to read words. According to Ehri (1995) and Share (1995), strong phonological and orthographic knowledge are the two critical elements for word reading. Students must learn and internalize the 26-letter system of symbols to decode words quickly and efficiently. After a student gains automaticity with word reading, the next phase is making meaning.

Comprehension is an active, ever changing process in which the reader gains knowledge throughout text. Although different models explain the process of comprehension, most researchers agree on the component model. Under this model, Compton (2013) holds that comprehension includes parsing, text representation, inferencing and the situation model, (p. 64). Readers constantly rely on their background knowledge, working memory, vocabulary, and word reading skills. Giving the numerous elements involved and opportunities for error, comprehension is upheld as the pinnacle of the reading process.
Together word reading and comprehension underpin the act of reading. If breakdowns occur during this journey, students will struggle to make meaning accurately. Prolonged and continued roadblocks in reading create deficiencies. According to Gelzheizer (2011), developing readers continue to struggle in middle school due to the increased classroom focus on comprehension, their limited background knowledge or vocabulary skills, low engagement, and lack of exposure to skilled instruction (p. 286). Overtime, students with reading gaps may require specialized instruction such as reading interventions.

Various models for reading interventions have developed over the years. This research project analyzed whether a single component model or multicomponent model was more effective in intermediate grades. A single component intervention focuses on one element of reading such as phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, or comprehension. In contrast, a multicomponent intervention includes decoding, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension (Edmonds et al., 2009, as cited by Wanzek 2013, p. 165). Multicomponent interventions strive to acknowledge the readers limited literacy skills, while simultaneously developing their higher order processing abilities.

Research results from Wanzek (2013), Edmond et al. (2009), and Scammacca (2007) all confirm that multicomponent interventions are more effective than single component interventions. In addition, the results of this study support the findings of the aforementioned research. As shown in Figure 1, students in the single component intervention grew, on average, 52 Lexile points on their post SRI assessment, while students in the multicomponent intervention grew, on average, 88 Lexile points (see Table 1, Table 2).
I gained immense insight from evaluating the effectiveness of intervention models. This insight informs my current teaching. The next section discusses my main takeaways from this yearlong project.

**Lessons Learned**

Three main lessons emerged from my research. I gained a deepened understanding of the reading development process, challenged my own mindsets regarding the structure of interventions, and extended more compassion towards my students. All of these lessons positively inform my instruction and relationship with students today.

The literature review section of this paper opened my eyes to the complicated nature of reading development. I had limited exposure to the pedagogy of reading prior to this project. I earned my teaching license through an alternative route program. As a result, I lacked the knowledge and understanding behind the reading process to adequately help students. Reading and internalizing the research helped me understand the physical and structural barriers to reading for middle school students. The most impactful information centered on brain development. According to Houston (2014), as the brain matures, white matter increases as gray matter decreases, which is associated with better reading (p. 2).

From a teacher’s perspective, I always thought the difficulty of learning to read increased with age. However, brain research shows middle school students actually are more structurally primed to learn to read rather than younger students. Information beyond brain development is just one of many insights gained from the literature review.

This project also changed my mindset regarding intervention models. I have taught a single component phonics intervention for almost three years. Prior to this research, I believed that a single component intervention was the most effective model. My results with
students supported and confirmed this belief until this research project. I learned that quicker and larger gains are possible with a multicomponent intervention. I started to encourage Share’s (1995) self-teaching model alongside context-dependent instruction. These changes led to more successful at-bats for students and ultimately word recognition connections.

Lastly, I learned the importance and power of compassion. Learning to read in middle school is elicits feelings of shame, fear, and regret. Delayed readers must not only break down the cognitive barriers to reading, but also the social and emotional roadblocks. Reading is a highly complex and personal journey. This research project provided an additional prospective and increased my compassion for students. My interventions now include social time and bonding activities to breakdown the anxiety related to reading. By showing more compassion, students are more trusting and vulnerable in class. As a result, students spend more time learning to read.

**Limitations**

Student sample demographics, length of time, and absences are limiting factors in this research project. Nearly all students who participated were Hispanic. In addition, all students were classified as English Language Learners. The lack of diversity and narrow focus of this study limits the applicability. In addition, student absences are a limiting factor in this data set. The school site had a high percentage of low-income students; approximately ninety-seven percent receive Free and Reduced Lunch. This economic factor leads to unpredictable attendance and reduce instructional time. Time is the last limiting factor. Even though the study captured data from eight weeks of interventions, the data collection process was extended three weeks due to holidays, school events, and schedule changes. These factors may have influenced student achievement results.
Next Steps

The intervention data suggests two major action steps for my personal practice. The first change is to provide additional time and instruction to readers who continue to struggle. Some students need more time to learn and master the foundational skills of reading. The second change recommended by the data is to include explicit comprehension and vocabulary curriculums. Although students grew in comprehension and vocabulary, this growth did not match the growth made from other components with direction instruction. These changes will likely elevate reading growth and provide a more consistent intervention program.

Extending the length of time in a multicomponent intervention may benefit struggling readers. Students in the eight-week intervention program grew in almost all of the components of reading. However, students fell short of closing the gap between themselves and their peers. Students in middle school reading two or three grade levels behind their peers must make at least double typical growth annually to enter high school on grade level. As Wanzek (2002) noted, students who remain significantly below grade level may benefit from additional time in reading interventions (p.909). Increasing the amount of time in the intervention programs will give students the opportunity and support to overcome previously debilitating reading deficiencies.

Another action step is to integrate two research-based curriculums into the program. Currently, the multicomponent interventions utilize Phonics Boost and Wilson Reading System. The first two curriculums are designed to treat word-reading gaps, while the reading of authentic novels addressed the comprehension gap. Vocabulary and comprehension
instruction occurred informally. To improve the program, direct instruction in comprehension and vocabulary is required.

For comprehension, the Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR; Boardman et al. (1997) may improve reading outcomes. A significant amount of time will be spent learning and practicing reading strategies. Compton et al. (2013) held that comprehension includes parsing, text representation, and inferencing (p.64). Relying on research, students will learn comprehension strategies such as Preview, Click and Clunk, Get the Gist, and Wrap Up. Student will preview the text, activate background knowledge and make predictions based on text features. Click and Clunk is a metacognition strategy that will help students monitor their own comprehension. This strategy will help students recognize unknown words and repair gaps in comprehension. Get the Gist will focus on creating and writing the main idea for the selection of text. Lastly, Wrap Up will teach students to ask and answer their own questions about the text. Together these strategies will provide students with methods to activate, build, and repair comprehension before, during, and after reading. These strategies will help advance each student’s level of comprehension.

Vocabulary instruction will rely on Marzano’s six-step approach to developing a deep understanding of new words. Following the six-step model proposed by Marzano, students will engage with one rigorous word per day through reading, writing, and speaking exercises. The six-step process includes: (1) hearing and reading a description of the new term with an example; (2) restating the description in their own words; (3) constructing a visual representation of the word; (4) participating in word building activities; (5) engaging in peer-to-peer discussions about the word; (6) practicing new term through interactive games (KIPP Foundation, 2016). Vocabulary words will be selected based on the KIPP Foundation’s
recommended word list with an emphasis on Tier 2 words. Through direct instruction of vocabulary, student mastery of grade level words should increase. Adding additional time and curriculum are adjustments aimed at better addressing student needs and improving instruction.

This research project found that multicomponent interventions are more effective than single component interventions. The data suggested that consistent replicable curriculums might influence the outcome of student learning.

Future Research

There is still much to learn about the process of reading. Although the volume of research has increased in the last decade, educators still struggle to accurately describe and teach the multilayered process of reading. Furthermore, as evidence by the current reading statistics, students continue to struggle with reading. Researchers need to identify the research-based strategies that are proven effective for developing readers, ELL students, and those with learning disabilities. Once a standard is created for the field, educators must adopt and incorporate these practices. Thus, an enormous task lies ahead. Researchers and educators must come together to improve reading instruction to ensure all students learn to read.

Summary

This project pushed me to transform myself from an educator into student. For years, I have relied on research-based practices for instruction. This project gave me the opportunity to test the research and challenge my own beliefs. Prior to my research, I taught single component interventions. However, the data gathered showed that multicomponent interventions had a greater influence on reading development. Through this process, I gained
a deeper understanding of the components of reading and methods to teach the underlying skills. Increasing my content knowledge also made me more aware of student learning and reading gaps. Ultimately, conducting research strengthened my instructional practices, which positively influenced student achievement.

This research project also stretched me as a teacher-leader. Education today is no longer centered on content knowledge. With the emergence of Common Core Standards, educators are now focused on teaching critical thinking skills. At the heart of critical thinking is the ability to read, understand, and respond to print. As teachers in the building learned about my research project, many came forward asking for guidance with their own teaching practice. I worked with a handful of teachers to determine which students were their lowest readers and designed content material to support their reading deficiencies. These collaborative interactions not only allowed me to utilize my content knowledge, but also share specific methods to support developing readers within the classroom. I look forward to additional opportunities to leverage the knowledge and outcomes my research project as a teacher-leader.

Beyond growing as an educator and teacher-leader, this project refocused my purpose and mission within education. I taught in a general education classroom for five years before assuming the reading specialist role. This position and research project has relit my fire for helping the most disenfranchised readers. Seeing the immediate results of an eight-week program gives me hope that all students can and will learn to read. I am grateful for the opportunity to drastically impact the trajectory of a student’s life. I look forward to continuing to grow and learn as a reading specialist as I implement that action steps identified in this paper.
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IS A SINGLE OR MULTICOMPONENT READING INTERVENTION


Dear Principal,

My name is Barbara Klun and I am an advanced degree student at Hamline University in Saint Paul, Minnesota. I wish to conduct research for my Masters of Literacy Education, which involves implementing single and multicomponent reading interventions for struggling readers in intermediate grades at your school-site, during the 2016-2017 school year. This project will be conducted under the supervision of my committee.

I am hereby seeking your consent to design and implement two reading intervention models to determine their effectiveness. I seek your permission to collect and analyze student reading growth through iReady and Scholastic Reading Inventory assessments. I have provided you with a copy of my capstone proposal which includes copies of the measures and consent forms to be used in the research process.

This research is public scholarship the abstract and final product will be cataloged in Hamline’s Bush Library Digital Commons, a searchable electronic repository. I may also publish or use my findings in scholarly ways in the future.

Your school’s participation is voluntary at any time, you may stop the research project without negative consequences. I have received approval from the School of Education at Hamline University.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Barbara Klun

Hamline University
PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN SCHOOL

I ___________________ give Barbara Klun permission to conduct the research titled, *Is a single component or multicomponent intervention program more effective at enhancing outcomes for struggling readers in intermediate grade?*. I understand that I shall not receive any compensation for participating in this study. My school’s participation in this study is voluntary and we are free to withdraw from the research process at any time, for any reason.

Sincerely,

Principal, Middle School
Appendix B: Informed Consent Letters

Dear Parent or Guardian:

I am a completing a master’s degree in education at Hamline University. As part of my graduate work, I plan to conduct research. The purpose of my letter is to ask your permission for your child to take part in my research. The final product will be a printed, bound thesis that will be shelved in Hamline’s Bush Library. I may also publish or use my findings in scholarly ways in the future.

My research will be based on reading data collected through the Scholastic Reading Inventory and running records. All students in reading intervention classes will receive targeted instruction in phonics or comprehension.

I have already received permission to do this research from my principal and the Hamline University Graduate School of Education.

Please return the permission form below by August 15. If you have any questions, please telephone me at school between 8:15-4:15. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ms. Barbara Klun

Permission for Minors to Take Part in Research

I, ___________________________ (parent/guardian), give permission for my child, ___________________________, to participate in the research project that is part of your graduate degree program. I understand that all results will be confidential and anonymous and that my child may stop taking part at any time without negative consequences.

Signed: ________________________________ Date: ___

(Parent/Guardian)
Estimado padre o tutor:

Estoy completando una maestría en educación en la Universidad de Hamline. Como parte de mi trabajo de posgrado, planeo llevar a cabo la investigación. El propósito de mi carta es pedirle su permiso para que su hijo/a participe en mi investigación. El producto final será una tesis impresa, vinculado y será archivada en la Biblioteca Bush de Hamline. También puedo publicar o utilizar mis descubrimientos de manera erudita en el futuro.

Mi investigación se basará en la lectura de datos recopilados a través del Inventario Escolar de Lectura y los registros de ejecución. Todos los estudiantes en clases de intervención de lectura recibirán instrucción específica en fonética o comprensión.

Ya he recibido permiso para hacer esta investigación de mi directora, y Escuela de Graduados de la Universidad de Hamline.

Por favor devuelva el formulario de permiso abajo antes del 15 de agosto. Si tiene alguna pregunta, por favor llámeme a la oficina de la escuela entre las 8:15-4:15. Gracias por su cooperación.

Sinceramente,

Srita. Barbara Klun

Permiso para que los menores participen en la investigación

Yo, ____________________________ (padre o tutor), le doy permiso para que mi hijo/a, ____________________________, Para participar en el proyecto de investigación que es parte de su programa de posgrado. Entiendo que todos los resultados serán confidenciales y anónimos y que mi hijo puede dejar de tomar parte en cualquier momento sin consecuencias negativas.

Firma: ____________________________ Fecha: ______

(Padre o Tutor:)
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Are your students making progress in reading? Are they on a path to college and career readiness?

The Reading Inventory is designed specifically to help educators answer those questions. The Reading Inventory is a computer-adaptive reading assessment program that provides immediate, actionable data on students’ reading levels and growth over time. The Reading Inventory helps educators forecast students’ trajectories to grade-level proficiency and college and career readiness in a low-pressure environment.

The Reading Inventory measures students’ reading growth from kindergarten to Grade 12 with two powerful subtests:

NEW! Foundational Reading Assessment: A foundational reading assessment for students in Grades K–2. Items focus on phonological awareness, letter-sound and letter-word
identification, decoding, and sight word recognition. Results are reported as total fluency scores.

**Reading Comprehension Assessment:** A reading comprehension assessment for students across Grades K–12. Items contain literary and informational text passages that students are likely to encounter both in and out of school. Test items are drawn from a variety of content areas. Test questions focus on literal comprehension of the passages. Items do not require prior knowledge of ideas outside the passage, do not test on vocabulary taken out of context, and do not require formal logic. Scores are reported in Lexile measurements.

Together the two subtests track students’ reading growth from the acquisition of foundational reading skills to the development of the advanced reading comprehension skills that are necessary for understanding the complex texts that are required to be college and career ready.

At the school and district levels, *Reading Inventory* results help administrators monitor students’ reading growth and gauge the effectiveness of reading programs. In the classroom, these results allow teachers to monitor students’ reading progress, differentiate instruction, make meaningful interventions, establish goals, and match students to complex texts.

**THE READING INVENTORY IS AN EFFECTIVE ASSESSMENT TO . . .**

- Identify struggling readers and make meaningful interventions
- Apply as a universal screener and progress-monitoring tool
- Establish obtainable and realistic growth goals for students
- Monitor progress toward grade-level expectations
- Monitor effectiveness of instruction
- Support Response to Intervention implementation
- Indicate expected performances on state tests

**Professional Learning Guide**

**About This Guide**

The *Reading Inventory Professional Learning Guide* features practical instructions for administering *Reading Inventory* assessments, generating reports, and interpreting test results. The guide also features best practices and guidelines for making data-driven decisions to inform instruction.

The *Reading Inventory Professional Learning Guide* includes five sections:

**Welcome to the Reading Inventory** (pp. 7–30) provides an overview of The *Reading Inventory* and explains the purpose, reliability, validity, and scoring of the two subtests.
Administering the *Reading Inventory* (pp. 31–52) outlines how teachers and administrators use the Student Achievement Manager (SAM), a state-of-the-art data management system, to set up the test, capture student test data, generate reports, and monitor student progress. This section also includes an overview of the *Reading Inventory* student experience.

Using *Reading Inventory Results* (pp. 53–116) provides detailed information on how educators can use *Reading Inventory* reports to screen and place students, monitor student progress, and plan appropriate instruction.

*Reading Inventory Best Practices* (pp. 117–128) provides a go-to list of instructional practices to use before, during, and after each *Reading Inventory* administration.

*Resources* (pp. 129–141) includes professional learning materials and reproducible resources to support reading instruction. Reproducibles can also be downloaded from SAM.
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**Foundational Reading Assessment (Grades K–2)**

The Foundational Reading Assessment monitors the acquisition of foundational reading skills for students in Grades K–2. These skills include phonological awareness (rhyme identification; initial, medial, and final sound identification), letter-word identification (uppercase and lowercase letter recognition, sight word recognition), and phonics/word attack skills (letter-sound identification, decoding).

The Foundational Reading Assessment can be used to assess students at the beginning of the school year and as a progress-monitoring tool throughout the year. The assessment items are designed to measure students’ fluency with foundational reading skills. Students receive fluency scores that indicate whether their knowledge of foundational reading skills is either on or below grade level.

In addition to assessing and progress monitoring, the Foundational Reading Assessment helps teachers determine whether students have developed a level of fluency that is necessary to comprehend texts. Students in Grades K through 2 who demonstrate proficiency with foundational reading skills may be ready to take the Reading Comprehension Assessment.

**Reading Comprehension Assessment (Grades K–12)**

The Reading Comprehension Assessment can be used to assess and monitor students’ growth in reading comprehension. The assessment includes nearly six thousand test items for readers at all levels. Each item consists of a literary or informational text passage, a sentence stem, and four answer choices. Item passages include texts that students encounter both in and out of school and are drawn from a variety of content areas. Questions assess students’ comprehension skills as applied to the passages.

Reading Comprehension Assessment results indicate students’ reading levels on the Lexile® Framework for Reading scale, a scientifically accurate system for measuring the comprehension levels of readers and the complexity of texts. Lexile® measures are used to find the range of texts with which students are most likely to succeed, meaning a text is just hard enough to challenge students and allow them to grow, but not so hard that students become discouraged.

The Foundational Reading Assessment helps educators monitor students’ development of foundational reading skills and indicates readiness for the Reading Comprehension Assessment.
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AUDIENCE

Students in kindergarten through Grade 2.

PURPOSE

The Foundational Reading Assessment is a valid and reliable measure of students’ foundational reading skills. In Grades K–2, use the Foundational Reading Assessment for the following purposes:

Grades K–2

Initial Assessment: Administer at the beginning of the year to get an initial assessment of students’ foundational reading skills.

Progress Monitor: Use up to two more times during the school year to monitor students’ development of foundational reading skills.

Determine Readiness for the Reading Comprehension Assessment:
The Foundational Reading Assessment measures readiness for the Reading Comprehension Assessment. The Foundational Reading Assessment indicates that students have achieved a level of fluency with foundational reading skills to sufficiently support comprehension. Teachers should review the Foundational Reading Report to view each student’s fluency score and to see whether this score indicates readiness for the Reading Comprehension Assessment. Students with a fluency score of 49 or above are recommended for the Reading Comprehension Assessment.

SEE ALSO

For more information

ACCESSING THE ASSESSMENTS

Note that teachers must direct K–2 students on which subtest to take for more information.
Welcome to the Reading Inventory

Overview

TESSING CALENDAR

Teachers should follow the testing calendar that is established by their administrations. The Foundational Reading Assessment may be administered up to three times per year. It is recommended that teachers administer the assessment at the beginning, middle, and end of the school year to allow time for students to make measurable progress.

ADMINISTRATION TIME 20–25 minutes

FORMAT AND CONTENT

The Foundational Reading Assessment begins with a simple test to ensure that students can effectively use the computer’s mouse or track pad. Then, students will complete up to 82 items in three skill strands. Each section begins with an animated trial that models the task, plus two practice items. All students receive a base set of items from each strand listed below. Additional items are administered based on performance. Test items assess skills from these strands:

- **Phonological Awareness:** This strand includes items designed to measure students’ rhyme identification skills and initial, final, and medial sound identification skills.

- **Letter-Word Recognition:** This strand measures students’ knowledge of uppercase and lowercase letter names, as well as sight words.

- **Phonics (Word Attack) Skills:** This strand measures students’ ability to identify letter sounds and to decode nonwords.

**FOUNDATIONAL SKILLS SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS IN GRADES 3 AND UP**

Students in Grades 3 and up do not take the Foundational Reading Assessment, as it is not an appropriate measure of fluency for students at these levels. Instead, administer the *Phonics Inventory* or another...
assessment designed to measure fluency for students in Grades 3 and up who struggle
that is with foundational reading skills.

Overview | Foundational Reading Assessment

SCORING AND RESULTS

Accuracy and fluency are two components used when measuring students’ foundational reading
skills. The scoring system for the Foundational Reading Assessment has been designed to assess
fluency, which refers to the combination of accurate and efficient, or speedy, responding.
Fluency is important because it frees the reader to attend to comprehension. If a student is
accurate but slow, it is likely that reinforcement of basic skills, along with ongoing practice and
corrective feedback, will increase fluency. Therefore, in order to receive credit for an item, the
student must answer the item correctly within a specified, empirically based time limit.
These thresholds vary from 1.2 seconds to 8.0 seconds, depending upon the difficulty of the
item.

Students’ Foundational Reading Assessment fluency scores are reported as either on or below
grade-level expectations.

FOUNDATIONAL READING ASSESSMENT FLUENCY RANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Grade-Level Fluency Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>36–58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>59–82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MONITORING FOUNDATIONAL SKILLS DEVELOPMENT

The Foundational Reading Assessment is just one measure of students’ foundational
reading skills. Teachers may review multiple measures of assessment, such as reading
records, fluency checks, projects and portfolios, self-appraisals, and teacher observations
to gain a comprehensive picture of students’ foundational skills.

SEE ALSO

To learn how to review students’ Foundational Reading Assessment subtest scores, see the Foundational Reading Subtest Report on page 78.

For information on interpreting Foundational Reading Assessment results, see the Foundational Reading Report on page 62 or the Progress to Career and College Report on page 80.
Understanding the Foundational Reading Assessment results helps teachers and administrators make informed choices about instruction and intervention. The chart below details instructional recommendations based on students’ Foundational Reading Assessment scores.

**FOUNDATIONAL READING ASSESSMENT SCORING GUIDE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundational Reading Assessment Fluency Score</th>
<th>Recommended Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 15</td>
<td>Uppercase and Lowercase Letter Recognition; Phonological Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 30</td>
<td>Letter-Sound Correspondence; Phonological Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 35</td>
<td>Basic Decoding and Word Recognition—focus on words with consonants and short vowels (CVCs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 – 48</td>
<td>Intermediate Decoding and Word Recognition—including words with short vowels, consonant blends and digraphs, and closed syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 – 58</td>
<td>Advanced Decoding and Word Recognition—including words with long vowels, variant vowels, diphthongs, and a variety of syllable types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 – 82</td>
<td>Morphology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructional Recommendations Based on Foundational Reading Assessment Fluency Score Range

**ALIGNMENT WITH DIBELS NEXT**

Student performance on the Foundational Reading Assessment is correlated with student performance on DIBELS Next. In addition, students’ Foundational Reading Assessment fluency scores are linked to students’ DIBELS Next composite scores as well as the corresponding DIBELS Next percentile rank scores. [dibelsnext.html](https://dibels.org/).

**RELIABILITY**

Reliability analyses of the Foundational Reading Assessment indicate that its fluency scores meet the highest standard of reliability. Reliability was established for all of the items in each strand and subscale of the assessment. Results indicate that the items within each strand and subscale have high levels of internal consistency, ranging from .75 to .94. That is, the items within each of the subscales reliably measure the same construct.

**FIELD TESTING**
The *Reading Inventory* Foundational Reading Assessment was field tested in conjunction with the development of *iRead*, a K–2 digital foundational reading program. The *iRead* development and evaluation sample consisted of 1,390 students from 75 classrooms, representing four school districts in geographically dispersed regions of the United States. The sample included 457 kindergarten students from diverse backgrounds. The representativeness of the sample with respect to reading skills is evidenced by the percentage of students who fell into the various categories of performance based on their DIBELS Next composite scores (administered in September and October 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIBELS Next Benchmark Classification</th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>First Grade</th>
<th>Second Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At or Above</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Below</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages of Students Falling Into Three DIBELS Next Composite Score Benchmark Classifications

These results indicate that the sample included considerable numbers of students who performed either At or Above Benchmark or Well Below Benchmark in reading as measured by DIBELS Next. The trend across grades was for fewer students to be At or Above Benchmark and more to be Below Benchmark or Well Below Benchmark with increasing grade level.


For more information on the Foundational Reading Assessment reliability and validity, see the *Reading Inventory Technical Guide* on the *Reading Inventory Product Support page*.  

VALIDITY

Validity indicates whether a test measures what it is supposed to measure. There are several ways to examine the validity of a test like the Foundational Reading Assessment. Each type of validation asks an important question about the test.

**Content Validity** Does the test content match the test purpose?

The Foundational Reading Assessment assesses phonological awareness, letter-name knowledge, letter-sound knowledge, sight word recognition, and decoding of nonwords. The phonological awareness items include rhyming and identification of first, last, and medial sounds. The letter items include both uppercase and lowercase letters. The sight word items were sampled from the first one hundred of Fry’s (2000) 1,000 Instant Words. The nonword items include commonly taught phonics skills, including CVC...
patterns, blends, digraphs, and long-vowel patterns. All items were reviewed by an expert panel for content validity and bias.

**Construct Validity** Does the test measure what it sets out to measure?

Construct validity is a form of validity that encompasses evidence provided about the content description validity and criterion-prediction validity of a test, but includes other evidence as well. The construct validity was supported by the results of confirmatory factory analyses of both correct and fluent responses.

**Criterion-Related Validity** Does the test accurately predict performance?

Criterion-related validity was demonstrated by the predictive validity coefficients generated when Foundational Reading Assessment accuracy and fluency scores were used to predict DIBELS Next scores. DIBELS Next was administered to the sample along with the Foundational Reading Assessment. Predictive validity coefficients were calculated using the Foundational Reading Assessment accuracy and fluency scores as predictors of DIBELS Next criterion scores. The criterion-predictive validity was demonstrated by how much the predictive validity coefficients were able to predict DIBELS Next criterion scores. The resultant validity coefficients are presented below. The results show that student performance on the Foundational Reading Assessment correlates with performance on DIBELS Next.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERION-RELATED VALIDITY</th>
<th>Foundational Reading Assessment</th>
<th>DIBELS Next</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>Grade 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Accuracy</strong></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fluency</strong></td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion-Related Validity Coefficients for Foundational Reading Assessment Accuracy and Fluency Scores With DIBELS Next
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Reading Comprehension Assessment

The Reading Comprehension Assessment helps educators monitor the growth of reading comprehension skills on the Lexile Framework for Reading, a scientifically accurate system for matching readers to texts.

AUDIENCE

Students in Grades K–12.

PURPOSE

The Reading Comprehension Assessment is a valid and reliable measure of students’ comprehension skills. This subtest is used for the following purposes across Grades K–12:

**Grades K–12**

- **Initial Assessment:** Administer at the beginning of the year to measure students’ reading comprehension levels and assess students’ reading ability.
- **Progress Monitor:** Administer two to four more times per year to monitor students’ development of reading comprehension skills and to help select reading materials according to both students’ Lexile measures and interests, thereby encouraging reading success.

TESTING CALENDAR

Teachers should follow the testing calendar that is established by their administrations. The Reading Comprehension Assessment should be used three to five times per year for screening and progress monitoring. The Reading Comprehension Assessment is based on prior knowledge of a student’s ability, and the starting point for each subsequent test is determined by the student’s previous performance. The Reading Comprehension Assessment assumes that instruction will occur between administrations, and it assumes that the student cannot grow more than a certain number of Lexile measures in a set range of time. It is recommended that each Reading Comprehension Assessment administration be spaced a minimum of 30 days apart. However, eight weeks is the ideal amount of time between administrations as it allows students to make gains through instruction and practice so teachers can make informed instructional decisions based on results.

DETERMINING READINESS

Administer the Foundational Reading Assessment to students in Grades K–2 prior to administering the Reading Comprehension Assessment to indicate whether they have developed the foundational reading skills necessary to comprehend texts. Consult the Foundational Reading Report or the Progress to College and Career Report to view students’ scores on the Foundational Reading Assessment and to see whether the scores indicate readiness for
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the Reading Comprehension Assessment. See page 9 for more information on the Foundational Reading Assessment.

SEE ALSO
See page 34 for more information on establishing a testing calendar for the Reading Comprehension Assessment.

ADMINISTRATION TIME

The Reading Comprehension Assessment is not timed. Each student will answer approximately 20–25 questions. Most students take 20–30 minutes to complete one administration.

FORMAT

The Reading Comprehension Assessment is a computer-adaptive test that adjusts item difficulty to students’ responses. As students progress through the assessment, the difficulty levels of questions change according to students’ performance. As the student correctly answers questions, the Lexile measure of each question increases. When the student answers a question incorrectly, the next question presented is at a lower Lexile measure. The assessment ends once the student has answered a sufficient number of questions to determine an accurate Lexile measure.

SAMPLE STUDENT READING COMPREHENSION ASSESSMENT PERFORMANCE

The bar graph above represents a sample student’s performance on one Reading Comprehension Assessment test. Each question is numbered. Questions answered correctly are blue; incorrect answers are orange. Note how the level of test items adjusts to the student’s responses. This graph of Reading Comprehension Assessment performance is only a sample. The total number of questions and the Lexile level of each question depends on individual student performance.
Overview | Reading Comprehension Assessment

TARGETING STUDENTS

One way to ensure accurate Reading Comprehension Assessment results is by targeting students for the initial assessment. See page 42 for information on how to target students. After the initial administration, the assessment relies on previous assessment results to determine the starting level for each subsequent test.
Welcome to the **Reading Inventory**

### Overview | Reading Comprehension Assessment

**CONTEN**

Reading Comprehension Assessment passages are selected from texts that students encounter both in and out of the classroom, such as textbooks, literature, magazines, and newspapers. Passage topics span a variety of interest areas. Each passage develops one main idea or contains information that comes before or after the passage in the source text. No prior knowledge is required to understand a passage.

Each test question, or item, includes a statement and four answer choices. This is considered an embedded completion item format, which has been shown to accurately measure the ability to draw inferences and establish logical connections between ideas.

Statements are written to enable students to arrive at the correct answer by comprehending the passage. All four answer choices are plausible when the statement is read independently of the text. Item reading levels are controlled to be easier than the most difficult word in the passage. All items were reviewed by an expert panel for content validity and bias.

### SAMPLE READING COMPREHENSION ASSESSMENT ITEMS

1. **Maya Cooper | Log Out**
   - "You're a winner because you're here. It doesn't matter when you cross the finish line." She smiled at him. "Some people are winners because they don't give up, no matter what happens to them."
   - **He had kept _______.**
     - answering
     - singing
     - trying

2. **African Elephants**
   - African elephants must stay cool in hot weather. They spray water on their bodies. They also cover their bodies with dust. The dust helps block the sun.
   - **The elephants get _______.**
     - dirty
     - sleepy
     - load
     - sick

3. **Roman Coins**
   - Roman coins were not just objects for buying things. They often carried a portrait of the emperor to show people throughout the Empire what their ruler looked like. A coin was also like a small newspaper, announcing great events, such as the building of a new temple in Rome. Other coins praised the emperor's generosity or wise rule.
   - **Roman coins were used for many _______.**
     - purposes
     - games
     - secrets
     - decades
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SEE ALSO

For more information on Reading Comprehension Assessment performance levels, see page 23.

because teachers can guide instruction as well as book selection based on each student’s test score (Lexile score)—leading to reading success.

Understanding this system allows students, teachers, and administrators to draw useful conclusions from Reading Comprehension Assessment reports, make informed choices about intervention, and encourage independent reading.

The Lexile Framework

The Lexile Framework is a system that matches readers to text. It is based on the theory that readers will be successful and their reading skills will progress when they are matched to appropriately challenging texts. The framework determines the text complexity (Lexile text measure) of any written material, as well as a student’s reading comprehension level (Lexile reader measure). When the Lexile measures of the text and reader are matched, the reader experiences confidence and control, enabling him or her to comprehend what is read, build his or her vocabulary by reading words in context, respond to text, and improve his or her independent reading skills. Matching students appropriately to texts fosters motivation for reading independently.

The Lexile Framework provides Lexile measures for literary and informational texts, from high-quality literature to newspapers and magazines, for readers at all levels. Tens of thousands of books have been leveled according to the Lexile Framework. Grade-level ranges and performance standards correlate to Lexile text measures, providing a common frame of reference with which teachers can view students’ performance.

DETERMINING TEXT COMPLEXITY

When determining the complexity of a text, consider not only quantitative measures such as Lexile, but also qualitative measures and aspects of reader and task. See page 112 for more information on text complexity.
Lexile Text Measure

A Lexile text measure is the specific number assigned to any text, based on analysis conducted by MetaMetrics. A Lexile text measure is based on two strong predictors of how difficult a text is to comprehend—word frequency and sentence length. Lexile text measures are rounded to the nearest 5L and range from 0L to 2000L. Text measures at or below 0L are reported as BR, for Beginning Reader.

READING COMPREHENSION ASSESSMENT PERFORMANCE LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Below Basic</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>0L to 275L</td>
<td>280L and Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>0L to 185L</td>
<td>190L to 530L</td>
<td>535L and Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BR to 215L</td>
<td>220L to 415L</td>
<td>420L to 650L</td>
<td>655L and Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BR to 325L</td>
<td>330L to 515L</td>
<td>520L to 820L</td>
<td>825L and Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BR to 535L</td>
<td>540L to 735L</td>
<td>740L to 940L</td>
<td>945L and Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BR to 615L</td>
<td>620L to 825L</td>
<td>830L to 1010L</td>
<td>1015L and Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BR to 725L</td>
<td>730L to 920L</td>
<td>925L to 1070L</td>
<td>1075L and Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>BR to 765L</td>
<td>770L to 965L</td>
<td>970L to 1120L</td>
<td>1125L and Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>BR to 785L</td>
<td>790L to 1005L</td>
<td>1010L to 1185L</td>
<td>1190L and Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>BR to 845L</td>
<td>850L to 1045L</td>
<td>1050L to 1260L</td>
<td>1265L and Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>BR to 885L</td>
<td>890L to 1075L</td>
<td>1080L to 1335L</td>
<td>1340L and Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>BR to 980L</td>
<td>985L to 1180L</td>
<td>1185L to 1385L</td>
<td>1390L and Above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For information on how administrators can use SAM to adjust performance levels, see page 39.
RECOMMENDED LEXILE RANGES FOR COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Band</th>
<th>Old CCSS Lexile Ranges</th>
<th>New CCSS Lexile Ranges for College and Career Readiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K–1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–3</td>
<td>450L–725L</td>
<td>420L–820L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–5</td>
<td>645L–845L</td>
<td>740L–1010L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–8</td>
<td>860L–1010L</td>
<td>925L–1185L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–10</td>
<td>960L–1115L</td>
<td>1050L–1335L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Foundational Reading Assessment Strands

PHONOLOGICAL AWARENESS
This strand assesses students’ awareness of rhyme and initial, medial, and final sounds. Students will be asked to select the words that rhyme or the words with the same initial, medial, or final sounds.

LETTER WORD IDENTIFICATION

PHONICS (WORD ATTACK)
This strand assesses students’ knowledge of letter sounds and decoding skills. Students will be asked to select the nonsense word they hear.

Reading Comprehension Assessment
Taking the Reading Comprehension Assessment
Students in Grades K–12 can take the Reading Comprehension Assessment. See the “Determining Readiness” box page 15 for more information about assigning subtests.

CHOOSING BOOK INTERESTS
SEE ALSO
Before taking the Reading Comprehension Assessment, students indicate the types of books they like to read on the Book Interest Screen by selecting up to
three genres of books from student book categories such as “friends and family,” “sports and fun,” and “earth and space.” These recommendations, see categories vary based on grade level: K–2, 3–5, and 6–12. At the completion of the test, each student receives an individualized Recommended Reading Report on the Recommended Reading Report. The books included on the Recommended Reading Report are based on the student’s reading interests and current Lexile score, ensuring that recommended books are engaging and at an appropriate reading level. Students’ selected reading interests do not, however, influence the selection of items on the test.

DIRECTIONS

Click or tap on a genre icon to select a category of interest. You may choose up to three categories.

Click or tap again to deselect the choice.

Click or tap Next to move on.

After logging in, students are presented with the test directions. When they finish reading or listening to the directions, they click or tap Next to begin the practice test. Practice questions
ensure that students understand the test directions and are comfortable using the computer or iPad® to take the test. Students will answer three practice questions that are formatted like the actual test. The Lexile measure of the practice questions that the student receives will be easier than the targeted reading level.

**Monitoring Students**

If a student is prompted to ask you for help, review the test directions and purpose. Then monitor as he or she retakes the Practice Test, and provide follow-up support as needed.

**LOCATOR TEST WITHIN THE TEST**

Students in Grades 7 and above who do not have estimated reading levels in SAM complete two practice items, followed by two to five additional items, to determine the appropriate levels of difficulty for the first test administration.

**DIRECTIONS**

Use your headphones to listen to the directions as they are read aloud. Then click or tap **Next** to move on.

Answer three Practice Test questions, one at a time. For each question, click or tap the circle next to your answer choice. Then click or tap **Next**.

If you miss a Practice Test question, a message will pop up telling you to see your teacher for help.

**Reading Comprehension Assessment Test Items**
Students will answer 20 to 25 questions.

**DIRECTIONS**

1. Read each passage.
2. Read the corresponding question. Choose an answer by clicking or tapping on the answer. Change your answer by clicking or tapping on a different choice. You can also click or tap **Skip** to receive a new passage and question.

**TIP**

Students can use up to three skips on each Reading Comprehension Assessment without penalty. Suggest using skips if students are struggling with a particular item.
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Appendix I: Sample Diagnostic Items
An Ideal Assessment

Adaptive assessments are not new. However, the rise of technology and the growth of computer usage in schools have made large-scale, computer-adaptive testing more feasible and increasingly common. Adaptive assessments, like i-Ready Diagnostic, leverage advanced technology to provide a deep, customized evaluation of every student and to track student growth consistently and continuously over a student’s entire K–12 career. This is especially beneficial for identifying gaps from prior years as districts transition to the Common Core. i-Ready also provides valid and reliable growth metrics across a district and school environment to optimize administrative decision making for long-term performance improvements.

Adaptive Assessments Maximize Information on Student Performance

Adaptive assessments are frequently chosen for their high precision and efficiency, allowing educators to pinpoint student needs more accurately and in less time than with traditional fixed-form assessments. By dynamically selecting test items based on student response patterns, adaptive assessments are able to derive large amounts of information from a limited number of test items and can adapt to students with low and high ability to get a better assessment of student performance.

Many educators familiar with fixed-form assessments may have some questions about the information gained from an adaptive assessment: With a limited number of test items, how
can I be sure of the skills my students have and have not mastered? How do I know that my student has mastered a skill, if he has not been tested on it? This is where i-Ready’s sophisticated adaptive logic and a bank of thousands of test items come into play—pinpointing students’ needs in reading and math down to the domain and sub-skill levels.

Great effort was taken in building out the i-Ready item bank and adaptive logic to ensure that, for example, when a 5th grade student is still lacking mastery of Grade 4 standards, the system provides the teacher with what would help the student the most—recommendations for the below-level skills the student still lacks. On the other hand, when the student’s initial performance demonstrates the mastery of higher level skills, no time is wasted on needlessly assessing lower-level prerequisite skills.

For example, if a student is able to correctly solve a two-digit multiplication problem that requires re-grouping, then there is no need to assess that student on single-digit addition, a skill that is necessary to solve the initial multiplication problem. Yet, with a fixed-form test, multiple test items would be required to gain this same information! Because i-Ready Diagnostic already knows the student has a very high probability of answering questions aligned to these standards correctly, it tries to gain more information about the student’s ability level by providing questions that will offer more information about the student.

To explain the difference simply, let’s consider a test item:

Mary goes to the coffee shop. She can purchase a pound of coffee for $9 or 12 ounces for $7. Which is the better bargain?

The above example tests students on three different sets of skills:

1) Do they possess the algebraic thinking skills to set up the problem to compare fractions?

2) Do they know their measurement conversions?

3) Do they possess the computational skills to manipulate and solve the problem?

On a fixed-form assessment this problem may simply be considered an example of comparing fractions for a student who is “average;” it may in fact be too easy or difficult for a number of students.

On an adaptive assessment items are tagged so that trends can be seen and more information can be efficiently gathered. Once a student fails an item, additional items assessing the relevant sub-skills are drawn to get to the root cause of getting the first question wrong.

This is powerful to educators as it drives more precise targeting of instruction.
Adaptive Assessments Promote Accurate Measurement of Growth Across a Student’s Career

i-Ready makes measuring student growth easy, because of its use of a vertical scale for scoring. Think of it like a growth chart seen at a pediatrician’s office—every child can be measured on one chart. Similarly, i-Ready uses a vertical scale to measure which skills a student has gained from one point in time to the next, on a “chart” of skills that spans kindergarten through 12th grade. Educators can thereby measure student growth on a consistent scale throughout a student’s entire career. Because i-Ready Diagnostic was built on the Common Core, this “chart” consists of Common Core skills expected of students at each grade level.

For example, consider a student who takes a fixed-form summative assessment at the end of each year in grades 3, 4, and 5. Each year he answers 60% of the items correctly on the test. Because the fixed forms for each grade are different, the percent correct does not tell the teacher how much growth the student has made. Alternatively, if this student took an i-Ready Diagnostic assessment at the end of each year, his placement may go from Level 1 the first year, to Level 3, the next year and Mid 5 the following year, measuring how much growth the student has made from year to year.

Key Distinctions of Fixed-Form and Adaptive Assessments

**Fixed-Form Assessment**
- Assesses proficiency on grade-level skills, but does not allow educators to measure student proficiency on the same scale from year to year
  - Fixed forms, fixed item selection
  - Presents items based on prior design
  - Can be paper- or computer-based
  - Narrower scope (single grade level)
- Score usually presented as percent correct—e.g. 90%
- Test has difficulty providing detailed information about very high performing or very low performing students

**Adaptive Assessment**
- Assesses proficiency on both on-grade and off-grade level skills without the need for additional test items and testing time; a vertical scale provides a consistent metric
for measuring student progress across multiple grade levels

- Adaptive forms, dynamic item selection
- Presents items based on ongoing calculations of student ability
- Computer-based
- Broader scope possible (multiple grade levels)
- Score presented on the spectrum of ability across grades—e.g. 750 (on an 800-point vertical scale)
- Questions within the test adjust to the student’s ability
Adaptive Assessments Help Administrators Make Long-Term Decisions and Measure Impact

For administrators, an adaptive assessment has proven to be the most precise measure of student growth (Growth, Precision, and CAT: An Examination of Gain Score Conditional SEM by Tony D. Thompson, Research Report, December 2008). This real-time visibility enables immediate, effective course corrections.

Administrators using i-Ready are given insight into:

• Percent of students performing below, on, and above grade level
• Percent of students on track to meet annual growth expectations
• Details by school, grade, class, and student

How i-Ready Diagnostic Works

Adaptive Structure:
i-Ready Diagnostic adapts, or adjusts, until it finds exactly the level at which students need to receive instruction.

- When students answer questions correctly, i-Ready gives them more challenging questions
- When students answer questions incorrectly, i-Ready gives them less challenging questions
- This process continues. In the end, i-Ready pinpoints which skills each student has mastered and which skills

**How i-Ready Diagnostic Works (continued)**

**Upon completion of the adaptive Diagnostic, multiple types of scores are reported by i-Ready to enable a well-rounded view of each student’s proficiency levels:**

- **Scale Scores** – a common language across grades and schools. Scale scores put everything on a single continuum so that educators can compare across grade levels. They provide a metric, which indicates that a student has mastered skills up to a certain point and still needs to work on skills that come after that point
- **Placement Levels** – the practical day-to-day language that helps teachers determine what grade level of skills to focus on with a particular student. Placement levels indicate where students should be receiving instruction
- **Norm Scores** – identify how students are performing relative to their peers nationwide. Based on a nationally representative sample of students taking the i-Ready Diagnostic, they specify a student’s ranking compared to students in the same grade. For example, if a student’s percentile rank is 90%, this means the student scored better than or equal to 90% of her national peers from the same grade level

**Assessment Length:**
- Students receive 54–72 items per subject
- Students typically take 30–60 minutes per subject to complete the Diagnostic. Average duration varies by subject and grade level, with grades K–3 tending towards the shorter end of the range. Additionally, variability exists in every grade given different student performance levels.

**Content Areas:**
i-Ready assesses across the following content areas, also known as domains:

**Reading**
- Phonological Awareness
- Phonics & Word Recognition
- Vocabulary
- Reading Comprehension: Literature
- Reading Comprehension: Informational Text

**Mathematics**
- Counting and Cardinality
- Number & Operations in Base Ten
- Number & Operations – Fractions
- The Number System
- Number and Quantity
- Operations & Algebraic Thinking
- Ratios and Proportional Relationships

- Expressions and Equations
- Functions
- Algebra
- Measurement and Data
- Statistics and Probability
- Geometry
**Lexile® Measures** – developed by MetaMetrics®, Lexile measures are widely used as measures of text complexity and reading ability, allowing a direct link between the level of reading materials and the student’s ability to read those materials.

**Quantile® Measures** – developed by MetaMetrics, the Quantile Framework for Mathematics is a unique resource for accurately estimating a student’s ability to think mathematically and matching him/her with appropriate mathematical content.

Educators are also given explicit qualitative information on each student’s abilities:

- The specific skills students have mastered and those that need to be prioritized for instruction
- **Standard-by-standard analysis** that details student performance against Common Core standards and sub-skills

**Underlying Theory**

Computer adaptive testing and the Rasch Item Response Theory model form a strong foundation for ensuring valid inferences are reported by i-Ready Diagnostic.

In 1960, Georg Rasch developed the Rasch Item Response Theory Model. In this model, the logit value or difficulty level of the items are independent of the ability level of the student. These logit values can also be used to describe the ability level of the student. Using the Rasch Equation, it is possible to calculate the probability of success that a student of a certain ability would have with an item of a certain difficulty. In fact, if the difficulty level of the item and the ability level of the student are the same, then the student will have an even chance of answering the item correctly or incorrectly. This phenomenon is shown graphically in Appendix II using a Wright Map to show the progression of item difficulty through the grades.

i-Ready Diagnostic uses both adaptive testing and item response theory to determine the ability level of the student. From extensive field-testing of items with over 2,000,000 students, there exists a very strong and reliable foundation for determining the difficulty level of each item as well as each indicator group. An indicator group is a set of items aligned to a specific skill. From the ability level of the student and the difficulty level of these indicators, i-Ready can make probabilistic inferences about what students know and are likely able to do. Using this information, the assessment can accommodate students of far-ranging ability levels. Moreover, the results from the i-Ready Diagnostic can pinpoint students’ strengths and provide teachers with actionable information on what students should work on next.
Designed for Common Core Success

Successful transition to the CCSS requires visibility into student performance on the more rigorous assessments that are to come. Using measures that are highly correlated to Common Core-based assessments is a critical step, and i-Ready offers that solution.

Common Core support embedded

High School Math and Reading

- Assesses both procedural and conceptual fluency
- Presents a range of challenging informational and literary texts, including authentic texts and multimedia items
- Prepares for College and Career Readiness expectations, including the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) and Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) expectations

Using Assessment Data to Meet

into the entire program

- Covers more than 90% of assessable standards in Grades K–8 as well as most standards in
Individual Student Needs

The adaptive logic enables a deep, customized evaluation of every student, tracking student growth consistently and continuously over a student’s entire K–12 career and identifying gaps from prior years and areas for further enrichment.

The Diagnostic results directly drive instantaneous reports that detail each student’s proficiency levels and areas of need, highlighting immediate next steps for instruction and enabling individualized learning programs. The reports (i.e., Student Profile Report pictured below) provide teachers with an action plan to make targeted, differentiated instruction a reality. The system also provides the tools to deliver that instruction in any style learning environment—including both online lessons and teacher-led instruction.
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Tabitha Fernandez – Mathematics – Grade 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test 1-09/06/2013</th>
<th>Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number and Operations</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building Number and Operations Skills

Number and Operations in grades K-8 focuses on representing, comparing, and performing operations with numbers. As in the CCSS, this domain includes whole numbers, decimals, fractions, integers, and irrational numbers, and emphasizes both conceptual understanding and computation. In grades 3-5, students gain an understanding of fractions and decimals and develop fluency with all four operations involving whole numbers, fractions, and decimals.

What Tabitha Can Do

Results indicate that Tabitha can likely do the skills shown below.

**Base Ten**
- Model three-digit numbers.
- Compare and order three-digit numbers.
- Know multiplication facts through 9 x 9.

**Fractions**
- Identify fractions (1/2, 1/4, 1/8) as parts of a whole using pictures.
- Identify fractions that name part of a whole (denominators of 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12).

Next Steps for Instruction

Results indicate that Tabitha will benefit from instruction and practice in the skills shown below.

**Base Ten**
- Know division facts through 81 ÷ 9.
- Add multi-digit numbers.
- Subtract multi-digit numbers.
- Multiply two-digit numbers by one-digit numbers.

**Fractions**
- Identify fractions shown on a number line.
- Use models to find equivalent fractions.
- Write equivalent fractions, including fractions in simplest form.
- Decompose a fraction into a sum of fractions with like denominators.
- Add and subtract fractions with like denominators.

Tools for Instruction

- Know Division Facts
- Subtract Multi-Digit Numbers
- Fractions on the Number Line
- Find Equivalent Fractions

Recommended Print Products

If you have this product... Use...

Ready® Common Core
- Grade 3
  - Lesson 4: Understand the Meaning of Division, p. 30
  - Lesson 5: Understand How Multiplication and Division Are Connected, p. 36
  - Lesson 6: Multiplication and Division Facts, p. 42
  - Lesson 9: Use Place Value to Add and Subtract, p. 72
  - Lesson 10: Use Place Value to Multiply, p. 84
  - Lesson 15: Understand Fractions on a Number Line, p. 138
  - Lesson 16: Understand Equivalent Fractions, p. 144
Conclusion

In summary, i-Ready Diagnostic is a computer-delivered, adaptive assessment in Reading and Mathematics for students in Kindergarten through High School. This assessment was developed to serve several purposes:

• Accurately and efficiently assess student knowledge by adapting to each student’s ability for the content strands within each subject. Offer an accurate assessment of student knowledge, which can be monitored over a period of time to measure student growth

• Provide valid and reliable information on skills students are likely to have mastered and the recommended next steps for instruction

• Link assessment results to instructional advice and student placement decisions

APPENDIX I Sample Diagnostic Items

All items within the Diagnostic were specifically built to assess students against key Common Core skill areas. Below are sample Diagnostic items from both Reading and Math, across multiple grades. Features technology-enhanced items as
Reading

Level 3 – Reading Comprehension
Mathematics

Level 12 – Reading Comprehension

Highlight text in passage to record right answer

Compare and contrast using multimedia
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Appendix E: Wilson Reading System Curriculum

Curriculum

The Wilson Reading System® (WRS) directly teaches the structure of the English language using an organized and sequential system in 12 Steps, not corresponded to school grade levels. It provides a complete curriculum for explicitly and systematically teaching decoding and encoding (spelling). From the beginning steps of the program, instruction also addresses high frequency/sight words, fluency, vocabulary, oral expressive language development and comprehension with progressively more challenging text. Throughout the program, the teacher follows a 10-part lesson plan that provides for extensive teacher-student interaction and multisensory learning methods.

Key components directly addressed in the Wilson Reading System are:

- Phonemic awareness
- Alphabetic principle (sound/symbol relationship)
- Decoding
- Encoding (spelling)
- Advanced word analysis
- High frequency/sight word instruction
- Vocabulary development
- Fluency
- Oral expressive language development
- Listening and reading comprehension with visualization

Fluency, Vocabulary, and Comprehension

Throughout the 12 Steps, students work on fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension skills.

Single word automaticity and fluency with connected text are part of each Wilson lesson. Students have multiple opportunities to develop quick and automatic word recognition in Parts 3 and 4 of the lesson. To help build fluency, students are provided opportunities to read and reread sentences (Part 5), and decodable passages (Part 9). Decodable text is used to develop prosody and expression. Students use a penciling technique to scoop the sentences and passages into phrases in order to learn to read the passages with prosody, or phrasing with proper intonation. The phrasing provides the natural pauses that occur within sentences, with an attention to the meaning, echo and choral reading is used. The Wilson Fluency®/Basic Kit is a supplemental program designed to provide explicit fluency instruction and reading practice to develop the application of skills with connected text. Additionally there are timed fluency drills for each step provided on the Wilson Academy.

Vocabulary is explicitly addressed in each WRS lesson plan. Vocabulary words are targeted in decoding and spelling activities in Parts 2, 3, 7, and 8 of the lesson plan and thoroughly embedded in instruction with connected text in Parts 5, 9 and 10 of the lesson plan. Teachers completing the WRS Level I Certification program further understand how to carefully choose targeted words with high curricular/academic utility from the appropriate substep and to integrate vocabulary instruction into each lesson.

Comprehension strategies are specifically addressed in Parts 9 and 10 of the daily lesson plan. In Part 9 of the lesson, students practice fluent reading with short, decodable passages that are included with each substep. These controlled passages allow students with emerging decoding skills the opportunity to develop fluency and reading comprehension strategies. Part 10 provides teachers with the opportunity to engage students deeply in a broad range of high-quality, increasingly
Lesson Plan

Teachers follow a 10-part lesson plan during each Wilson Reading System® (WRS) session. A full lesson requires 90 minutes. The lesson plan moves at a quick pace with constant interaction between teacher and student. It is divided into 3 Blocks.

- **Block 1: Parts 1-5** emphasize word study.
- **Block 2: Parts 6-8** emphasize spelling.
- **Block 3: Parts 9-10** emphasize fluency and comprehension.

**Block 1: Lesson Plan Parts 1-5**

30 minutes: word study; phonemic awareness, decoding, vocabulary, single word accuracy/automaticity, phrasing/prosody, fluency and comprehension at the sentence level

**Block 2: Lesson Plan Parts 6-8**

30 minutes: spelling, sight word instruction, vocabulary, proofreading

**Block 3: Lesson Plan Parts 9-10**

Materials

Wilson Reading System® (WRS) materials for both teachers and students are extensive so that the focus can be on diagnostic instruction. All WRS materials use a color-coded and numbered system for a highly organized reading program.

All materials and texts are phonetically controlled, containing wordlists, sentences, and short stories that incorporate only the elements of word structure that have been taught up to the corresponding lesson.

Two levels of vocabulary are provided within all of the substep materials. Level A words, sentences, and stories are appropriate for elementary students, English language learners, and older students with limited vocabularies. The words, sentences, and stories in Level B
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IS A SINGLE OR MULTICOMPONENT READING INTERVENTION

Excerpts from Lessons 7, 28, & 58
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All students start with Lesson 1.

**Phonics Boost Lessons—Book 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Phonological and Phonemic Awareness</th>
<th>Phonics Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Introduce Phonics Boost Lessons Teach Oral Reading Marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Teach Oral Reading Scoring Practice Oral Reading Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Definition of a Phoneme Introduce <em>Finger-Stretching</em> Phonemes</td>
<td><em>Short a</em> and <em>Short i</em> Letter Sounds Consonant Letter Sounds Introduce <em>Build a Word</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Short a</em> and <em>Long a</em> Phonemes</td>
<td>Closed Syllables, Introduce <em>Word Sort</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Review <em>Short a</em> and <em>Long a</em> Phonemes with Segmenting</td>
<td>Introduce Nonsense Words Introduce <em>Detective Work</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Review <em>Short a</em> and <em>Long a</em> Phonemes with Blending</td>
<td><em>Short o</em> Letter Sound, Introduce <em>Words to Read</em> and <em>Sentences to Read</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>Short i</em> and <em>Long i</em> Phonemes</td>
<td><em>Digraph</em> <em>sh</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Review <em>Short i</em> and <em>Long i</em> Phonemes with Segmenting</td>
<td><em>Short u</em> Letter Sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Review <em>Short i</em> and <em>Long i</em> Phonemes with Blending</td>
<td><em>Digraph</em> <em>th</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>Short o</em> and <em>Long o</em> Phonemes</td>
<td><em>Short e</em> Letter Sound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IS A SINGLE OR MULTICOMPONENT READING INTERVENTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Phonemic Awareness</th>
<th>Phonics Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Review <em>Short o</em> and <em>Long o</em> Phonemes with Segmenting</td>
<td><em>Digraph ch</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Review <em>Short o</em> and <em>Long o</em> Phonemes with Blending</td>
<td><em>Digraphs wh</em> and <em>ph</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>Short e</em> and <em>Long e</em> Phonemes</td>
<td>Spelling with Doubled Letters <em>ff, ll, ss</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Review <em>Short e</em> and <em>Long e</em> Phonemes with Segmenting</td>
<td>Spelling with <em>Digraph ck</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Review <em>Short e</em> and <em>Long e</em> Phonemes with Blending</td>
<td><em>Trigraphs tch</em> and <em>dge</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><em>Short u</em> and <em>Long u</em> (/y/) Phonemes</td>
<td>Final 2-Sound Blends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Review <em>Short u</em> and <em>Long u</em> (/y/) Phonemes with Segmenting</td>
<td>Initial 2-Sound Blends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Review <em>Short u</em> and <em>Long u</em> (/y/) Phonemes with Blending</td>
<td>3-Sound Blends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>Phonological Awareness</strong>: Identifying Syllables Using Whale Talk, Syllable Stomp, and SyllaBoards™</td>
<td>Digraph Blends and <em>squ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>Phonological Awareness</strong>: Review Blending Syllables</td>
<td>Suffix –s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td><strong>Phonological Awareness</strong>: Review Blending Syllables</td>
<td>Suffix –es</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Other Vowel Phoneme /#/</td>
<td><em>ang, ing, ong, ung, ank, ink, onk, unk</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Review Other Vowel Phoneme /#/ with Segmenting</td>
<td>Reading Two-Syllable Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Review Other Vowel Phoneme /#/ with Blending</td>
<td>Spelling Two-Syllable Words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All students start with Lesson 1.

**Phonics Boost Lessons—Book 2**
25 Other Vowel Phoneme /oi/  
Schwa (/ə/)

- Review Other Vowel Phoneme /oi/ 26 with Segmenting
  - Reading Challenging Words with Three or More Syllables

- Review Other Vowel Phoneme /oi/ 27 with Blending
  - Reading More Challenging Words with Three or More Syllables

- Other Vowel Phoneme /ou/ 28
  - Reading Most Challenging Words with Three or More Syllables

29 Review Other Vowel Phoneme /ou/ with Segmenting
- Spelling Words with Three or More Syllables

30 Review Other Vowel Phoneme /ou/ with Blending
- Suffix –ed Adds Syllable /ed/

31 Other Vowel Phoneme /p/
- Suffix –ed Adds Sound /d/ or /t/

32 Review Other Vowel Phoneme /p/ with Segmenting
- One-Syllable Words with Suffix –ed

33 Review Other Vowel Phoneme /p/ with Blending
- Multi-Syllable Words with Suffix –ed

34 R-controlled Vowel Phoneme /or/
- Pay Attention to Consonant Suffixes

- Review R-controlled Vowel Phoneme /or/ 35 with Segmenting
  - Pay Attention to Vowel Suffixes

36 R-controlled Vowel Phoneme /ar/
- Adding Consonant Suffixes to Closed-Syllable Words

- Review R-controlled Vowel Phoneme /ar/ 37 with Segmenting
  - 1-1-1 Doubling Rule

38 R-controlled Vowel Phoneme /er/
- The Letters ar Spell /ar/ and the Letters or Spell /or/

- Review R-controlled Vowel Phoneme /er/ 39 with Segmenting
  - Four Spellings for /er/: er, ir, ur, and ear in One-Syllable Words

- Review R-controlled Vowel Phonemes 40 with Blending
  - Four Spellings for /er/: er, ir, ur, and ear in Multi-Syllable Words
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Scope and Sequence Continued

All students start with Lesson 1.
### Phonics Boost Lessons—Book 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Phonics Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Two Additional Spellings of /er/: or and ar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Consonant-le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Other Spellings of /əl/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>y as a Vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Open Syllables in Two-Syllable Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Open Syllables in Words with Three or More Syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Consonant-le with Open Syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td><em>Hard</em> and <em>Soft c</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td><em>Hard</em> and <em>Soft g</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td><em>Soft g</em> Exceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Vowel-Consonant-E in One-Syllable Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Vowel-Consonant-E in Two-Syllable Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Vowel-Consonant-E in Words with Three or More Syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Vowel-Consonant-E Spelling Schwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Reading Words with <em>e</em> Dropped to Add a Vowel Suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Spelling Words with <em>e</em> Dropped to Add a Vowel Suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Odd Syllables: <em>tion</em>, <em>sion</em>, <em>ture</em>, and <em>cious</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Six Spellings of <em>Long o</em>: <em>o</em>, <em>oa</em>, <em>ow</em>, <em>oe</em>, <em>o-e</em>, and <em>ough</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Six Spellings of <em>Long o</em> in Words with Three or More Syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Six Spellings of <em>Long a</em>: <em>a</em>, <em>ai</em>, <em>ay</em>, <em>a-e</em>, <em>eigh</em>, and <em>ea</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Phonics Boost Lessons—Book 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Phonics Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Six Spellings of <em>Long a</em> in Words with Three or More Syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Five Spellings of <em>Long i</em>: i, ie, y, i-e, and igh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Five Spellings of <em>Long i</em> in Words with Three or More Syllables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Three Spellings of <em>Long e</em>: e, ee, and ea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Four Additional Spellings of <em>Long e</em>: ie, y, ey, and e-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>The Letter i Spells <em>Long e</em> in an Open Syllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Eight Spellings of <em>Long e</em>: e, ee, ea, ie, y, ey, e-e, and i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Four Spellings of <em>Long u</em>: u, u-e, ue, and ew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Six Spellings of /ɔː/ as in <em>Food</em>: oo, ou, ew, u, ue, and u-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Two Spellings of /oi/: oi and oy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Two Spellings of /ɔ/ as in <em>Book</em>: oo and u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Two Spellings of /ou/: ou and ow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Two Spellings of /aw/: aw and au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>The Letters ow Spell Two Sounds: /ɔː/ as in <em>Snow</em> and /ow/ as in <em>Cow</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>The Letters oo Spell Two Sounds: /ɔː/ as in <em>Food</em> and /ɔ/ as in <em>Book</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>The Letters ea Spell Three Sounds: /eɪ/ as in <em>Eat</em>, /ɛ/ as in <em>Bread</em>, /æ/ as in <em>Steak</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Two Vowels Together Can Spell Two Sounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>More Words with Two Vowels Spelling Two Sounds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prefixes

Prefix or Not?
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Lesson Plan Book 1
Lesson Plan 7
OBJECTIVES

Phonemic Awareness
- To understand that the phoneme /ĭ/ is the same as the name of the letter i.
- To accurately segment single-syllable words with short i and long i phonemes.
- To accurately identify short i and long i phonemes in spoken words.

Phonics Concept
- To understand that a digraph is two letters that spell one sound.
- To understand that the letters sh are a digraph that spell the sound /sh/.
- To accurately read and spell words with the phoneme /sh/ spelled with digraph sh.

LESSON OUTLINE

I. Oral Reading - page 139
II. Phonemic Awareness - page 140
1. State
2. Remind students during Phonemic Awareness.
3. short i phoneme
4. long i phoneme
5. Segment i phoneme

III. Phonics Concept - page 146
1. State
2. digraph sh
3. Build digraph sh.
4. Build nonsense words with digraph sh.

IV. Student Practice - page 153
1.
2.
3.
4. Sentences

WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW

Phonemic Awareness
- Short i is the first phoneme in the word itch.
- The symbol for the short i phoneme is /ĭ/.
- Long i is the first phoneme in the word island.
- The symbol for the long i phoneme is /ī/.

Phonics Concept
Digraphs
- A consonant digraph is two letters that make one sound: ch in chat, sh in shop, th in thin, wh in whale, ph in phone, ck in duck, ng in sang, and gh in tough.
We teach only the digraphs ch, sh, th, wh, ph and ck in Phonics Boost lessons. The digraph ng is taught as part of the “chunks” ang, ing, ong, and ung in Lesson 22.

- The digraph th has an unvoiced sound (the vocal chords are not used) as in thumb and a voiced sound (the vocal chords are used) as in that.
- See the What You Need to Know section of Lesson 9 (page 179) to learn more about digraph th.

Materials

For a list of Standard Lesson Materials see Appendix B.

Teacher Materials
For Phonics Concept in This Lesson
- Large letter tiles a–z, digraph sh
- Colored tiles
- Write on board:

A digraph is 2 letters that spell one sound.

Teacher board is illustrated like this in lesson plans:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Student Materials
For Phonics Concept in This Lesson
- Holding whiteboard with tiles
- Working whiteboard

Student board is illustrated like this in lesson plans:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Optional Materials for Overhead Projector
- Overhead Transparencies
  7.1 - Word Sort
  7.2 - Detective Work
- Wet erase markers
- Paper to cover answers

Complete directions for Phonics Boost activities and routines are in Appendix A.

Teacher’s notes and Observations:
I. ORaL REadInG
WRITE THE DATE AND READERS’ NAMES ON PASSAGE PAGE

1. Students write in the date.
2. Students write in the names of the Readers.

TEACHER AND STUDENTS REVIEW VOCABULARY (Words to Preview)

1. Teacher reads the word.
2. Students point to and read the word.
3. Teacher reads the definition.
4. An individual student reads the sentence.

READER #1 READS FOR ONE MINUTE

1. Reader stands and faces the class to read.
2. Teacher times Reader for one minute.
3. Teacher and students mark errors as Reader reads.
4. Teacher and students review errors.
5. Teacher and students score Reader #1.

READER #2 READS FOR ONE MINUTE

1. Repeat Reader #1 steps for Reader #2.

READER #3 READS FOR ONE MINUTE

1. Repeat Reader #1 steps for Reader #3.

READERS CHART ACCURACY PERCENTAGE & WCPM

1. Students who read chart their scores on their own Tracking Charts.

ORal REadInG

Lesson 7 Passage

Teacher Materials

• Passages
• Two

Student Materials

• Passages
• Two

Oral Reading Reminders:

• Words to Preview is an introduction to the vocabulary, not a vocabulary lesson.
Readers stand and face class, so it is easy for other students to hear.

Readers must read loudly enough for all to hear.

A Reader stuck on a word may ask for the word to be provided. Do not provide the word until the student asks for it.

**Scoring Reminders:**

- Self-corrections do not count as errors.
- Hyphenated words count as one word.
- Added words count as errors.
- Numbers count as one error.

II. **PhOnEMIC aWaREnESS**

**Short i and Long i Phonemes**

**STATE OBJECTIVES**

1. State the objectives of the Phonemic Awareness part of the lesson:
   1. To understand that the long i phoneme is the same as the name of the letter i.
   2. To accurately segment phonemes in single-syllable words with short i and long i.
   3. To accurately identify the short i and long i phonemes in spoken words.

**REMIND STUDENTS NO PRINT OR LETTERS ARE USED DURING PHONEMIC AWARENESS**

1. Remind students that in this part of the lesson:
   1. Students will be listening to phonemes in words without looking at or naming letters.
   2. Students are to say the phonemes not the letter names.
   3. Teacher will not write words or letters.
   4. Teacher will not say letter names.

**REVIEW **SHORT I PHONEME - /i/ **

1. Explain what will happen next:
1. **Students** will stretch phonemes in words with the **short i** phoneme.

2. Review **short i** phoneme and movement:
   1. **Teacher** reminds students that the **short i** phoneme is /ĭĭĭĭĭ/.
   2. **Teacher** makes the **short i** “itch” movement while saying the phoneme /ĭĭĭĭĭ/.
   3. **Students** make the **short i** “itch” movement as they say /ĭĭĭĭĭ/.
   3. Stretch words with **short i** phoneme.

   **I**

   **Teacher** stretches word with **short i** phoneme:
   1. **Teacher** says **kit**.
   2. **Teacher** stretches the phonemes in **kit** - /k/ /ĭ/ /t/, **kit**.

3. **Teacher** says:
   1. The vowel phoneme is /ĭĭĭĭĭ/.
   2. I know the vowel phoneme /ĭĭĭĭĭ/ is short because /ĭĭĭĭĭ/ is the first phoneme in **itch** (while making the **short i** “itch” movement).
REVIEW SHORT I PHONEME - /ĭ/ - Continued

3. Stretch words with short i phoneme - Continued

Teacher and students stretch word with short i phoneme:

1. Teacher says limb.
2. Students repeat limb.
3. Teacher and students stretch phonemes in limb - /l/ /ĭ/ /m/, limb.
4. Teacher and students say:
   1. The vowel phoneme is /ĭĭĭĭĭ/.
   2. I know the vowel phoneme /ĭĭĭĭĭ/ is short because /ĭĭĭĭĭ/ is the first phoneme in iiiitch (while making the short i “itch” movement).

YOU DO

Students stretch words with short i “itch” phoneme:

1. Individual students stretch phonemes in the words below.
2. After student stretches the phonemes, teacher asks the student:
   1. What is the vowel phoneme?
   2. Is the vowel phoneme long or short? (Be sure students say /ĭĭĭĭĭ/ not short i sou)

bid /b/ /ĭ/ /d/ chin /ch/ /ĭ/ /n/ dig /d/ /ĭ/ /g/
lick /l/ /ĭ/ /k/ zip /z/ /ĭ/ /p/ if /ĭ/ /f/

TEACH LONG I PHONEME - /ī/ - Continued

1. Introduce long i phoneme and movement:
   1. Teacher tells students that the long i phoneme is /ĭĭĭĭĭ/.
   2. Students repeat the long i phoneme /ĭĭĭĭĭ/.
   3. Teacher tells students that the long i phoneme is the first phoneme in the word island.
   4. Teacher explains to students that /ĭĭĭĭĭ/ is also the name of the letter i.
5. Teacher says /ɪ/ while writing the lowercase letter i in the air with index finger.

6. Students repeat /ɪ/ as they write the lowercase letter i in the air with index fingers.

2. Remind students they can use the posters to check if a vowel phoneme is short or long:

![Short Vowels Poster]

1. Teacher points to the short i section of the Short Vowels poster.

2. Teacher reminds students they can check the vowel phoneme by reading the sentence:
   “I know /ɪ/ is short because /ɪ/ is the first phoneme in itch.”

3. Teacher points to the long i section of the Long Vowels poster.

4. Teacher shows students they can check the vowel phoneme by reading the sentence:
   “I know /ɪ/ is long because /ɪ/ is the name of the letter i.”
Positive Error Correction

If a student incorrectly stretches the phonemes:
1. Teacher tells student which phonemes were correct.
2. Teacher repeats the word.
3. Student says the word, listening for the missed phoneme(s), and stretches the phonemes again.
4. If necessary, teacher or other students stretch the phonemes for the student correctly.
5. Student independently stretches the phonemes correctly.

Always finish with student independently stretching the phonemes correctly.

ʊ TEACH LONG I PHONEME - /ɪ/ - Continued

3. Explain that students will stretch words with long i vowel phoneme.

Teacher stretches word with long i phoneme:

1. Teacher says bike.
2. Teacher stretches the phonemes in bike - /b/ /ɪ/ /k/, bike.

Teacher and students stretch word with long i phoneme:

1. Teacher says time.
2. Students repeat time.
3. Teacher and students together stretch phonemes in time - /t/ /ɪ/ /m/, time.

Teacher and students say:

1. The vowel phoneme is /ɪɪɪ/.
2. I know the vowel phoneme /ɪɪɪ/ is long because /ɪɪɪ/ is the name of the letter i (while writing the lowercase letter i in the air).

Teacher stretches word with long i phoneme:

1. Individual students stretch phonemes in the
words below.

2. After student stretches the phonemes, teacher asks the student:

1. What is the vowel phoneme?
2. Is the vowel phoneme long or short?
   (Be sure students say, “/ĭĭĭĭĭ/,” not “the long i sound.”)
3. How do you know the vowel phoneme is (long or short)?
   (Student can answer with his own words or)

**SEGMENT WORDS TO IDENTIFY SHORT I AND LONG I PHONEMES**

1. Explain that students will stretch phonemes in words with short i and long i and decide if the vowel phoneme is long or short.

Teacher stretches word with short i phoneme:

1. Teacher says chin.
2. Teacher stretches the phonemes in chin - /ch/ /ĭ/ /n/, chin.

Teacher says:

1. The vowel phoneme is /ĭĭĭĭĭ/.
2. I know the vowel phoneme /ĭĭĭĭĭ/ is short because /ĭĭĭĭĭ/ is the first phoneme in iiiiiitch (while making the short i “itch” movement).

Teacher stretches word with long i phoneme:

1. Teacher says rhyme.
2. Teacher stretches the phonemes in rhyme - /r/ /ĭ/ /m/, rhyme.

Teacher says:

1. The vowel phoneme is /ĭĭĭĭĭ/.
2. I know the vowel phoneme /ĭĭĭĭĭ/ is long because /ĭĭĭĭĭ/ is the name of the letter
i (while writing the lowercase letter i in the air).

**Teacher** and **students** stretch word with **short i** phoneme:

1. **Teacher** says **dish**.
2. **Students** repeat **dish**.
3. **Teacher** and **students** stretch phonemes in **dish** - /d/ /i/ /sh/, **dish**.
4. **Teacher** and **students** say:
   1. The vowel phoneme is /ĭĭĭĭĭ/.
   2. I know the vowel phoneme /ĭĭĭĭĭ/ is short because /ĭĭĭĭĭ/ is the first phoneme in **itch** (while making the **short i** “itch” movement).

**Teacher** and **students** stretch word with **long i** phoneme:

1. **Teacher** says **size**.
2. **Students** repeat **size**.
3. **Teacher** and **students** stretch phonemes in **size** - /s/ /i/ /z/, **size**.
4. **Teacher** and **students** say:
   1. The vowel phoneme is /ĭĭĭĭĭ/.
   2. I know the vowel phoneme /ĭĭĭĭĭ/ is long because /ĭĭĭĭĭ/ is the name of the letter i (while writing the lowercase letter i in the air).

**SEGMENT WORDS TO IDENTIFY SHORT I AND LONG I PHONEMES - Continued**

**Students** stretch words with **short i** and **long i** phonemes:

1. **Individual students** stretch phonemes in the words below.
2. **Teacher** asks the student the following questions:
   1. What is the vowel phoneme?
      (If the student responds with “The i sound,” say, “That is the name of a letter. What is the phoneme?”)
   2. Is the vowel phoneme long or short?
3. How do you know the vowel phoneme is (long or short)?

(Student can answer with his own words or by reading the sentence on the poster.)

- mice /m/ /ī/ /s/
- write /r/ /ī/ /t/
- ride /r/ /ī/ /d/
- lime /l/ /ī/
- kid /k/ /ī/
- /d/
- hike /h/ /ī/
- /k/ /ī/
- tip /t/ /ī/ /p/
- sight /s/ /ī/ /t/
- lip /l/ /ī/ /p/
- bid /b/ /ī/ /d/
- vine /v/ /ī/ /n/
- Jim /j/ /ī/ /m/
- my /m/ /ī/
- kite /k/ /ī/ /t/
- sigh /s/ /ī/
- ice /ī/
- /s/
- pit /p/ /ī/ /t/
- mine /m/ /ī/ /n/
- in /ī/ /n/
- like /l/ /ī/ /k/
- height /h/ /ī/ /v/
- hi /h/ /ī/
- rid /r/ /ī/ /d/
- Mitch /m/ /ū/ /ch/

II. PhOnICS COnCEPT

Digraph sh

Teacher Materials

- Large sh

- Write

A digraph is 2 letters that spell one sound.

Student Materials

- Holding
- Working

STATE OBJECTIVES

1. State the objectives of the Phonics Concept part of the lesson:
   1. To understand that a digraph is two letters that spell one sound.
   2. To understand that the letters sh are a digraph that spells the sound /sh/.
   3. To accurately read and spell words in which the digraph sh

2. Remind students:
   1. When we understand letter sounds, we can read more accurately.

○ TEACH DIGRAPH SH
1. *Students* place materials on desks. See list above.

2. Explain digraphs:
   1. *Teacher* tells students that some sounds are spelled with two letters.
   2. *Teacher* explains that these are called digraphs.

3. Read the definition on the board:

   A digraph is 2 letters that spell one sound.

4. Teach the sound /sh/ with a movement:
   1. *Teacher* says the sound /sh/.
   2. *Teacher* says the sound /sh/ and shows the movement:
      - Forefinger to mouth as if asking someone to be quiet - /sh/.
   3. *Students* repeat the sound while making the movement.
● TEACH DIGRAPHSH - Continued

5. Teach the digraph spelling sh:

1. Teacher holds up the letter tile sh.

2. Teacher explains that the two letters sh together spell the sound /sh/.

3. Teacher points out that the two letters are on one tile because together they spell the one sound /sh/.

4. Students point to the letter tile sh on their holding boards.

5. Students say the sound /sh/.

● BUILD REAL WORDS WITH DIGRAPHSH

1. Teacher and students build words with digraph sh.

1. Teacher explains that students will build real words with digraph sh.

Teacher builds mash:

1. Teacher says mash.

2. Teacher stretches the sounds - /m/ /ă/ /sh/, mash.

3. Teacher puts one colored tile on the board for each sound in mash while saying the sound - /m/ /ă/ /sh/.

4. Teacher spells each sound by placing a letter tile above each colored tile while saying the sound - /m/ /ă/ /sh/. 
5. **Teacher** uses Touch & Say to read **mash**- /m/ /ā/ /sh/, **mash**.

6. **Teacher** points out that the two letters **sh** spell one sound /sh/.

7. **Teacher** clears board.

**BUILD REAL WORDS WITH DIGRAPH SH - Continued**

**WE DO**

Teacher and students together build the word **shop**:

1. **Teacher** says **shop**.
2. **Students** repeat **shop**.
3. **Teacher** and **students** stretch the sounds - /sh/ /ō/ /p/, **shop**.
4. **Teacher** and **students** put one colored tile on the board for each sound in **shop** while saying the sound - /sh/ /ō/ /p/.

5. **Teacher** asks **individual students** the following questions to lead students in spelling each sound by placing letter tiles above the colored tiles, one at a time:

   1. What is the first sound you hear? (/sh/)
   2. What letters spell /sh/? (sh)
   3. Do we use one tile or two? (one)
   4. Why? (because **sh** spells one sound.)
   5. What is the next sound you hear? (/ō/)
   6. What letter spells /ō/? (o)
   7. What is the last sound you hear in **shop**? (/p/)
   8. What letter spells /p/? (p)

6. **Teacher** and **students** use Touch & Say to read **shop** - /sh/ /ō/ /p/, **shop**.

Teacher and students clear boards.
BUILD REAL WORDS WITH **DIGRAPH SH** - Continued

**YOU DO**

Students build words with **digraph sh**:

1. **Teacher** explains that students are going to use colored tiles and letter tiles to build four familiar words with the **digraph sh** sound.

2. **Teacher** dictates each of the following words using the sentences below:

   1. **wish** - Did you make a **wish** as you blew out your birthday candles?
   2. **shot** - Sandra got 3 points for that basketball **shot**.
   3. **dash** - I will **dash** home after school to see my new puppy.
   4. **shin** - Juan yelped in pain when he bumped his **shin** on the corner of the bench.

3. After **teacher** dictates each word, **all students** build the words one at a time:

   1. **Students** say the word.
   2. **Students** stretch the sounds in the word.
   3. **Students** put one colored tile on boards for each sound while saying the sound.

```
[Colorful tiles representing words]
```

4. **Students** spell the word by placing one letter tile above each colored tile.

```
[w i sh] [s h o t]
[d a sh] [sh i n]
```

5. **Students** use Touch & Say to read the word.

6. **Students** hold up their boards so **teacher** can check their spelling.
7. Teacher checks students’ work, providing positive error correction as needed.

8. Students clear boards.
BUILD NONSENSE WORDS WITH

DIGRAPH SH

1. Teacher and students build nonsense words with *digraph sh*.

1. Teacher explains that students will build nonsense words with *digraph sh*.

   Teacher builds the nonsense word *dosh*:
   1. Teacher says *dosh*.
   2. Teacher stretches the sounds - /d/ /o/ /sh/.
   3. Teacher puts one colored tile on the board for each sound in *dosh* while saying the sound - /d/ /o/ /sh/.

   ![Colored Tiles]

   4. Teacher spells each sound by placing a letter tile above each colored tile while saying the sound - /d/ /o/ /sh/.

   ![Letter Tiles]

   5. Teacher uses Touch & Say to read *dosh* - /d/ /o/ /sh/.

   6. Teacher points out that the two letters *sh* spell one sound /sh/.

   7. Teacher clears board.

DIGRAPH SH - Continued

Teacher and students together build the word *shap*:

1. Teacher says *shap*.

2. Students repeat *shap*.

3. Teacher and students stretch the sounds - /sh/ /a/ /p/, *shap*.

4. Teacher and students put one colored tile on the board for each sound in *shap* while saying the sound - /sh/ /a/ /p/.
4 BUILD NONSENSE WORDS WITH

5. **Teacher** asks individual students the following questions to lead students in spelling each sound by placing letter tiles above the colored tiles, one at a time:

   1. What is the first sound you hear? (/sh/)
   2. What letters spell /sh/? (sh)
   3. Do we use one tile or two? (one)
   4. Why? (because **sh** spells one sound.)
   5. What is the next sound you hear? (/ä/)
   6. What letter spells /ä/? (a)
   7. What is the last sound you hear in **shap**? (/p/)
   8. What letter spells /p/? (p)

6. **Teacher** and students use **Touch & Say** to read **shap** - /sh/ /ä/ /p/, **shap**.

7. **Teacher** and students clear boards.

**DIGRAPh SH - Continued**

**YOU DO**

**Students** build words with **digraph sh**:

1. **Teacher** explains that students are going to use colored tiles and letter tiles to build five nonsense words with the **digraph sh**.

2. **Teacher** dictates each of the following words:

   1. **shaz**
   2. **shog**
   3. **nish**
   4. **fash**
   5. **lish**
BUILD NONSENSE WORDS WITH

3. After teacher dictates each word, all students build the words one at a time:
   1. Students say the word.
   2. Students stretch the sounds in the word.
   3. Students put one colored tile on boards for each sound while saying the sound.

4. Students spell the word by placing one letter tile above each colored tile.

5. Students use Touch & Say to read the word.
6. Students hold up their boards so teacher can check their spelling.
7. Teacher checks students’ work, providing positive error correction as needed.
8. Students clear boards.
IV. Student Practice

Student Materials

- Pencil

Optional Materials for Overhead Projector

- Overhead
  - 7.1
  - 7.2
- Wet
- Paper

WORD SORT  Digraph or No Digraph

1. *Teacher* explains that words will be sorted by whether or not they have a digraph.

2. *Teacher* leads students in sorting the first two words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Digraph</th>
<th>Digraph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bit</td>
<td></td>
<td>cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lot</td>
<td></td>
<td>dish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. *Teacher* and students underline the digraph in *cash*.

4. *Students* independently sort the remaining words, underlining the digraphs as each word is sorted.

5. *Teacher* and students check answers.
Word Sort Answers - Lesson 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Digraph</th>
<th>Digraph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bit</td>
<td>cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lot</td>
<td>dish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tab</td>
<td>shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gap</td>
<td>mash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ram</td>
<td>shag</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DETECTIVE WORK

Column 1 - Teacher models one word at a time and repeat:

1. Teacher:
   1. Underlines each grapheme and says the sound.
   - Underline digraphs with one line to show that they spell one sound.

1. mash

2. Reads the word.

2. Students repeat:
   1. Underline each grapheme and say the sound.
   2. Read the word.

Column 2 - Students work in pairs:

1. One student as Reader reads the column to the other student as Checker.
2. *Students* reverse roles.

**Column 3** - *Students* repeat steps for Column 2.

| Students do not underline any letters in Columns 2 and 3. |
|---------------|------------------|
| Students read the words *without* sounding out in Columns 2 and 3. Both students in each pair read Columns 2 and 3. |
**Column 1** – Work with your teacher to underline the graphemes, say the sound, and read the words. Underline digraphs with one line.

**Column 2** – Trade books with a partner. Both partners read the words in the column. Take turns as Reader and Checker. Do not underline or say sounds, simply read the words.

**Column 3** – Repeat partner work. Both partners read the words, taking turns as Reader and Checker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Read with teacher.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Both partners read this column once.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Both partners read this column once.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>m a s h</strong></td>
<td>1. shin</td>
<td>1. hash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>s h o t</strong></td>
<td>2. dish</td>
<td>2. shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>d a s h</strong></td>
<td>3. rash</td>
<td>3. dash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>s h i n</strong></td>
<td>4. ship</td>
<td>4. bash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>r a s h</strong></td>
<td>5. shad</td>
<td>5. shin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>s h a g</strong></td>
<td>6. ash</td>
<td>6. shag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>w i s h</strong></td>
<td>7. shot</td>
<td>7. gosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>b a s h</strong></td>
<td>8. mash</td>
<td>8. ship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <strong>g o s h</strong></td>
<td>9. shop</td>
<td>9. dish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <strong>s h a d</strong></td>
<td>10. gosh</td>
<td>10. shot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. <strong>h a s h</strong></td>
<td>11. shag</td>
<td>11. ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. <strong>s h i p</strong></td>
<td>12. hash</td>
<td>12. wish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. <strong>a s h</strong></td>
<td>13. bash</td>
<td>13. rash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. <strong>d i s h</strong></td>
<td>14. dash</td>
<td>14. mash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. <strong>s h o p</strong></td>
<td>15. wish</td>
<td>15. shad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORDS TO READ

• Remind students that words in *italics* are nonsense words.
## Words to Read

### LESSON 7

The words in *italics* are nonsense words.

#### Challenging

1. wish  
   - yosh  
   - bish

2. cash  
   - vosh  
   - vish

3. shot  
   - cosh  
   - tish

4. fish  
   - yash  
   - yosh

5. ship  
   - kish  
   - shan

6. dash  
   - shib  
   - shob

7. dish  
   - bosh  
   - shap

8. shop  
   - pash  
   - shid

#### More Challenging

9. sash  
   - shoz  
   - sish

10. shin  
    - shan  
    - shom

11. hash  
    - hosh  
    - lish

12. rash  
    - tash  
    - tosh

13. shag  
    - gish  
    - shog

14. mash  
    - mish  
    - losh

15. gosh  
    - shig  
    - shap

16. lash  
    - zish  
    - zosh

#### Most Challenging

17. shim  
    - zash  
    - fash

18. nosh  
    - shaz  
    - dosh

19. gash  
    - bosh  
    - hish

20. josh  
    - fish  
    - jash

21. shod  
    - sish  
    - shab

22. posh  
    - pash  
    - shix
23. sham *shom nish* 24. mosh *vash fosh*
● SENTENCES TO READ
Lesson 7

Sentences to Read

Challenging
1. Gosh, Nash, is that a rash on your shin? (9)
2. Tish, will you dash to the shop for Mom? (9)
3. Mash the mud into the gap in the dam. (9)
4. Pam, is that a lash in your pot of jam? (10)
5. Do you have cash to get into the big bash? (10)
6. Is that a gash on the lip of the dog? (10)
7. Val had a sash with a big rip in it. (10)
8. Lash this rod to the lid of the fish bin. (10)

More Challenging
9. Do not be rash when you quit the shop job. (10)
10. Did Cal not want ham in his hot dish of hash? (11)
11. Ship the cod and shad fish to the shop in Nod. (11)
12. When did Dash and Nan put the tan sham on the cot? (12)
13. Tish and Sal will gab, yak, and dish about Kim and Hal. (12)
14. Did you put the fish and yam mash in the cat dish? (12)
15. Will the doc give you a shot for the rash on your shin? (13)
16. It is sad that the lad was shod with a bag and a rag. (14)

Most Challenging
17. At the bash, the sad sot had a shot of gin from the tin vat. (15)
18. The nag at the Dash-In shop had on a shag wig under a tam. (14)
19. The bad con hid his shiv in the gash in the rot on the log. (15)
20. Dot’s big tan van is rad and posh with its shag rug on the dash. (15)
21. Nash had a lot of zip and vim in the mosh pit at the hot gig. (16)
22. On his mad dash in the fog, the rash man hit his shin on a log. (16)
23. What do you and Josh wish for a nosh on your big job at the lab? (16)
24. It is sad, but in his bid to win the ship, Dash did not have a shot. (17)
Lesson 7

Digraph or No Digraph
Sort the words according to whether they have a digraph or not. Underline the digraph as you sort each word.

1. cash  6. tab
2. bit    7. mash
3. dish   8. gap
4. shop   9. shag
5. lot    10. ram
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>No Digraph</strong></th>
<th><strong>Digraph</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Column 1** – Work with your teacher to underline the graphemes, say the sound, and read the words. Underline digraphs with one line.

**Column 2** – Trade books with a partner. Both partners read the words in the column. Take turns as Reader and Checker. Do not underline or say sounds, simply read the words.

**Column 3** – Repeat partner work. Both partners read the words, taking turns as Reader and Checker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Column 1</strong></th>
<th><strong>Column 2</strong></th>
<th><strong>Column 3</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read with teacher.</td>
<td>Both partners read this column once.</td>
<td>Both partners read this column once.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Correct</td>
<td>Number Correct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Words to Read

LESSON 7

The words in *italics* are nonsense words.

**Challenging**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wish</th>
<th>Yosh</th>
<th>Bish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>cash</td>
<td>vosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>shot</td>
<td>cosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>fish</td>
<td>yash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>ship</td>
<td>kish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>dash</td>
<td>shib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>dish</td>
<td>bosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>shop</td>
<td>pash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**More Challenging**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>sash</td>
<td>shoz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>shin</td>
<td>shan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>hash</td>
<td>hosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>rash</td>
<td>tash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>shag</td>
<td>gish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>mash</td>
<td>mish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>gosh</td>
<td>shig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>lash</td>
<td>zish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Most Challenging**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>shim</td>
<td>zash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>nosh</td>
<td>shaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>gash</td>
<td>bosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>josh</td>
<td>jish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>shod</td>
<td>sish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>posh</td>
<td>pash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LESSON 7  Sentences to Read

Challenging

1. Gosh, Nash, is that a rash on your shin?  (9)
2. Tish, will you dash to the shop for Mom?  (9)
3. Mash the mud into the gap in the dam.  (9)
4. Pam, is that a lash in your pot of jam?  (10)
5. Do you have cash to get into the big bash?  (10)
6. Is that a gash on the lip of the dog?  (10)
7. Val had a sash with a big rip in it.  (10)
8. Lash this rod to the lid of the fish bin.  (10)

More Challenging

9. Do not be rash when you quit the shop job.  (10)
10. Did Cal not want ham in his hot dish of hash?  (11)
11. Ship the cod and shad fish to the shop in Nod.  (11)
12. When did Dash and Nan put the tan sham on the cot?  (12)
13. Tish and Sal will gab, yak, and dish about Kim and Hal.  (12)
14. Did you put the fish and yam mash in the cat dish?  (12)
15. Will the doc give you a shot for the rash on your shin?  (13)
16. It is sad that the lad was shod with a bag and a rag.  (14)

Most Challenging

17. At the bash, the sad sot had a shot of gin from the tin vat.  (15)
18. The nag at the Dash-In shop had on a shag wig under a tam.  (14)
19. The bad con hid his shiv in the gash in the rot on the log.  (15)
20. Dot’s big tan van is rad and posh with its shag rug on the dash.  (15)
21. Nash had a lot of zip and vim in the mosh pit at the hot gig.  (16)
22. On his mad dash in the fog, the rash man hit his shin on a log.  (16)
23. What do you and Josh wish for a nosh on your big job at the lab?  (16)
24. It is sad, but in his bid to win the ship, Dash did not have a shot.  (17)
Lesson 7 Passage

and tracking chart
George Washington was the first President of the United States of America. We call 14 George Washington the “Father of Our Country.” Before he became president he did many other things.

George Washington was born in the colony of Virginia in 1732. While Washington was growing up, the United States was not a country yet. The people in America lived in colonies ruled by Great Britain.

When George was growing up, not everyone went to school. That meant that many people did not learn to read and write. But George Washington did go to school. He learned to read and write.

At about age 15 George Washington learned to make maps. Over the years he made about 200 maps of different places. Some of his maps were of towns. He also drew maps of farms and wild country. His mapping skills helped him later in his life when he was in the army.
In 1775 the American colonies went to war against Great Britain. They fought to be free from British rule. George Washington was a general in the army during this war. He was a smart and brave leader. Even when the war was not going well, General Washington did not give up.

The army did not have enough trained people. It also did not have much money. When General Washington had to face these problems, he led the army well. Many think George Washington was a big reason the colonies won the war.

After the war the colonies became a new country called the United States of America. The people of the new country elected George Washington as their first president. Some people wanted him to have the powers of a king. But George Washington did not want to be a king. He wanted to be a leader who was one of the people.

George Washington was president for eight years. After his time as president was over, he returned to Mount Vernon, the home and farm he loved. He lived there for two years until he died on December 14, 1799, at the age of 67.
### Tracking Chart

**Name:** Sample Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>10/2</th>
<th>10/4</th>
<th>10/5</th>
<th>10/6</th>
<th>10/9</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>10/14</th>
<th>10/18</th>
<th>10/22</th>
<th>10/27</th>
<th>10/28</th>
<th>10/31</th>
<th>11/03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reader #1</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accuracy Percentage**

Goal is 98% or better

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>91%</th>
<th>92%</th>
<th>89%</th>
<th>93%</th>
<th>95%</th>
<th>97%</th>
<th>96%</th>
<th>99%</th>
<th>98%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>98%</th>
<th>99%</th>
<th>98%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% or below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Words Correct per Minute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WCPM</th>
<th>63</th>
<th>59</th>
<th>64</th>
<th>68</th>
<th>73</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>83</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>98</th>
<th>105</th>
<th>117</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>115 or above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110–114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105–109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100–104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95–99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90–94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85–89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80–84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75–79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70–74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Seven Steps to Implement Phonics Blitz and Phonics Boost in Grades 2–12

For schools interested in implementing Phonics Blitz and Phonics Boost lessons, we recommend the following 7 steps. The process outlined below will ensure that students are placed in appropriately sized, homogeneous groups, and that every student receives the most effective instruction.

**STEP 1  Screen** – Assess all students in grades 2–12 with a grade level, one-minute oral reading fluency (ORF). Calculate the Words Correct per Minute (WCPM) and Accuracy Percentage from the ORF reading. DIBELS and AIMSWeb are examples of appropriate norm-referenced ORF measures. Students who read at the grade level benchmark for WCPM and read with at least 97% accuracy are reading with appropriate rate and accuracy. They do not need further assessment. The following steps are for students who do not meet both the WCPM and Accuracy Percentage benchmarks.

**STEP 2  Diagnose** – Administer the RGR Diagnostic Decoding Surveys to students who read below the WCPM benchmark or read with less than 97% accuracy on the ORF screening measure. The Surveys take about 7 minutes per student to administer and score. They provide information about each student’s decoding abilities and the severity of any decoding weaknesses. Really Great Reading offers workshops on how to administer the Surveys.

- For students younger than the beginning of second grade, administer only the Beginning Decoding Survey. For students in the middle of second grade or older, administer both the Beginning and Advanced Decoding Surveys.

**STEP 3  Group** – Enter students’ scores from both the ORF screening measure and the RGR Diagnostic Decoding Surveys into the Grouping Matrix. The Grouping Matrix will group students based on their decoding abilities. It will also provide an instructional recommendation for each student, as shown on the next page.

**STEP 4  Assign Teachers, Determine Intervention Groups, and Schedule Instruction** – Identify which students (of those identified with weaknesses) will receive intervention instruction and the teachers who will deliver the instruction, and schedule the classes.
STEP 5  **Train Teachers** – Really Great Reading offers 2, 3, or 4 day Phonics Blitz/Phonics Boost teacher training workshops and a half-day follow-up session. The workshops are described on the next page.

STEP 6  **Teach Lessons** – Teach the Phonics Blitz and Phonics Boost lessons.

STEP 7  **Post Test** – After the lessons are completed, administer an ORF measure and the RGR Diagnostic Decoding Surveys. The ORF Accuracy Percentage and WCPM scores will determine the effectiveness of lessons by showing the overall improvement in students’ scores while reading. The Surveys post-test scores will show whether each student’s phonics skills show adequate improvement or whether they need to continue phonics instruction. The post-tests will also identify students who may need further diagnosis to determine if they will benefit from instruction in fluency, vocabulary or comprehension after they improve their phonics skills.
Phonics Blitz and Phonics Boost Workshops

(The same workshops prepare teachers for Phonics Blitz or Phonics Boost instruction.)

*Phonics Blitz™* and *Phonics Boost™* lessons are most successful when the teachers are well trained in phonics instruction. *Really Great Reading* offers the following workshops that provide teachers with the knowledge and practice needed to implement the lessons effectively. When teachers are well trained, the students receive maximum benefit from the lessons.

To request information about *Phonics Blitz* and *Phonics Boost* workshops, email info@ReallyGreatReading.com.

Screening and diagnostic assessment Workshop

One day

*Really Great Reading* offers a one-day workshop for staff members who will assess students. The workshop covers administering and scoring the *RGR Diagnostic Decoding Surveys*. For teachers who have not administered ORF measures, we will include instruction on how to administer and score an oral reading fluency measure. We recommend that all teachers who give *Phonics Blitz* or *Phonics Boost* lessons attend this workshop. Even if teachers do not assess students, familiarity with the assessment process helps them understand the rationale for the lessons and their students’ decoding skills needs.

Phonics Blitz and Phonics Boost Teacher Training Workshops

(The same workshop prepares teachers for Phonics Blitz or Phonics Boost instruction.)

*Really Great Reading* provides 2, 3, or 4 day teacher training for those who will be giving the *Phonics Blitz* or *Phonics Boost* lessons depending on the teachers’ prior experience with phonics instruction.

**2 days** – For teachers who have extensive knowledge and have recently taught a phonics-based intervention program. The workshop includes:
- Review of specific phonics concepts taught in Lessons 1-20.
- Ways to accomplish effective delivery of the lessons.
- Practice delivering the lessons.

**3 days** – For teachers with some knowledge of phonics, but little or no experience teaching phonics to struggling readers. The workshop includes all topics in the 2-day workshop plus:
- Overview of why students struggle reading.
- What phonemic awareness is and how to teach it.
- Correct phoneme articulation.
4 days – For teachers with no prior experience teaching phonics. The workshop includes all topics in the twoday and three-day workshops plus: (Most teachers of grades 4–12 need the 4-day workshop.)

- What phonics is.
- Basic phonics principles and patterns.
- Working with struggling readers.
- More elaboration on phonemic awareness.

Follow-up Workshop

Half-day

We recommend a half-day follow-up workshop about 3 weeks after delivery of lessons has begun. This workshop answers questions teachers have after they begin using the lessons. The half-day workshop also covers the advanced phonics concepts taught in later lessons which are not covered in the initial training.

Phonics Suite

*Phonics Blitz* and *Phonics Boost* are part of **Phonics Suite**, a growing family of lessons that improve students’ accuracy and comprehension. Students are matched to lessons based on the level of their decoding weaknesses, as determined by a diagnostic assessment. All instruction is given in small homogeneous groups at the appropriate pace based on the students’ specific needs.

The **Phonics Suite** family of lessons available now or in development includes:

**Phonics Blitz™**

40 lessons for students in grades 4–12 with some solid phonics skills. These students primarily need to understand vowel spellings, learn to read multi-syllable words, and break guessing habits.

- Phonics Blitz lessons can be completed in 10–12 weeks.
  - The time-frame will need to be adjusted if lessons are shorter than 50 minutes or if class sizes are larger than recommended.
- Lessons are written to be taught in approximately one-hour sessions.

Ideally schools will schedule 50–60 minute lessons 5 days a week. However, lessons can be as short as 30 minutes and given as few as three days a week. Any adjustment will result in the lessons taking more than 10–12 weeks to complete.

**Phonics Boost™**

80 lessons for students in grades 2–12 with more significant phonics weaknesses. These students understand some parts of phonics, although they need intensive instruction beginning with short
vowels. Compared to Phonics Blitz students, Phonics Boost students need a slower pace and more practice to improve accuracy and fluency.

- Phonics Boost lessons can be completed in 20–22 weeks.
  - The time-frame will need to be adjusted if lessons are shorter than 50 minutes or if class sizes are larger than recommended.

- Lessons are written to be taught in approximately one-hour sessions.
  - Ideally schools will schedule 50–60 minute lessons 5 days a week. However, lessons can be a short as 30 minutes and given as few as three days a week. Any adjustment will result in the lessons taking more than 20–22 weeks to complete.

Phonics Blast-off™

In development. Scheduled for publication in 2009.

Lessons for students who demonstrate a severe deficit in phonics knowledge, many of whom will demonstrate some phonemic awareness weakness. Students in grades 2–12 who read significantly below grade level and perform poorly on the Beginning Decoding Survey need this level of instruction. Students in the 1st grade who have difficulty keeping up with phonics instruction in the general classroom setting will also benefit from these lessons. Students in Phonics Blast-Off are likely to need intensive instruction over the full school year.

Grouping Matrix

The Grouping Matrix places a student into one of 7 groups, based on the degree of decoding strengths and weaknesses the student shows on the three assessments. The Grouping Matrix also provides a maximum recommended group size and instructional recommendations for each group. When applicable, the instructional recommendations include materials that REALLY GREAT READING publishes or has plans to publish.

The chart below shows the 7 groups students may be placed in, the maximum recommended group size, and instructional recommendations by grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RGR Matrix™ Description</th>
<th>Grouping Group</th>
<th>Max. Group Size</th>
<th>Instructional Recommendations Grades 2 and 3</th>
<th>Instructional Recommendations Grades 4–12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strong Readers</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No decoding or fluency instruction recommended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Slow Reading Rate (Strong Decoding Skills)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Fluency or vocabulary instruction, or a combination recommended. (Type of instruction depends on whether vocabulary is a weakness or not.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Decoding Weaknesses</td>
<td>PHONICS BOOST</td>
<td>PHONICS BLITZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mild Decoding Weaknesses</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>PHONICS BOOST 80 one-hour lessons</td>
<td>PHONICS BLITZ 40 one-hour lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderate Decoding Weaknesses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PHONICS BOOST 80 one-hour lessons</td>
<td>PHONICS BLITZ 40 one-hour lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Significant Decoding Weaknesses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PHONICS BOOST 80 one-hour lessons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Severe Decoding Weaknesses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHONICS BLAST-OFF (publication scheduled for 2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Recommend Further Testing</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Scores are very low. Issues other than decoding may be impeding reading. Recommendation is to give the RGR Pre-Reading Surveys. If they do not yield enough information, obtain a full diagnostic work-up by trained personnel if one is not already on file.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To request a username and password for the Grouping Matrix, email info@rgrco.com with the following information: Primary User’s Name, Primary User’s e-mail address, School or organization name, Preferred Username, Preferred Password, State, and School District. If you have questions about the Grouping Matrix, call 866-401-7323 x 1.

Phonics Boost is a set of 80 lessons that teach phonemic awareness and phonics concepts in a moderately paced, multi-sensory, systematic, and explicit manner. They are designed to improve the accuracy and reading skills of students in grades 2–12 and adults. The lessons help students who exhibit one or more of the following weaknesses when they read:

- misread unfamiliar words and words that look alike
- struggle with reading multisyllable words
Hi Barbara,

That’s wonderful! You can absolutely use the sample lesson for Boost. If you need anything else just let us know!

Michelle
866-401-7323

From: Klun, Barbara E. [mailto:bklun01@hamline.edu]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2017 9:42 AM
To: Really Great Reading
Subject: Using Sample Lessons in Senior Thesis

Dear Really Great Reading,

I'm a graduate student at Hamline University. I'm writing my graduate Capstone project titled, Is a Single or Multicomponent Reading Intervention Program More Effective at Enhancing Outcomes for Struggling Reader in Intermediate Grades? I used your Phonics Boost curriculum as part of my reading interventions. Could I please use your sample lessons attached in my appendix?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Truly

Barbara
### Table 1 Single Component Group SRI Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average SRI Scores: 173.15, 207.23, 51.93
Table 2 Multicomponent Group SRI Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg. SRI Lexile Scores: 305.35, 394.20, 84.62
Table 3 Control Group SRI Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. SRI Lexile Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-18.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4 Single Component Group i-Ready Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Pre-Test Phonological Awareness</th>
<th>Post-Test Phonological Awareness</th>
<th>Pre-Test Phonics</th>
<th>Post-Test Phonics</th>
<th>Pre-Test High Frequency Words</th>
<th>Post-Test High Frequency Words</th>
<th>Pre-Test Vocabulary</th>
<th>Post-Test Vocabulary</th>
<th>Pre-Test Comprehension</th>
<th>Post-Test Comprehension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Grade Level Equivalent</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5 Multicomponent Group i-Ready Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Pre-Test Phonological Awareness</th>
<th>Post Test Phonological Awareness</th>
<th>Pre-Test Phonics</th>
<th>Post-Test Phonics</th>
<th>Pre-Test High Frequency Words</th>
<th>Post-Test High Frequency Words</th>
<th>Pre-Test Vocabulary</th>
<th>Post Test Vocabulary</th>
<th>Pre-Test Comprehension</th>
<th>Post-Test Comprehension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Grade Level Equivalent</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6 Control Group i-Ready Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Pre-Test Phonological Awareness</th>
<th>Post-Test Phonological Awareness</th>
<th>Pre-Test Phonics</th>
<th>Post-Test Phonics</th>
<th>Pre-Test High Frequency Words</th>
<th>Post-Test High Frequency Words</th>
<th>Pre-Test Vocabulary</th>
<th>Post-Test Vocabulary</th>
<th>Pre-Test Comprehension</th>
<th>Post-Test Comprehension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Grade Level Equivalent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>4.375</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>