After discussing my current practices at the time with my mentor I decided to address indicator three; collaborating with colleagues to review and interpret assessment data in order to plan and adjust instruction and assessments to meet the needs of individuals and/or small groups. We decided that I was consistently (every assessment deadline) meeting with colleagues to review and interpret assessment data and used data to plan instruction. I was meeting to review and interpret my SRBI students reading assessments with the school SRBI Specialist. In addition, our grade level would meet to review the results of our writing prompts (after every assessment deadline). However, I needed to improve my collaboration by becoming more proactive in planning and adjusting my instruction and assessments to meet the needs of individuals and/or small groups with SRBI Specialists and grade level members.

After conferring with my mentor I decided to use my colleagues as a primary resource. I conducted several interviews. My goal was to understand how other professionals within the building collaborated with colleagues to review and interpret assessment data in order to plan and adjust instruction and assessments to meet the needs of individuals and/or small groups. In addition, our grade level participated in a Professional Learning Community in which our goal was to improve our guided writing instruction.

I found the interviews with my colleagues to be very beneficial. One recommendation included setting a schedule to meet with SRBI specialists biweekly, in order to update each other on what interventions we are providing to the students receiving SRBI reading support both in and out of the classroom. Some of my colleagues also recommended meeting directly after every assessment deadline with the SRBI Specialist to review and interpret data and adjust interventions. Frequent informal conversations were also strongly recommended.

In my classroom I have two students who are receiving tier 2 support for reading. They meet with me 4-5 times per week for small group instruction and are pulled 3-4 times per week by our SRBI Specialist. Students A and B both entered Second Grade at DRA level 16, one level below benchmark. Currently, both students have made significant progress and are reading at a DRA level 24, which is currently at benchmark. At the beginning of the year I was reviewing their assessment data from the DRA2, my own informal running records and reading inventories to design my interventions. However, I was not coordinating efficiently with the SRBI Specialist. Students were making progress, but I felt there was room for even greater growth. I was checking in with the schools SRBI Specialist and reviewing data, but not taking the time to sit down and review/interpret the data and design interventions together. However, this would change. I was looking to improve my interventions, so around the beginning of November I began meeting with the SRBI specialist biweekly to review Students A and B assessment data. Our focus was the results of their DRA2. At that time students A and B were both not self monitoring, which was affecting their fluency. When they made a miscue they were not stopping to self correct. Our goal for both students was that they will self monitor for accuracy while reading. Our interventions included small group instruction 3-4 times per week, including explicit phonics instruction, decoding strategies and using the context of the sentence. I assessed both students by taking a 100 word running record once per week, with the goal of 80% accuracy for 6 weeks. Students A was reading with 68% accuracy and Student B with 67% before our interventions began. After monitoring Students A and Bs growth over several progress monitoring periods, the SRBI Specialist and myself agreed that Students A and B had made adequate progress (were consistently scoring above 80% accuracy) and it was time to adjust our interventions and goals. After reviewing our assessment data we decided that both students were

struggling to answer interpretive questions (example: What is the lesson of the story?) Our new goals for both students stated that they would consistently score a 3 on the DRA comprehension continuum on interpretive written responses. In order to score a 3 on the DRA Continuum student responses must reflect that they understand the important text implications and may include supporting details. Our interventions included small group instruction 3-4 times per week, including explicit instruction in inferring or "reading between the lines" while reading and guided practice in answering interpretive questions. We used the students Reader's Notebooks, Just Right Books and Guided Reading books. After several weeks of progress monitoring students A and B were making significant progress in answering interpretive questions orally during and after their reading. However, they were struggling to express their thinking in writing, often including unnecessary or unrelated information, instead of giving evidence for their answers they were summarizing the texts. So our focus shifted to teaching them how to write concise written responses to interpretive questions.

The second grade team participated in a Professional Learning Community in which our goal was to improve our guided writing instruction. Participating in this PLC helped me in collaborating with colleagues to review and interpret assessment data in order to plan and adjust my instruction. We decided that improving our small group writing instruction would be a product of improving our collaboration with colleagues to review and interpret assessment data in order to plan and adjust instruction and assessments to meet the needs of individuals and/or small groups. Prior to reviewing student data, the grade level met, pooled our resources, researched and discussed interventions and lessons for each individual trait. We were able to create a binder, organized by the writing traits which was full of materials, lessons, and activities that we could use during guided writing instruction. These materials came from a variety

professional texts, websites and years of teaching experiences. After reviewing my student's data, I felt confident taking these materials and providing my students with quality guided writing instruction. For example, after reviewing student data, group A consisted of four students who were part of the organization group. These students struggled to write a fluent and sequential narrative story with a beginning, middle and end. The goal of my instruction was for them to be able to write a fluent and sequential narrative story with a beginning, middle and end. I taught the students of group A a variety of strategies. Some of these strategies included retelling their story across their fingers and acting their stories out. We evaluated our students Winter Prompts using a rubric which evaluated the six traits of writing for each student's prompt. Each trait was scored on a scale of one to five. The traits included voice, ideas, organization, word choice, sentence fluency and conventions. After reviewing our prompts together as a team, we put our students into groups for guided writing instruction depending on the trait where they showed a weakness. For struggling writers, we prioritized and focused on the trait that we felt was most important for each individual student. Although we were working in a small group I always used the workshop model by modeling, providing guided practice and having the students try the strategy independently. We also reviewed several simple texts that had an obvious series of events (Example: Peter's Chair, The Snowy Day). I had the students retell the story to a partner and write the events out into a variety of graphic organizers. Some of the organizers included comic strip organizers, story mountains and a scaffolded summary form. After several weeks of working with group A, there was a noticeable change in the organization of their small moment stories, they were more fluent and possessed a beginning, middle and end.

In both instances student performance improved due to my improved ability to collaborate with my peers. By collaborating with the school SRBI specialist we were able to

come up with well planned out intervention goals and strategies for my students receiving SRBI support in reading. This led to Students A and B making greater progress and eventually getting up to the appropriate DRA benchmark. By collaborating with the second grade team in our PLC we were able to create a rubric and method for better assessing our students, group our students in guided writing groups and pool our resources to come up with a binder full of different lessons and strategies. Due to this collaboration I was able to target my student's weaknesses in writing with proven strategies and interventions. The students in Group A showed significant progress in the trait of organization, and after several weeks of intervention in this writing trait I was able to shift my focus to other weaknesses in their writing, the next one for group being word choice. In the future I will continue to collaborate with my colleagues to review and interpret assessment data in order to plan and adjust instruction and assessments to meet the needs of individuals and/or small groups. By doing this I will provide my students with better, differentiated small group instruction which will improve student performance.