Beginning in January, I started teaching a group of five students, of various grade levels, strategies to build comprehension skills in a READ 180 class. The class meets for 45 minutes, 3 days a week to strengthen their understanding and application of reading comprehension strategies. I plan to administer the Scholastic Reading Inventory to my students three times a year to procure a reading comprehension baseline and assess growth. Currently, I use assignments such as the workbook, student discourse and formative assessments to monitor understanding and acquire a grade. I rely heavily on the prescriptive practice and materials of READ 180 for my planning, instruction, activities and assessment. While reflecting on the narrow measures of assessment it became clear that I was focusing solely on comprehension and not enough on other reading skills. I do not believe that the assessments provide enough data that comprehensively measures each student's' knowledge, skills, successes or weaknesses related to reading comprehension and the various components of reading.

Development of New Learning:

After reviewing the CCT Performance Profile and Indicators with my mentor, I realized that my assessments and data collection were not continual or comprehensive. The data is used to monitor overall reading comprehension progress as well as calculate a grade. I have not been thoroughly analyzing the data or utilizing multiple measures to gain a full scope of student performance levels in regards to reading achievement or drive instruction. I developed the following goal to address this weakness: I will learn to use information gathered from multiple measures of assessments to analyze student performance levels and as a result data will drive instruction and support individual student literacy growth. I expect to see an improvement in students' overall reading achievement.

One way that I developed new learning was by using my Professional Learning Community as a guiding resource. I was able to conduct interviews and discuss strategies with experienced teachers, which included an English and READ 180 instructor. My goal was to understand how other professionals within the building administered assessments and interpreted the data to plan or adjust instruction for their students. An English teacher that I interviewed stressed the importance of using a pre and post test as a summative assessment for each unit to look at individual growth as well as formative assessments to monitor progress. She further discussed how this helps pinpoint where students are struggling and how designing and implementing further instruction can target these areas. She also suggested looking at the Newsela website for lexile leveled news articles, for extra drill and practice on comprehension strategies. From this conversation I realized that I wasn't using assessments to truly dissect a student's struggle with reading or guide lessons. I needed to incorporate a breadth of assessment strategies, informal and formal, to gauge learning and instruction. A READ 180 teacher that I interviewed began by expressing the importance of "getting the student's to buy in". Interestingly enough, he shared that as he collects diagnostic assessment data on comprehension and fluency along with summative data, he puts it into an excel spreadsheet and frequently shares this with his students. He said that this was beneficial for a multitude of reasons. First, it demonstrated to students that their work was highly valued and it motivated them to take more responsibility for their efforts. Also, it opened up dialogue in a descriptive, nonjudgmental way, different from

feedback given during lessons or class assignments. By interviewing colleagues and discussing strategies, I learned helpful new techniques to use in my classroom and improve instruction.

Another way that I developed new learning, was accomplished through reviewing books and scientific research literature. According to the Consortium On Reading Excellence (CORE) *Assessing Reading: Multiple Measures,* the complex process of fluent reading is largely made up of two major domains. First, is the ability to decode or recognize individual written words and second is the ability to comprehend text as a whole unit. They emphasize that in order to identify student progress, prevent reading difficulty from compounding and provide help to students with reading difficulties, teachers need to utilize assessments that isolate these major components. Similarly, they asserted that unlike the primary grade assessment, which begins with discrete skills, reading assessment for older students often starts broadly and then becomes more discrete in order to pinpoint particular reading subskills that might cause reading difficulty. From this reading I realized that I need to utilize a variety of assessment instruments, rather than just comprehension, that focus on each component of reading separately. I also came to understand how differently reading assessment is used for older students, working backwards through the five major components of reading to identify weaknesses . I realized that using and analyzing specific skills assessments would enable me to better identify students' specific weaknesses, inform instruction and increase achievement. Additionally, I read The National Reading Panel (NRP), focusing on the fluency section. The NRP affirmed that the research on repeated reading and other guided oral reading procedures have clearly been shown to improve word recognition, fluency, comprehension and overall reading achievement. The NRP also asserted that newer guided repeated oral reading techniques share several key qualities: repeated readings are done until a prespecified level of proficiency is reached, feedback for guiding the reader's performance, and increased reading practice through peer guidance, tutors, audiotapes, and one to one instruction. From this reading, I realized how important assessing fluency and incorporating direct, explicit fluency instruction was in my practice for student success.

Impact on Practice:

Through my development of new learning I discovered numerous ways that I could improve and implement strategies to analyze student performance, drive instruction and improve literacy growth. Reflecting on my interviews and readings, I began to develop pre and post tests for each unit in the READ 180 workbook. Prior to this, I had used the last practice section of a unit in the workbook as a summative assessment. The post test served as a summative assessment in which students could generalize skills they learned, show individual growth and reveal if there were any concepts still not mastered for future instruction. Analyzing the summative assessments along with student work and discourse, enabled me to pace the scope and sequence of material in a more effective way. Students received extra practice and direct instruction with pinpointed trouble spots rather than the whole concept again. Additionally, I began to develop an excel spreadsheet to chart growth and share with my students. I would chart their growth in comprehension scores and fluency scores. These charts also included

their grade level, lexile level, expected growth, expected spring scores and their assessment scores. This proved extremely effective in motivating students to take responsibility of their learning. Sharing and reviewing data with students of where they currently are to where their spring goal should be, not only gave us a common language but drove them to “beat their scores”. Students seemed to appreciate the objectivity of the data and shift of responsibility.

Next, I decided to focus on implementing a greater focus on fluency into the class. I started by getting a baseline for each student using the MASI-R Oral Reading Fluency Measure. Thinking back on the CORE and NRP readings as well as my interviews, I realized that not only did my students need explicit instruction in fluency, but that it has been shown to improve growth in other areas of reading. I began selecting passages based on each students lexile level so that it would be at the independent level and that were about 100 words long as suggested by CORE. Initially, I worked one on one with students while practicing their fluency to model and give immediate feedback to the reader. I had a prespecified goal for each student to reach 97% accuracy, appropriate pacing and tone on their passage before moving on to a new one. Additionally, we were able to work on using context clues to figure out unknown vocabulary as well as visualizing and retelling the story. After establishing a routine and expectations for fluency practice, I paired students together for peer guided oral readings. Based on their fluency baseline I paired stronger readers with weaker readers to build their skills. This allowed me to circulate the room, observe students, and give further feedback. Both forms of oral reading seemed to prove effective in the classroom. Students appeared to enjoy the one on one practice and frequently asked to perform the peer guided oral readings. Students said that they liked “being the teacher” when it was their turn to listen to their partner and give feedback.

Finally, for particular students I needed to work backwards through the major components (i.e. comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, phonics, phonemic awareness) to pinpoint particular subskills that cause reading difficulty. Student M in particular had a very low comprehension lexile level and a very low fluency score. After analyzing these scores and observing him in class, I decided to look at his phonics skills using the CORE Phonics Survey. Based on this assessment student D did not know most of the consonant sounds, vowel sounds and refused to continue testing after the closed syllable word section. I would have implemented direct, explicit instruction to build phonics skills, however the following day a PPT was held and decided he would attend a different school, suited to his needs, effective immediately.

Impact on Students:

The positive impact on students was significant and obvious. Due to reading various resources and interviewing colleagues I was able to improve my practice and the students' performance has improved significantly. Utilizing a pre and post test for each chapter concept helped to identify what the students know, what they need more practice in and growth over time. For the chapter on sequencing, 5 out of 5 students could not identify signal words and 3 out of 5 could not independently sequence events of a story/event. After explicit instruction 5 out of 5 students could identify signal words in a passage and 5 out of 5 could independently sequence events of a story/event. For the chapter on main idea and detail, 2 out of 5 students could identify the

main idea of a passage and 2 out of 5 students were able to identify at least 3 supporting details. At the end of the chapter 4 out of 5 students were able to identify the main idea and 3 out of 5 were able to provide/identify at least 3 supporting details. Using this data, I provided extra practice and direct instruction, using Newsela articles and short stories, to identify main idea and details. For the students who had mastered these skills they were given enrichment activities. Similarly, utilizing comprehension and fluency assessments, has helped shape instruction for more comprehensive reading achievement. Focusing on comprehension and fluency instruction as well as practice in the class has improved overall reading achievement in students. At the beginning of this unit student comprehension scores (lexile level) were as follows; D-531, P-59, W-709, C-884, J-892. The final comprehension scores were as follows; D-700, P-980, W-829, C-*removed from school, J-971. Since implementing direct fluency instruction and guided oral reading practice in the class, students have also increased these scores. The student fluency scores were as follows; D-91 WCPM with 94% accuracy, P-143 WCPM with 97% accuracy, W-104 WCPM with 97% accuracy, C-94 WCPM with 97% accuracy, J-148 WCPM with 97% accuracy. The final fluency scores were as follows; D-*removed from school, P-158 WCPM with 99% accuracy, W-109 WCPM with 99% accuracy, C*removed from school, and J-159 WCPM with 99% accuracy.

Compared to the beginning of the year, students read with an increased level of fluency, have increased their comprehension strategies, and have improved their overall reading achievement. This can be attributed to the implementation of continual assessments of multiple components of reading as well as change in instructional practice. As a result of my new learning, my practice has improved and likewise positively impacted my students.