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REASON FOR REFERRAL:

Greg is not currently in Special Education, and has no identified learning disability. Greg was chosen for this evaluation because he has struggled in the past with literacy. Greg was referred for an educational evaluation by Mrs. Kidd, his third grade teacher, due to concerns about his reading fluency.

FAMILY HISTORY:

Greg’s CA-60 states that Greg lives with his mother and sister in a house in Bloomfield Hills, Michigan. His CA-60 also states that his father does not live in the house with the family. Greg attended a private kindergarten school called Saint Regis Catholic School, then transferred to Conant Elementary School in first grade. During an interview with Greg’s mother Carol, weaknesses, strengths and interests were discovered. Carol stated that Greg is a very curious and kind young boy. She also stated that he needs to receive explicit directions, needs to be brought into discussions, and has trouble making connections between reading and writing. She also stated that he stays up late to watch Detroit Tigers baseball games, and that hockey uses up a lot of his energy. Frankie has no identified issues with vision or hearing. This information was obtained from Greg’s CA-60 and an interview with his mother.

DEVELOPMENTAL/MEDICAL HISTORY:

Greg does not have glasses and does not use equipment to improve hearing. It is difficult for him to sit up straight in his chair.

ACADEMIC HISTORY:

After viewing his CA-60 and consulting with previous year teachers, a few areas of weakness were identified. Greg’s struggle with literacy is also evident this year in third grade. Greg has very illegible handwriting, he does not take any interest in improving his literacy skills, he is unable to read books at grade level with fluency and with a high comprehension percentage, and he is unable to decode unknown words. According to report cards from first grade, Greg did not adequately develop skills in the follow areas: writing on topic and including detail, using complete sentences with capitals and punctuation, and using reading strategies to decode unknown words. According to his second grade report card, Greg did not adequately develop skills in: using correct grammar and word usage in order to increase fluency, using the writing process to produce a finished piece of writing, proofreading and editing his own writing in order to make improvements, and demonstrating comprehension through written response.

Greg has received support to help him with his struggle with literacy. Greg was in a reading recovery program after first grade because he was below grade level expectations. Greg also received literacy support in second grade four to five times a week for thirty minutes each meeting. He had difficulty understanding sequence of events in stories, and decoding unknown words. Greg has had other support at Conant Elementary in order to attempt to improve his literacy skills. Greg took part in a reading recovery program, and received support from general education resource teachers for the majority of second grade, starting in October of 2011. Greg has been invited to take part in a before school reading program three times a week in order to improve his reading fluency and comprehension. At this time, no decision has been made regarding if he is going to take part in this program.

SOCIAL/EMOTIONAL HISTORY:

Greg gets along with many of the students in the class. He seems to have a lot of friends, and on first impression, appears to be a relatively happy person.

STUDENT INTERVIEW:

Greg was interviewed on September 26, 2012. Greg explained his everyday interests and academic interests during this open-ended interview. Greg stated that he does not enjoy many of the subjects that he learns in the classroom, and his favorite subject in school is Music. He stated that a challenge that he has with reading is stretching out words. He stated that a challenge that he had with writing was spelling words correctly. In his free time he stated that he likes to play video games.

INFORMAL OBSERVATIONS:

After gathering anecdotal information regarding behavior and academics during class instruction and assessment, it is evident that Greg is not engaged in class.

At school Greg has been observed lying on his desk and slouching in his chair. He has his head on his desk multiple times throughout the day, and whines when he is asked to do something academically.

On September 27, 2012 Greg was observed during a math lesson. The beginning of the lesson required Greg to take part in mental math activities. He was required to start with a number, and count up by tens, writing the numbers on the board. Greg did not seem very confident with his answers, and was looking on his neighbor’s white board before writing the answer on his whiteboard. Greg did not complete all of the mental math exercises. When mental math was finished, Greg put his head on his desk and his hood on his head. He kept his head on his desk for the majority of the lesson. I could not see his eyes or his face. After the math lesson was completed, his teacher, Mrs.Kidd, asked Greg to work in his math journal on math pages. A few minutes after given the direction, Greg put his math journal away. I asked him if he finished doing his math work and that I wanted to see his journal. Greg took out his journal, and I noticed that he only answered one question out of six questions.

Greg was also observed on September 27, 2012 during silent reading time. He was given forty minutes to read silently a book of his choice. Greg was observed drawing pictures on his whiteboard, instead of following the instructions, which were to read.

Greg’s teacher Mrs. Kidd was interviewed on September 26,2012 Mrs. Kidd expressed that she is concerned because he is not on the same level academically as most of his peers in his class. Greg is one of three students who show significant areas of concern. Greg’s weaknesses as a writer according to Mrs. Kidd are his messy handwriting, his lack of motivation, and his overall need to develop when it comes to literacy. She stated that he never seems engaged in class and it is hard to motivate him to do anything at all in school. During D.E.A.R time (Drop Everything and Read) Greg usually draws on paper, or reads low level picture books. Mrs. Kidd expressed concern because Greg is always tired in class. She wonders if he is on medication that is making him tired, or if he just does not sleep well enough at night. Two additional concerns that Mrs. Kidd stated were that he is very unorganized, and does not complete the majority of assignments across subjects.

Greg spends a lot of time with his head on his desk, with his face mostly covered. It is hard to get Greg engaged in many activities and instruction that goes on in class. He usually puts up a fight when asked to sit up in his seat. I recorded the frequency of his head on his desk behavior during a one-hour observation period for four days. The criterion for the behavior to be recorded was that he had to have his head on his desk, for at least three minutes at a time.

This graph shows the amount of times that Greg spent with his head on his desk for at least three minutes at a time, over a span of four days. The minimum about of time he spent with his head on his desk was twelve minutes on day two. On day one, Greg spent about thirty minutes with his head on his desk during a one-hour observation period. Greg was not following directions as my mentor teacher asked, and did not seem engaged in the lesson. Greg misses out on a significant amount of in class instruction each day.

ASSESSMENT TECHNIQUES AND ANALYSIS:

The following assessments were administered to Greg in order to assess his sight word accuracy, oral reading fluency, reading comprehension, and current writing skills.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| TEST | SUBSCALE | RAW SCORE | STANDARD SCORE | PERCENTILE | 68% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL |
| ***Woodcock-******Johnson III Tests of Achievement (WJ III)*** | Basic Reading Skills CompositeLetter-Word Identification subtestWork Attacksubtest | -3614 | 786690 | 151<25 | 75-8163-6987-93 |
| TEST | SUBSCALE | RAW SCORE(Total sounds read including errors) | Total PhonemesRead correctly | PERCENTILE RANK (according to 1st grade fall norms) |  |
| ***AIMSweb*** | **Phoneme Segmentation Fluency** (first grade)Progress Monitoring 1Progress Monitoring 2Progress Monitoring 3Progress Monitoring 4 | 85767975 | 99969692 | >90>90>90>90 |  |
| TEST | SUBSCALE | RAW SCORE(Total Words Read) | PERCENT(Accuracy) |  |  |
| **Dynamic Assessment**Word Recognition | Pre-testPost-test | 24/4034/40 | 60%85% |  |  |

*Woodcock Johnson III (WJ-III):*

Greg was administered two subtests from the Woodcock Johnson III on October 29, 2012. The two subtests that were administered to Greg were the *Letter-Word Identification* subtest, and the *Word Attack* subtest. The WJ III includes 22 subtests across that are used to assess the areas of reading, oral language, written language, mathematics, and other test areas. The subtests are administered to the student with an easel. The letters and words are in front of the student, and the administer looks at the other side of the easel, and reads the directions. The WJ III is a norm-referenced test that compares a student’s academic achievement to the average performance of same-age peers. The Woodcock Johnson III uses Standard Scores (SS), which are based on a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. Standard scores of 90-110 are considered to be within the “average” range on this assessment. The data collected from Greg’s achievement scores were derived from age-based norms.

*Overall Results of Basic Reading Skills from WJ-III:* In the area of basic reading skills, Greg’s standard score was 78 and his percentile rank was 15. This equates to Greg scoring as well as or better than 15 percent of his grade-level peers. A 68 percent confidence band was used to estimate Greg’s true score on basic reading skills to be in the range of 75-81. This means the examiner is 68 percent confident that Greg’s score would fall within the range of 75-81 standard score if he was administered the test at any other time or under any other standard conditions. Based on results of all the subtests given, Greg’s grade equivalent score is 2.5, which means Greg’s composite score is equivalent to the average composite score obtained by children that are in the fifth month of second grade. Greg’s age equivalent is 7-5, which means his composite score is equivalent to the average composite score obtained by children that are 7-years, 5- months-old in the normative sample. When compared to others in his grade, Greg’s basic reading skills are below grade level because his standard scores do not fall within the average range of 90-110.

The following subtests for basic reading skills were administered:

*Letter-Word Identification:* The Letter-Word Identification subtest is administered to students in order to measure their automatic word identification skills. The first few items of the subtest require students to identify letters. As students work through the subtest, the items on the subtest become harder. The student is then required to correctly pronounce individual words. The words become harder as the test progresses, and the words are seen less frequently in written language.

Greg achieved a raw score of 36 items correct on the Letter-word Identification subtest. Because this is a standardized test, this translates into a standard score of 66 and a percentile of 1. This means on this particular day, Greg scored as well as or better than less than 1 percent of his same-age peers in the normative sample. A 68 percent confidence band was used to estimate that Greg’s true score on this subtest was estimated to be in the range of 63-69. This means the examiner is 68 percent confident that Greg’s score would fall within this range if administered the test at any other time or under any other standard conditions. On this subtest, Greg’s grade equivalent score is 2.4, which means Greg’s raw score is equivalent to the average raw score obtained by children that are in the fourth school month of second grade. Greg’s age equivalent is 7-9, which means his raw score is equivalent to the average raw score obtained by children that are 7-years, 9-months-old in the normative sample. However it is incorrect to interpret age equivalent or grade equivalent scores as suggesting his skills in this area are similar to student’s age or in the month of grade because these scores do not take into account the difficulty of the items the students completed correctly. Greg’s score on this subtest indicates his word identification is below average compared to his same-age peers, because his standard score falls more than two standard deviations below the mean and outside the average range of 90-110. It appears that Greg needs more instruction on how to pronounce words and letter sounds within words.

*Word Attack:* This subtest is used to measure the student’s ability to apply phonic and structural analysis skills to pronounce unfamiliar printed nonsense words. The first few items require the student to produce letter sounds. The following items on the test require the individual to read nonsense words aloud. As the student works through the test the difficulty of the items increases. On this subtest, Greg achieved a raw score of 14 items correct. Because this is a standardized test, this translates into a standard score of 90 and a percentile of 25. This means on this particular day, Justin scored as well as or better than 25% of his peers. A 68% confidence band was used to calculate that Justin’s true score was estimated to be between 87-93. This means the examiner is 68% confident that Justin’s score would fall within this range if given the test on any given day under standard conditions. On this subtest, Greg’s grade equivalent score is 2.7, which means Justin’s raw score is equivalent to the average raw score obtained by children that are in the seventh school month of second grade. Greg’s age equivalent is 8-3, which means his raw score is equivalent to the average raw score obtained by children that are 8-years, 3- months old in the normative sample. Remember it is incorrect to interpret age equivalent or grade equivalent scores as suggesting his skills in this area are similar to student’s age or in the month of grade because these scores do not take into account the difficulty of the items the students completed correctly. Greg’s score on this subtest indicates his phonetic decoding skills are average compared to same-age peers, because his standard score falls within the average range of 85-115.

*Academic Improvement Monitoring System web (AIMSweb):*

AIMSweb is a curriculum-based measurement tool for benchmark and progress monitoring assessments. It is based on direct, frequent probes. AIMSweb can be used to assess students from grades K-12, but the probes are only available for K-8: Older students are administered the Grade 8 probes. AIMSweb is typically given at the beginning of the year, middle of the year, and end of year. The biggest component is progress monitoring for all students allowing teachers to write individual goals and to monitor progress more frequently. In third grade, students are assessed for reading comprehension and fluency, but based on Greg’s scores on the *WJ-III* and *BRI* Greg was assessed for Phoneme Segmentation Fluency at a first grade level.

**Greg**

**Peer**

**

Four Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF) probes were administered to Greg. The same four probes were administered to one of Greg’s peers from his third grade class. The peer was administered the same four progress monitoring probes on the same dates. The PSF probes consist of 92-99 words. The words are divided into phonemes. The words are either three-letter consonant-vowel-consonant (CVC) words or two-letter vowel-consonant (VC) words. For these probes, the student says the sounds in the word that the examiner presents orally. One point is given to the student for each sound segment correctly produced in 1 minute. A correct sound segment is one the student produces that correctly corresponds to the word presented. Credit is given for each correct sound segment, even if the student has not segmented the word fully. Credit is also given for complete, incomplete, or overlapping segmentation.

Greg and his same-grade peer were administered four progress monitoring probes at the first grade level for Phoneme Segmentation Fluency. The four probes given were 1P06, 1P20, 1P21, and 1P33 on 10-29-12, 11-1-12, 11-5-12, and 11-7-12, respectively. Greg’s results for the four probes were 85/99 phonemes correct, 76/96 phonemes correct, 79/96 phonemes correct, and 75/92 phonemes correct.

Greg’s peer obtained the following scores: 93/99 phonemes correct, 92/96 phonemes correct, 92/96 phonemes correct, and 90/92 phonemes correct, respectively. It is apparent that the peer was able to correctly identify more phonemes correct than Greg. Refer to Comparison graph. Greg took more time to complete the probes and said them orally with less confidence. When he came to sounds that he did not think he could pronounce, he would skip over them. Greg’s peer had more confidence as he said the phonemes, and took less time to complete the probes.

Greg’s scores on the probes compared to other first graders in the fall are above average. He scored at or above the 90th percentile on the four probes, respectively. However, that is compared to scores of first graders, and Greg is in third grade. Phoneme segmentation fluency probes are not available in third grade because it is a skill that should be mastered by the end of first grade. In order to be at or above the 90th percentile, a raw score of 60 is required; to achieve the 75th percentile, the raw score needs to be at or above 51; for the 50th percentile, a raw score of 41 is required; for the 25th percentile, a raw score of 29 is required; and for the 10th percentile, a raw score of 14 is required. Even though he was above average in comparison to first grade, it must be remembered that he is a third grade student, and still needs to master this concept. He is not on-track for meeting the winter benchmark based on the trend of the current data.

*Basic Reading Inventory:*

The Basic Reading Inventory is a criterion-referenced test that was administered to Greg on September 24, 2012. The BRI is used to assess Greg’s sight word skills, oral reading fluency, and reading comprehension. First, Greg was given a sight word list consisting of twenty words. His current grade is third grade, so the third grade list was administered to him. Greg correctly identified fourteen out of twenty words, or seventy percent of the words. This put Greg at a frustration level. If a student achieves a score of fourteen-fifteen words correct, it puts him or her at a frustration level. If a student achieves a score of sixteen-eighteen words correct, it puts him or her at an instructional level. If a student achieves a score of nineteen-twenty words correct, it puts him or her at an independent level. Since Greg was at a frustration level for the third grade list, I administered him a word list one grade level below his current grade level, or one word list below his frustration level word list. Giving a student a word list one grade level below his frustration level is a standard procedure for administering the BRI. I administered the second grade word list in order to see if he could score at an instructional or independent level. The second grade word list also consisted of twenty words. Greg initially answered seventeen out of twenty words correctly. This put him at an instructional level (The same scoring is used for all graded word lists). He was asked to go back to his errors and try to say the word again. Greg corrected two of his errors. The first time he read it, he rushed at the end. Therefore Greg correctly answered nineteen out of twenty words, or 95 percent of the words correctly, putting him at an independent level. There was no need to test down to the first grade word list because it was determined through the second grade word list that his independent reading level for the word lists was at a second grade level.

Graded Word List (GWL)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reading Level | Grade Level  |
| Independent Reading Level |  Second Grade |
| Instructional Reading Level | Not determined |
| Frustration Reading Level | Third Grade |

After the sight word test was administered, a first grade narrative passage was administered to Greg. The first grade narrative was administered to Greg because the BRI administration guide suggests administering a reading passage one grade level below the independent level for word list reading. Since Greg’s independent level with the word list was a second grade level, he was administered a first grade reading passage. Greg read the entirety of the passage in one minute, putting his oral reading rate at 60 words per minute. Greg’s oral reading for a first grade passage was at an instructional level. It was at an instructional level because he had five total miscues as he read through the passage. If a student makes ten or more miscues while reading the passage, it puts him or her at a frustration level. If a student makes six-nine total miscues while reading the passage, it puts him or her at an instructional/frustration level. If a student makes five total miscues while reading the passage, it puts him or her at an instructional level. If a student makes two-four total miscues while reading the passage, it puts him or her at an instructional/independent level. If a student makes zero-one miscues while reading the passage, it puts him or her at an independent level. Greg had a total of five miscues throughout the reading passage. All five of Greg’s miscues were substitution miscues. Greg substituted the word “what” while attempting to read the word *that*. He substituted the word “that” while attempting to read the word *the*. For the most part, Greg’s miscues did not change the meaning of the passage. Greg spoke with some intonation, but ignored most punctuation. Greg was asked comprehension questions after he completed reading the passage orally. Greg got one and one half questions incorrect out of ten total questions, placing him at an independent/instructional level. Since his reading level for the reading passage was at an independent level, I did not test down or up. When asked to retell the story, he did so satisfactorily. He was able to retell the main points in the story, but missed a few details.

Reading Passage

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reading Level | Grade Level  |
| Independent Level |  Not determined |
| Instructional Reading Level | First grade |
| Frustration Reading Level | Not determined |

*Direct Writing Assessment:*

Greg’s writing sample about his summer memory was scored using the six-trait writing model. The six traits that are assessed in this model are:

1. Ideas: The meaning and development of the message.
2. Organization: The internal structure of the piece.
3. Voice: The way the writer brings the topic to life.
4. Word Choice: The specific vocabulary the writer uses to convey meaning.
5. Sentence Fluency: The way words and phrases flow throughout the text.
6. Conventions: The mechanical correctness of the piece.

Each of the six traits is evaluated by assigning one out of five scoring categories to each trait. The five categories are: strong, effective, developing, emerging, or not yet developed.

His teacher, Mrs. Kidd, gave this writing assignment to Greg on September 5,2012 which was the second day of third grade. The students were asked to write about one summer memory. The students were given about thirty minutes to complete this writing assignment. Mrs. Kidd wanted the students to write within the first week of school to show the students where they started in terms of their writing skills at the beginning of school year. As the year progresses, the students’ writing should progress as well. At the end of the year, Greg will compare his writing piece from the beginning of the year, to his writing piece at the end of the year.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TRAIT:** | **SCORE:** |
| IDEAS | Emerging |
| ORGANIZATION | Emerging |
| VOICE | Not yet developed |
| WORD CHOICE | Not yet developed |
| SENTENCE FLUENCY | Emerging |
| CONVENTIONS | Emerging |

* *Ideas:* Greg did pick one idea and stuck with that idea throughout his writing sample. However, he had trouble providing details about the topic. He repeated sentences a few times, and contradicted himself in his writing. For example, he first stated that his friend did not want to go swimming, but the next sentence states that his friend did want to go swimming. Greg did not end his writing piece in a logical way, and the reader is left confused. For example, he starts his writing piece by writing about how he went to the lake to go swimming. However, he never actually talks about swimming in his writing, and ends his piece by saying that him and his friend jumped off of a boat.
* *Organization:* The writing pieces starts off with a clear beginning discussing what the writing piece is about (his favorite summer-time memory). The middle of the writing piece discusses that swimming is his favorite summer time memory. However, the ending of the story starts to stray away from the topic of the story, and he never really writes about his swimming experience. He only states that he jumps off of the boat into the lake, not actually about swimming in the lake. He wrote, “We jumpt off the top ov the bate it was rely fun and I was cod”. It does not tell the reader about his swimming experience.
* *Voice:* Greg’s voice is not apparent in his writing at this point in time. His writing is very basic, and not developed.
* *Word Choice:* Greg’s word choice is very basic. He has not yet developed ways to make his writing more colorful, lively and descriptive. Some phrases that he uses in his writing are “I went to the lake to go swimming with my fernde”, “bow he did’n want to go swimming and he want tide to go swimming.”
* *Sentence Fluency:* Greg sequences his phrases in a way that makes sense. His ideas and phrases make sense and build off of each other. Greg repeats some ideas, and contradicts in two sequential phrases. His writing sample is actually just one big run-on sentence, with a lot of “ands” placed in between two different ideas or phrases.
* *Conventions:* Greg uses very basic conventions in his writing sample. He starts of his writing piece with the topic that he is writing about. He writes from left to right and has mostly complete sentences. However, Greg does not use capital letters, and he does not use punctuation in this writing piece.

Some of his spelling sounds phonetically correct, however he does spell many words incorrectly.

*Dynamic Assessment-Word Recognition:*

Greg was administered a dynamic assessment in word recognition in order to measure his potential to learn subject matter when a series of prompts was given. A dynamic assessment is a model of assessment that requires the student to be assessed, taught, and assessed again after being taught the material. It is designed to see where a student is before the lesson is taught, and then to measure the capability of learning new skills.

For the pre-test, Greg was shown 40 words using flash cards, one word for each card. 20 of the words were from a first grade word list, and 20 of the words were from a second grade word list. The same words were used in the pre-test and in the post-test. The same words were used to facilitate in recognizing clear improvement in the specific set of words. In between pre-testing and post-testing, Greg was taught word recognition skills using a separate list of 40 words (20 from a first grade word list; 20 from a second grade word list). First and second grade word lists were chosen because of the results of the BRI. Greg is at frustration level on third grade word lists, so it was important to test word lists that were at his instructional or independent level. A series of six prompts were implemented in order to see which prompts best facilitated increased word recognition during the teaching phase of the dynamic assessment. The data from the pre-test, teaching phase, and post-test are summarized in the table below:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1st grade** | **2nd grade** | **Combined Total** |
| **PRE-TEST** | 16/20 | 8/20 | 24/40 |
| **POST-TEST** | 20/20 | 14/20 | 34/40 |

|  |
| --- |
| **TEACHING – GRADUATED PROMPTING (6 PROMPTS)** |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| **1st****grade** | 10/20 | 2/20 | 6/20 | 2/20 | 0/20 | 0/20 |
| **2nd grade** | 4/20 | 2/20 | 8/20 | 2/20 | 3/20 | 1/20 |
|  **Total** | 14/40 | 4/40 | 14/40 | 4/40 | 3/40 | 1/40 |

The dynamic assessment involved a series of six prompts, which included the following:

Prompt 1: Flash Timed-Flash the word and give the student three seconds to say the word. Ask the student, “What does this say?”

Prompt 2: Untimed-Flash the word and give the student an unlimited amount of time to say the word. Tell the student to sound out the word.

Prompt 3: Syllable Division-Flash the word with the syllables of the word divided. Tell the student, “Look at how this word is divided into sections. Try to say the word now.” If a word has only one syllable, use a rhyming word and tell the student, “The word you are trying to figure out rhymes with this word.”

Prompt 4: Written Response-Write the word the student said above the actual word shown. Then ask the student what the word is.

Prompt 5: Contextual Cue-Use the word in a sentence and say the sentence to the student, replacing the word with “blank”. Tell the student, “I am going to use the word in a sentence. See if you can figure out the word when you hear how it is used in a sentence.”

Prompt 6: Identify the Word-Tell the student the word and have them repeat it. Say, “This word is … now you say the word.”

It is clear from this dynamic assessment that Greg is capable of learning skills to recognize words, as well as gaining strategies in order to improve his word recognition. Greg correctly pronounced a total of 24 words on the pre-test out of 40 words, and a total of 34 words correct on the post-test out of 40 words. Greg’s total words correct increased by 10 words from pre-test to post-test. During the teaching phase of the assessment, it appeared that Greg learned new strategies to help him correctly identify words from a first grade list, and from a second grade list. For example Greg was able to use the syllable division strategy to say the words ‘beautiful’ and ‘cannot’. He also used the written response strategy to help him say the word ‘cloud’.

During the post-test, it was evident that Greg knew how to use his strategies such as the syllable division strategy, and the written response strategy. For example, when he came to the word ‘beautiful,’ he divided the word up into three syllables and then was able to correctly say the word. Greg was thinking out loud during the post-test and I was able to understand his thinking. Before he divided the word ‘beautiful’ into syllables, he said “I’m going to break this one up to make it easier.” He was able to correctly answer three words on the post-test by using the written response strategy. From doing this dynamic assessment with Greg, it is evident that he responds to teacher instruction, and is capable of quickly picking up on, and applying new strategies. This is shown by his success and improvement with the post-test. The syllable division strategy was the most effective strategy and allowed Greg to correctly read the greatest number of initially unknown words. Words he read correctly using the syllable division strategy were ‘beautiful’, ‘better’, and ‘cannot’. However, the contextual cue strategy did not work well as well in assisting Greg in recognizing words. This is shown by the lower number of additional words read using this strategy. Only two words in the post-test were reading using this strategy. The two words were ‘always’ and ‘almost’.

SUMMARY:

Greg seems to be functioning slightly below average to average range compared to his third grade peers at Conant Elementary School. His main areas of concern are reading (sight word skills, and oral reading fluency), writing (voice, and word choice), Greg is significantly behind his peers when it comes to reading. He is currently in a before school program to enhance reading skills (fluency, comprehension, and decoding skills) three times a week with a general education resource teacher. When asked to do a task or pay attention to instruction, Greg appears to shut down. Greg needs support to help him become motivated and take ownership of his learning. He has been making progress since he has been taking part in the before school program, and should remain in the program.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Based on the available data, it is recommended that Greg continue to receive support in the before school reading program for the area of basic reading skills. (REASON: Greg is below reading level compared to his peers in third grade.)
2. Greg may benefit from having access to dictionaries and other resources such as spell checker to assist with his spelling while writing. (REASON: Greg has limited word usage in his writing, and struggles to spell simple words such as the word “of” correctly.)
3. Greg may benefit from using an organizer in the pre-writing stage of writing to improve his voice and to form ideas. (REASON: Greg struggles with idea generation and finding his voice and may benefit from organizing his ideas before writing a formal piece.)
4. Greg may benefit from frequent breaks when he becomes frustrated during times of academic struggle. (REASON: When Greg becomes frustrated, he is unable to sit up in his chair and do any work or listen; therefore, taking breaks or standing up and walking around may allow Greg to refocus and concentrate.)
5. A Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA) of Greg’s head on desk behavior and other off-task behaviors may be beneficial to determine a more specific reason for Greg’s problem behaviors. A Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP) using positive reinforcement for on-task behavior may decrease the problem behaviors.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:

**Common Core Standard:** [**CCSS.ELA-Literacy.W.3.3**](http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/W/3/3/) Write narratives to develop real or imagined experiences or events using effective technique, descriptive details, and clear event sequences.

1. Greg will improve the quality of his written work by applying a pre-writing strategy in order to generate a topic sentence, supporting details, and a concluding sentence
	1. When given a narrative text example, Greg will identify a topic sentence, supporting details, and a concluding sentence with 80% accuracy
	2. When given a graphic organizer, Greg will use a graphic organizer to fill in a topic sentence, supporting details, and a concluding sentence with 100% accuracy
	3. When given a narrative topic, Greg will write a topic sentence, supporting details, and a concluding sentence with 100% accuracy
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