**NCSU Reading Evaluation Report**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Student Name: Lee Brooks** | **Tests Administered: Parent Interview, Elementary Reading attitude Survey, Phonemic Awareness Test, Informal Phonics Inventory, Word Recognition in Isolation, Informal Reading Inventory, Words Their Way Spelling Test, Unassisted Writing Sample** |
| **Age: 7****School: Lacy Elementary****Grade: 1st****Tester’s Name: Amanda Ricketts** **Dates Tested:** 1/22, 1/29, 2/5  |  |

Lee Brooks was brought to the North Carolina State University Reading Clinic for an evaluation of his literacy-related issues with phonological awareness and reading skills. This report summarizes our work with Lee and provides an interpretation of the testing results. We also weave in some background information shared by Lee’s family that further completes this report. Recommendations for instruction are also suggested. We encourage you to share the information in this report with his teachers.

# Background and Affective Information

Lee’s mother requested the evaluation because Lee struggles in reading despite his efforts to apply himself, and he has previously been identified as not reading at grade level. Lee is an active first grader who enjoys legos, playing chess, video games, and karate. During our first clinic session, Lee relayed that reading was his least favorite activity, particularly when asked to read books for school. His mother shared that concerns with Lee’s literacy skills were first noted in Kindergarten. In Kindergarten, Lee began seeing a literacy specialist at his school and is receiving this continued support through his first grade year.

Lee indicated that he feels very anxious when called on to answer questions about a text during school because, “I know how to read a lot but I try to think of something and if I don’t do it quick enough the teacher calls on someone else.” He also explained his negative feelings towards reading out loud in class by stating, “ I don’t know some words and all of the other twenty people know how to read all of them.” Aligned with Lee’s responses about reading, he scored in the 38% for positive attitude about recreational reading and 44% for academic reading. However, based on our interaction at the clinic Lee seems more motivated to read books while using technology such as the IPAD.

# Informal Reading Assessments

Lee Brooks was administered the Qualitative Reading Inventory-5 (QRI-5) to determine his current reading levels. The QRI-5 is a reading inventory that assesses word recognition in graded word lists, word recognition in passage reading, reading speed, and reading comprehension. An overall reading level is determined by balancing these components.

**Word Lists**

The QRI-5 contains graded word lists that are presented in both a timed (i.e., words are flashed for less than 0.5 seconds) and an untimed format. We are particularly interested in a student’s results on the flashed word list because it reveals how automatic the student’s reading is at that particular level. On this word recognition in isolation (WRI) task, Lee demonstrated an ability to immediately recognize words through a Primer (beginning of first grade) level. At the first grade level, however, Lee’s ability to recognize words automatically dropped significantly to only 20%. This suggests texts at the first grade level may be too difficult for him. When given more time with the first grade level words, Lee was still unable to decode many of the words and frequently looked only at the beginning chunks of the word or stated, “I don’t know that” before trying to decode.

The Phonemic Awareness test results indicate that Lee is able to identify and produce rhymes, identify beginning sounds and words that begin the same way, and blend/segment onset and rime. The results indicate that Lee struggles dividing words into syllables, substituting one phoneme for another, and deletion of final and initial sounds.

The Informal Phonics Inventory test results indicate that Lee is able to identify consonant sounds and some beginning consonant blends. His areas of needs are pronunciation of some beginning consonant blends, final consonant blends, and identification of short vs. long vowels.

**Passages**

After completing the word list reading, Lee read narrative passages orally at the pre-primer 2, pre-primer 3, and primer levels. Measures of oral reading fluency were recorded, including Lee’s accuracy, rate, and prosody at each level. Also, to determine Lee comprehended what he read, he was asked comprehension questions following each passage. We expand on all of these results here.

**Fluency.**

Lee’s accuracy scores were 100%, 92%, and 88%, respectively, at the pre-primer 2, pre-primer 3, and primer levels. Lee reached an independent level on the pre-primer 2 level (middle of Kindergarten.) Lee reached an instructional level on the pre-primer 3, end of Kindergarten, and frustration level on the primer passage (beginning of first grade).

His reading rate across the pre-primer 2, pre-primer 3, and primer passages were respectively: 61 wpm, 25 wpm, and 25 wpm. With the primer text, Lee’s rate was consistent with 50% of other first grade students in the winter (Hasbrouk & Tindal, 2006).

 Lee’s prosody was a level 3 at his independent reading level, his prosody declined to a level 2 as his reached his instructional and frustration reading levels. Lee began to read in two-three word phrases with frequent pauses.

Comprehension.

Before reading a passage, the examiner assessed Lee’s prior knowledge about the passage topic through oral questioning. Following his reading, examiners asked detailed comprehension questions probing Lee’s ability to answer implicit (inferential) and explicit (factual) questions. At each level, he was asked to answer the questions without looking at the text. The comprehension score indicates the percentage of questions Lee answered correctly from memory. Lee’s comprehension score at the pre-primer 3 level was 100%, at pre-primer 2 it was 100%, and at the primer level it was 66%. All three passages read were narrative texts. Notably, the two questions that Lee struggled with on the primer level were implicit which indicates he needs support with inference skills.

Lee provided detailed answers to the concept questions asked before reading each narrative. These answers indicate that Lee’s prior knowledge could be assisting his comprehension of these texts.

**Summary**

The purpose of administering an informal reading inventory is to determine the student’s reading levels. Knowing these levels is important in order to ensure that Lee is reading texts that are at a level appropriate for him (and that will continue to build his reading fluency, his vocabulary, his reading stamina, and his reading confidence). We considered Lee’s accuracy scores and his comprehension scores to determine his reading level. His independent level is the level at which he can read with no assistance. These would be books that he can read on his own. His instructional level is the level that Lee can read with some support, whether from a teacher, parent, peer, or computer. His frustration level is the level that will likely be too difficult for him.

His scores yielded the following results:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Functional Reading Levels | Grade |
| Independent | Pre-Primer 2 |
| Instructional | Pre-Primer 3 |
| Frustration | Primer |

Given that Lee’s scores for pre-primer 3 and primer levels did not indicate a significant drop in comprehension or accuracy, we will be targeting a range of reading levels during assisted instruction.

**Writing Assessment**

Lee’s writing was next evaluated using the 6+1 Trait ™ Writing Model. To procure a writing sample from Lee, the test administrator created a writing prompt based on Lee’s interests. Lee’s writing prompt stated, “Imagine you are building the biggest Lego tower in the world! What would it look like and how would you build it?” He proceeded to write for 9 minutes.

**Writing Strategies**

Lee began writing after he discussed aloud his ideas. He had difficulty focusing and needed prompting to produce more than a sentence. Lee chose to write immediately and did indicate a need to outline or brainstorm on paper prior to writing.

After he finished writing, the test administrator asked Lee if he wanted to read, revise, or fix anything in his sample prior to it being evaluated. Lee then read his story to the administrator and added a period at the end.

**Writing Traits**

Lee’s piece was evaluated according to six writing traits: (1) ideas, (2) organization, (3) voice, (4) word choice, (5) sentence variation, and (6) conventions. Lee was then assigned between a 1 (experimenting) and a 5 (experienced) for each trait. (Descriptors for all 5 scores are shown at the bottom of the chart below.) The examiners kept in mind grade-level expectations as they scored each trait. What follows is a rubric outlining Lee’s writing scores.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Trait** | **Definition** | **FIRSTNAME’s** **score** | **Explanation**  |
| Ideas | The main message | 4 | Lee gave detailed ideas indicating what his tower would look like. He then gave supporting details by indicating that there would be a hot tub, mansion, and swimming pool included in the tower. |
| Organization | The internal structure of the piece | 4 | Although he stayed on topic, Lee struggled with including a beginning, middle and end to his story. However, he did have a sequencing of ideas that were easy to follow and answered both topic questions. |
| Voice | The personal tone and flavor of the author’s message | 3 | Audience awareness is present in a general way throughout his piece. Lee understands that he is describing his Lego tower so someone else can visualize it. The use of exclamation points or feelings words were not present. |
| Word Choice | The vocabulary a writer chooses to convey meaning | 4 | Lee uses a few experiments with vocabulary such as “manchnn” for mansion and “obrs” for outdoors. His words are basic and are grammatically correct.  |
| Sentence Variation | The rhythm and flow of the language | 4 | Lee’s sentences do not always begin the same way. For example he started sentences with “how”, and “it will”He is using (and) as a connective word and is writing sentences that have some rhythm.  |
| Convention | Mechanical correctness | 4 | Lee’s writing is easy to decode. For example, he writes “swimpo” for swimming pool, and “manchnn” for mansion.He uses capital letters at the beginning of his sentence and periods to indicate the end of a sentence.  |

*1=experimenting; 2=emerging; 3=developing; 4=capable; 5=experienced*

**Summary**

Lee’s strengths in writing include his ideas and convention. His piece was enjoyable to read, but could benefit from work with voice and organization. The use of a graphic organizer to help Lee brainstorm a solid beginning, middle and end will be very beneficial to his organization.

**Interpretation of Assessments:**

Lee is reading instructionally at the pre-primer 3 reading level, with specific instructional needs in the areas of word identification and decoding skills. Lee’s comprehension is sufficient at the primer level, which indicates that although his accuracy at this level is frustration he is still making sense of the text. Lee struggles with implicit questions after reading. He struggles to decode primer texts and resorts to word-by-word reading and asking an adult. As a result, his accuracy suffers.

# Recommendations

Based on Lee’s performance, we have provided the following recommendations for word knowledge, fluency, comprehension/vocabulary, and writing. We hope you will share these recommendations with Lee’s teachers and/or tutors.

1. A strategy that will help Lee understand that answering questions requires different sources of information is Question Answer Relationships (QAR). The types of questions are “Right There,” “Search and Find,” “Author and You,” and “On My Own.” See handout for more information.
2. To improve Lee’s comprehension, we recommend using graphic organizers before, during, and after reading. Graphic organizers, such as webs, compare and contrast charts, and Venn diagrams, help to organize information visually. An Inquiry Chart may help Lee set a purpose for his reading with specific questions, use his prior knowledge, be more attentive to text information, and summarize prior and new knowledge after reading.
3. To help improve Lee’s word knowledge, he should receive explicit spelling instruction with a focus on contrasting short and long vowel patterns (cap/cape, fin/fine). He should only study the spelling of words he is able to read. Sorting words into categories attending to target sounds and orthographic features would help Lee solidify these phonic elements.
4. Lee may benefit from the practice of isolating individual sound segments through activities such as Push-and-Say-It. This activity uses concrete manipulatives to “push and say” each sound within a word. Given the word *chop* for example, Lee would push the *ch* while saying /ch/, then push the *o* while saying /o/, then push the *p* while saying the /p/ sound. After deconstructing a word, Lee should always blend it back together by reading the whole word. Words for Push-and-Say-It activities should parallel the picture and word sorting activities.
5. Lee may improve his reading speed through timed repeated readings in independent level texts. Timed repeated readings require Lee to read a text several times, timing each reading with a stopwatch. Lee can chart his progress and note improvement in his reading rate after multiple readings. We recommend that Lee engage in timed repeated readings with text that he reads orally and silently.
6. To increase length of his written pieces, Lee would benefit from prewriting activities. Activities that occur prior to writing, such as webbing and story mapping, provide assistance in idea development as well as in organizing and sequencing these ideas. These strategies would give Lee the support he needs to expand his writing topics and further develop his writing skills.

It has been a pleasure working with Lee. If there are any questions regarding this report, please contact Dr. Kristin Conradi at keconrad@ncsu.edu.
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