

Minnesota State University Moorhead RED: a Repository of Digital Collections

Dissertations, Theses, and Projects

Graduate Studies

Fall 12-20-2018

Quantity Versus Quality: Comparing Reading Recovery and Title I Reading as a First Grade Early Literacy Intervention

Jenna Meyers meyersjen@mnstate.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://red.mnstate.edu/thesis

Part of the Curriculum and Instruction Commons

Researchers wishing to request an accessible version of this PDF may complete this form.

Recommended Citation

Meyers, Jenna, "Quantity Versus Quality: Comparing Reading Recovery and Title I Reading as a First Grade Early Literacy Intervention" (2018). *Dissertations, Theses, and Projects*. 101. https://red.mnstate.edu/thesis/101

This Project (696 or 796 registration) is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at RED: a Repository of Digital Collections. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Projects by an authorized administrator of RED: a Repository of Digital Collections. For more information, please contact RED@mnstate.edu.

Quantity Versus Quality: Comparing Reading Recovery and Title I Reading as a First Grade Early Literacy Intervention

A Project Presented to

The Graduate Faculty of

Minnesota State University Moorhead

By

Jenna Meyers

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Science in

Curriculum and Instruction with a

Literacy Emphasis

December 2018

Moorhead, MN

Acknowledgements

One week after my first semester of graduate school at Minnesota State University Moorhead, my mom, Carol Prien, passed away after a 14 month journey with Metastatic Breast Cancer. It is her voice in my mind that has helped push me through the past five semesters towards obtaining a master's degree. During the most difficult season of my life, the support of my husband, Brady, and the joyful encouragement of my daughters, Melody and Macy, have motivated me to continue to pursue my goals. The past 18 months have taught me that life's challenges do not have to hold you back from pursuing your passions. Thank you for the endless love and support!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	6
CHAPTER ONE	7
Introduction	7
General Problem/Issue	7
Subjects and Setting	9
Description of Subjects	9
Selection Criteria	9
Description of Setting	10
Informed Consent	10
CHAPTER TWO	12
Review of Literature	12
Definition of Terms	12
Comparing Interventions	13
Early Intervention in Literacy	13
Reading Recovery	14
Teacher-Student Ratio	18
Statement of Hypothesis	20
CHAPTER THREE	21
Research Questions	21
Research Plan	
Methods and Rationale	21
Schedule	23

Ethical Issues	24
Anticipated Response	24
CHAPTER FOUR	25
Data Analysis and Interpretation	
Description of Data	
Student Achievement	
Results and Findings	
Research Questions	
Question One	27
Question Two	
Question Three	
Conclusion and Implications	
CHAPTER FIVE	35
Action Plan and Plan for Sharing	
Plan for Taking Action	
Plan for Sharing	35
REFERENCES	
APPENDIX A	40
APPENDIX B	41
APPENDIX C	
APPENDIX D	44
APPENDIX E	46
APPENDIX F	47

APPENDIX G	48
APPENDIX H	49
APPENDIX I	50
APPENDIX J	51

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to promote full implementation of the Reading Recovery program and compare the relationship of Reading Recovery and Title I Reading services among struggling first grade readers. This study will look at first grade students in three classrooms who are reading below grade level and are selected to receive a daily, 30-minute reading intervention that supplements classroom instruction. Two of the classrooms will be placed in Title I reading groups following Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) curriculum. The lowest readers from the third classroom will be tested and selected for 12 to 20 weeks of Reading Recovery, an individualized, one-on-one program. The study aims to determine if one intervention will yield greater accelerated gains in student achievement on the Observation Survey for Early Literacy Achievement.

Chapter One

General Problem/Issue

The Reading Recovery program is currently offered as a form of early intervention for struggling first grade readers district wide. The district's goal for Reading Recovery states:

The goal of Reading Recovery is to give children who struggle in learning to read and write expert tutoring that ensures a self-improving system of reading strategies that will allow them to become independent readers and writers (Agre & Peterson, 2016, 3). The goal of accelerated learning in reading is to prevent retention, placement in long-term remedial programs, and further intervention for students who do not meet grade level expectations without the intervention.

Buildings who offer Title I in the district also offer small group interventions for struggling readers, all of whom use Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI). LLI is written and published by Fountas and Pinnell. It is a supplemental program presented in small groups of no more than three students according to their instructional reading level. Ultimately the goal of LLI is the same as Reading Recovery; to help students reach grade level expectations in reading (Fountas & Pinnell, 2018).

Small group interventions are seen as favorable among many building principals because more students are able to receive the intervention at the same time. For this reason, small group interventions can also be perceived as more cost effective. My observations show that building principals are faced with budget constraints, which continue to increase each year. Students are struggling in more areas than reading, and funds need to be spread among interventions for a variety of content areas. I currently work in a building that has two Reading Recovery teachers. However, based on the 2017-2018 kindergarten data this school qualifies for four to five. Each year the data from the students in my building does not positively reflect the Reading Recovery program due to the fact that my building is considered under implemented. Therefore the data from my building is not considered valid. It is my understanding that the constraints of the Title I budget are largely to blame.

The following statistics from my building illustrate the need for effective and fully implemented early reading intervention. In the 2017-2018 school year, 0% of kindergarten students entered in the fall with the ability to read a leveled text. Marie Clay, the founder of Reading Recovery, states that 80-90% of students do not require Reading Recovery procedures, however, 73% of first graders from our building were reading below grade level in the fall of the 2017-2018 school year (2016, p. 2). This means that 38 out of 52 students from our first grade population were reading below grade level, qualifying them for first round Reading Recovery services. In the fall of the 2018-2019 school year, 75% of first graders from our building qualified for Reading Recovery (46 out of 61 students). Both school years, only eight students were selected for First Round Reading Recovery lessons in the fall.

I do not mean to imply that our students are not making progress in reading. Our building's schoolwide literacy goal states that 75% of students will make at least one year of growth in one year of time according to their instructional reading level. In the 2017-2018 school year, 73% of first grade students met this goal and made at least one year of growth in reading. However, 67% of students were reading below grade level at the end of first grade. This means while a majority of students in my building are making one year of progress each year, because they are starting below grade level expectation, they continue to be deficient in their reading

ability. The topic for this particular action research study was inspired by these statistics and my building's lack of full implementation for early literacy intervention. According to the Reading Recovery Council of North America, "full implementation is achieved when district support is robust enough to ensure that every child who needs Reading Recovery services has access to the intervention. This is calculated by determining individual need at individual schools and should not be construed as a district average" (Effective Implementation, 2018, 3). The purpose of this study is to promote full implementation of the Reading Recovery program and to compare the relationship of Reading Recovery and Title I Reading services among struggling first grade readers. Will the two interventions yield different results?

Subjects and Settings

Description of subjects. Prior to the beginning of the school year, one of three classrooms will be randomly selected by the Fargo Public School District's Reading Recovery Teacher Leader to receive fully-implemented Reading Recovery lessons. The remaining two classes will receive Title I Reading support using LLI as the intervention, a pull out reading model. The participants in this study are the eight students selected to receive Reading Recovery and the seven students selected for Title I Reading groups using Leveled Literacy Intervention who tested at the same text reading level.

Selection criteria. Reading Recovery students are selected only using achievement criteria (Agre & Peterson, 2016). The students in each first-grade class are ranked based on their reading ability by the classroom teacher from highest to lowest. The ten lowest performing students from the randomly selected first-grade class to receive fully implemented Reading Recovery services are to be tested using the Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement (OS). After each assessment is scored, the scores are ranked using normative U.S. data averages,

also referred to as stanines. The stanines are a range from one to nine; five is considered average, and anything below four is considered at risk (APPENDIX B). The eight students with the most stanines at or below four are selected for Reading Recovery services.

The same ranking procedure and assessment will be administered with the 7 students who will be selected for Title I Reading groups from the remaining first-grade classrooms. Their group selection is based on current instructional reading levels.

Description of setting. This study takes place in an elementary school serving kindergarten through fifth grade in a populous Midwestern city. It is centrally located in a well-established, diverse neighborhood. The neighborhood is comprised of older, established homes as well as apartment buildings, government subsidized homes, and a trailer court. It is inhabited by residents with diverse histories, backgrounds, socioeconomic levels, and languages. The student body is composed of 41% Caucasian, non-Hispanic, 26% African American students, 18% Asian American, 9% Native American, 5% Hispanic, and 1% Pacific Islander. The student population is high poverty: 74.6% of the student population are eligible for free or reduced lunch. A variety of programs are offered to support the needs among the student body to promote school attendance, health, wellness, and building positive relationships. These programs include: lunch buddies, Check and Connect, Charism, YMCA, Rising Readers, Chess Club, after-school gym, track, AM Running Club, Adopt-A-School Partners, PTA, Big Brothers Big Sisters school lunch mentors, Caring Closet, Christmas Help, Kiwanis K-Kids, Breakfast Club, Self-Managers, Community Trust Officers, and more.

Informed consent. Permission will be obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Minnesota State University Moorhead and from Fargo Public Schools to conduct this study. The school district's IRB procedure will be followed to obtain permission to conduct

research, which will involve receiving permission from the Reading Recovery teacher leader for the district as well as from the building principal at the school where the research is conducted.

Protection of human subjects participating in research will be assured. Guardians of the participants will be informed of the purpose of the research and any procedures required by the participant. Confidentiality will be protected through the use of pseudonyms without identifying information. The choice to participate or withdraw at any time will be outlined verbally with the participants' legal guardian(s) (APPENDIX C).

Chapter Two

Review of Literature

There are students in every classroom who are falling behind their peers. If these students are not identified early in their educational career, the achievement gap will continue to grow. Early intervention is crucial for the future success of students who are performing below grade level and aligning a research-based intervention aids in closing the achievement gap. Research strongly supports early intervention for low performing literacy learners. Reading Recovery is a research based, early intervention for struggling readers in first grade. It is an intense one-on-one intervention that is designed to follow the individual child within the program because there is no set sequence for teaching literacy (Clay, 2016, p.1). Reading Recovery teachers spend one year in training to learn how to follow the individual child and participate in ongoing professional development every year to remain highly qualified. While other literacy interventions, both one-on-one and small group, may share similar components with Reading Recovery, this comprehensive literacy program sets itself apart as a unique and individualized program because lessons are designed for the individual child.

Definition of terms. For the purpose of this study, the following terms are defined: <u>Accelerated Learning:</u> When a child performing below grade level makes fast progress (Clay, 2016).

<u>Acceleration</u>: A child performing below grade level will make progress faster than his/her average performing classmates in order to catch up. (Clay, 2016, p. 19).

Early Intervention: Instruction provided to the lowest performing students. For this study, student achievement in reading and writing is assessed among children ages six through eight. (Clay, 2016, p. 2-3).

Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Assessment: A literacy assessment to determine a student's independent and instructional reading levels (Fountas & Pinnell, 2018).

<u>Instructional Reading Level:</u> The text level that a child can read with support from a teacher <u>Leveled Literacy Intervention</u>: A daily, small-group intervention that supplements classroom literacy instruction (Fountas & Pinnell, 2018).

<u>Reading Recovery</u>: A 12- to 20-week one-on-one early intervention with the goal of helping the lowest performing students in first grade develop the skills to work independently in reading and writing by reaching average levels of classroom performance. In order to reach average levels, students must make progress at an accelerated rate (Agre & Peterson, 2016, p. 3).

<u>Text Reading Level</u>: The text level a child can read without support during the Observation Survey of Early Achievement assessment

Comparing Interventions

Early intervention in literacy. Early intervention for students who are struggling is a pivotal part in ensuring that they close the achievement gap with their grade level peers (Schwartz, Schmitt, & Lose, 2012). The timing of early intervention is also crucial. Lovett, Frijters, Wolf, Steinbach, Sevcik, & Morris (2017) found in their study on early intervention that students who received a literacy intervention in first or second grade had greater gains in basic reading skills than the students who received their literacy intervention in third grade. Closing the achievement gap was not the only beneficial data that resulted from this study; they also found that students who received their intervention in first grade continued to make progress in reading at more accelerated rates after their program was complete (Lovett, et al., 2017). This study shows that the timing of early intervention can make a considerable difference for children who are struggling to perform at grade level, specifically in first grade for reading and writing.

Intervening early can greatly impact a child's future success in academic achievement. With first grade being identified as a monumental point in a child's success for literacy learning, it is safe to predict that children who enter first grade with a reading deficit will continue to experience difficulty when they are older if an intervention is not provided (Juel, 1988). Closing the achievement gap will not only benefit a child's future, but it is also a cost saving option for school districts (Askew & Simpson, 2004). Juel's (1988) research concluded that children classified as good readers in first grade have an 88% chance of being good readers in fourth grade, compared to the 87% of children who were classified as poor readers in first grade and continued to struggle in fourth grade. A study found that children who mastered reading fluency later in their education have a lower outcome on comprehension scores (Park, Chaparro, Preciado, & Cummings, 2015). The study compared children who had mastered the same set of skills at an earlier age. The data collected from Park et al. (2015) also states that "success or failure in learning to read seems to be established quite early in school, and it is difficult to fill the gaps with late compensation" (p. 1204). Early intervention ensures that educators believe that all children can learn (Sharratt, Coutts, Hogarth, & Fullan, 2013). It means that districts must be willing to invest as early as possible in a child's career so that additional support is no longer needed for a vast majority of students (Park et al., 2015).

Reading recovery. Research done by Marie Clay, the founder of Reading Recovery, aimed to find the optimal time in a child's educational career where they would benefit from extra help to reduce the risk of literacy difficulties (Clay, 1994). After completing her research, Clay developed the Reading Recovery program and concluded that it "is designed for children who are the lowest achievers in the class/age group" in first grade (Clay, 2016). Clay argues that

providing access to early intervention will greatly reduce the number of children who have lasting problems with literacy learning (2016).

Clay states that "in Reading Recovery we are able to produce efficient results for a diverse population of learners because we can design a series of lessons for each individual child" (2016, p. 1). Reading Recovery is not a curriculum, but rather a program where the performance of the individual child one day determines the learning targets for the following day to maximize the learning opportunities. There is not a set sequence for literacy learning and Reading Recovery teachers are trained to be responsive to each child's individual learning (Clay, 2016).

The first ten lessons in Reading Recovery are referred to as 'Roaming around the Known' (Roaming). This is a time when the trained Reading Recovery teacher refers to everything that the child can do independently based on the results of the OS. No deliberate teaching is provided during this period of time. Instead, the processes of reading and writing are shared between the student and teacher, and the child is able to build confidence by only performing tasks that are known (Clay, 2016). Following Roaming, every Reading Recovery lesson includes the following components:

Familiar reading, rereading yesterday's new book while taking a Running Record, working with letter identification, breaking words into parts, composing and writing a story, hearing and recording sounds in words, reconstruction of the cut-up story, new book introduction, and attempting to read the new book (Clay, 2016, p. 35).

The child builds on previous literacy learning each day to prepare for new learning at the end of the lesson when the new book is read. It is important to remember that no child will follow the same series of lessons because this instruction is designed for the individual child.

15

At the beginning of the school year, first-grade teachers and Reading Recovery teachers work together to rank order children's literacy competence from highest to lowest to identify the lowest performing students according to their instructional reading level, other assessment data, and classroom observations. After children are identified as the lowest 20% of their class/age group, trained Reading Recovery teachers complete the six literacy tasks within the Observation Survey of Early Achievement: Letter Identification, Word Reading, Writing Vocabulary, Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words, Concepts about Print, and Text Reading. These scores are ranked using normative U.S. data averages (stanines) in order to select students to participate in the program. If a child is not selected for first round lessons, it is likely that they will again be tested in 12 to 20 weeks for second round placement if their scores still qualify them as the lowest performing literacy learners (Clay, 2002).

Reading Recovery is a comprehensive, not remedial, reading program that aims to develop a child's self-extending system in order to engage in independent literacy learning. By taking a preventative approach, students do not internalize their challenges over longer periods of time (Bufalino, Wang, Gomez-Bellenge, & Zallud, 2010). After a child learns to read, they are then able to read to learn; a skill that extends well into their adult lives (Sylva & Hurry, 1996). According to Thornton-Reid & Duncan (2008) "it is the ultimate goal of Reading Recovery to help students make accelerated progress so that at-risk students become indistinguishable from their on grade-level peers" (p. 56). This solidifies the need for early literacy intervention at this critical time in a child's educational career because the achievement gap grows when the child continues to perform and internalize bad habits.

Teaching reading is not a "one-size-fits-all" process, which makes Reading Recovery unique. It aims to modify instruction based on how each individual child responds, rather than assuming the child's inadequacies are to blame. The Reading Recovery teacher uses daily lesson records, anecdotal notes, sensitive observation of literacy performance, and running records to plan and respond to the individual child's way of processing (O'Connor, Briggs, & Forbes, 2013). It is important that Reading Recovery teachers take their role as skilled observers very seriously as they aim to follow the child's individual understandings toward developing a literacy processing system (Askew & Simpson, 2004).

After 12 to 20 weeks of instruction, a child can successfully discontinue the series of Reading Recovery lessons through a consultation with the classroom teacher, observations of the student in the classroom setting, and an analysis of the student's scores on the newly administered OS assessment to analyze their reading and writing behavior (Clay, 2016).

When looking for a "best fit" program and intervention for successful early intervention, research evidence is extremely important in the selection process (Gomez-Bellenge, 2006). Reading Recovery is a program that carries a wealth of research in favor of its success (Thornton-Reid & Duncan, 2008, Jesson & Limbrick, 2014, Bryk, DeFord, Lyons, & Pinnell, 1994, Hurry & Sylva, 1996, Lose, Schmitt, & Schwartz, 2012, & Coutts, Fullan, Hogarth, & Sharratt, 2013).

Although a majority of research favors Reading Recovery as an effective early literacy intervention, there are studies that suggest the gains are not withheld in later years (Bieber & Choi, 2011). Bieber and Choi state that the intervention does not sufficiently help struggling readers catch up with their peers and stay caught up. Their research does not state whether or not the program was fully implemented in the rural setting with which it took place (2011). Clay (1994) states that "full implementation in a local, state, or national education system carries advantages over and above the progress of children" (p. 5). It is difficult to cite the success or

failure of a program when it is not fully implemented. A key element to the success of the program as a whole greatly relies on full implementation (Coutts, Fullan, Hogarth, & Sharratt, 2013 & Baker & Brown, 2018). When tying it back to the cost/benefit analysis of not only early intervention but to the Reading Recovery program, there is data to suggest that a 79% rate of student success would warrant a successful investment in the program promoting student achievement (Coutts et al., 2013). It is also important to note that additional factors may play a role in a child's continued progress or lack thereof, such as home, community, culture, language, personal characteristics, teacher expectations, classroom interactions, and school systems (Jesson & Limbrick, 2014).

In comparison to these results, Bufalino et al. (2010) found in their research that the rate of acceleration for children in Reading Recovery was a predictor in later literacy development and progress. Their results showed that the longer it took children to reach grade level expectations in the 12 to 20-week Reading Recovery program, which also included students who met grade level expectations in more than 20 weeks, the less likely that the child was able to sustain that accelerated progress. They argue acceleration, which is a primary goal of Reading Recovery, is "a key to a child's continued progress beyond the intervention" (p. 12).

Teacher-student ratio. Traditional Title I programs using small group instruction are often implemented with the intent of serving more students performing below grade level. However, teacher-student ratios in the intervention setting play a role in the success of the intervention. Lose, Schmitt, & Schwartz (2012) based their research on two studies that are critical elements of the theoretical base for Reading Recovery compared to small group instruction. They aimed to see how literacy outcomes of children varied depending on the group size in the intervention setting; 1:1, 1:2, 1:3, or 1:5. Their results indicated that the 1:1 group,

those who received Reading Recovery, scored significantly higher than the comparison groups based on scores from the OS. The data also revealed that there was not a significant difference in scores based on the three small-group conditions (Lose, Schmitt, Schwartz, 2012).

In a one-to-one setting, the teacher is better able to support the child's literacy learning rather than making decisions based on the assumed needs of the group of learners. When a group of students is placed together according to similar Text Reading Level or assessment based literacy skills, they are not likely to follow the same path of developing a self-extending system for literacy learning. Following a set curriculum, even in a one on one setting, does not meet the individual needs of the students (Clay, 2016). According to Bufalino et al. (2010), "the key to the pace of each child's progress is the good teaching that Reading Recovery teachers provide" (p. 13). The ability to carefully observe the individual child increases the likelihood that the teacher is teaching at the child's cutting edge of development, which Vygotsky (1978) coined as the "child's zone of proximal development". Working within the child's zone of proximal development? Working within the child's needs the child's likelihood of independently taking on their learning, initiating independent problem solving, and applying their learning outside of the intervention setting (Clay, 2016).

Research shows that the one-to-one intervention alone is not the key to success, Reading Recovery provides instruction that is responsive to the learner and lessons are based solely on the child's individual response to literacy activities (O'Connor, Briggs, & Forbes, 2013). Hurry & Sylva (1996) conducted a study that compared Reading Recovery with another one-on-one intervention, Phonological Intervention. Phonological Intervention provides 40, 10-minuteindividual sessions using a series of three or four pictures of familiar objects. The child is required to identify the odd one out in the picture series based on a certain criterion, such as rhyme or alliteration (Sylva & Hurry, 1996). Their results favored Reading Recovery after initial testing. As a longitudinal study, they looked at student progress one full school year later and their results showed that Reading Recovery children still made significantly more progress than the comparison cohort (Sylva & Hurry, 1996). Phonological Intervention was less effective because it isolated skills in phonological awareness rather than approaching reading and writing as a complex, reciprocal process. The only disadvantage to the Reading Recovery program in this particular study was a greater expense. One could argue that the results outweigh the cost in the long run because as stated by Askew & Simpson (2004), "learning to read in first grade is a long-term investment" (p. 36).

As stated throughout this paper, there are many factors that contribute to successful early intervention: research-based interventions, teacher-student ratio, the timing of the intervention, and more. Research favors the Reading Recovery program, but the one on one intervention style can lead to apprehension from school districts, especially when considering finances. Successful early intervention is a preventative measure that decreases the need for later intervention with a majority of students. While traditional Title I settings may serve more students, the quality and slow acceleration of student progress put the child at risk of needing continued support throughout their school career. Investing in early interventions with proven track records, like Reading Recovery, is a long-term investment into the future of students because the program is centered on the child as an individual.

Hypothesis Statement

The lowest performing first-grade students who receive Reading Recovery will obtain higher scores on the Observation Survey for Early Achievement than students who receive Title I services.

Chapter Three

Research Questions

As a trained Reading Recovery teacher and Title I Reading teacher, I am concerned by the number of students reading below grade level at the beginning and end of first grade. I was curious to see if our school's lack of fully-implemented Reading Recovery had an impact on the progress our students were making in the first-grade intervention settings. Because of this curiosity, I formulated the following research questions:

- 1. How do scores from the Observation Survey of Early Achievement compare among students who receive Reading Recovery and students who receive Title I Reading?
- 2. What is the difference between the average entry and exit scores on each of the subtest of the Observation Survey of Early Achievement?
- 3. During the 10-week study period, how many students in Reading Recovery and/or Title Reading achieved the district goal of making one year's growth in Text Reading Level? How many students made accelerated growth by achieving more than one year's growth in Text Reading Level?

Answering the above questions would help confirm the need for full implementation of the Reading Recovery program at our school and in our district.

Research Plan

Methods and rationale. At the beginning of the school year, all elementary teachers in the district are required to administer the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark assessment with students who did not meet the previous spring's expectations to determine their instructional reading level (APPENDIX I-J). This data will be used to determine which students are

performing below grade level in first grade according to district standards. All first-grade students performing below grade level will be identified in each first grade classroom.

The Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement (OS) will be used as the measuring instrument and is also the primary tool to select, diagnose, and monitor student performance in Reading Recovery (APPENDIX D-H). "The Observation Survey introduces teachers to ways of observing progress in the early years of learning about literacy and makes possible the early identification of children who may encounter difficulties" (Clay, 2016, 1). The OS is a standardized assessment administered by a trained Reading Recovery teacher in a one to one setting and assesses students in six critical areas of literacy learning: Letter Identification, Ohio Word Test, Writing Vocabulary, Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words (HRSW), Concepts About Print, and Text Reading Level. The reliability of the OS has been estimated using a variety of methods and reliability estimates have been found to range from moderate to high (Goldsworthy, Gray, May, & Sirinides, 2016, 34). Although the standard error of measurement is not provided for all six subtests, reliability measures of Text Reading Level and Writing Vocabulary subtests yielded coefficients of .92 and .87 (Goldsworthy et al., 2016, 34).

Researchers have found that scores can be validly interpreted for the following purposes: (a) identification of at-risk students; (b) measurement of early reading constructs; and (c) prediction of the attainment of performance benchmarks (Goldsworthy et al., 2016, 35).

Students in one randomly selected first grade classroom will receive Reading Recovery as their intervention. This intervention will be considered fully implemented because selection is from a smaller pool of students. The students' scores from the OS are ranked according to stanines, and the eight lowest performing students are selected to receive services based on these

stanines. Reading Recovery is a one-on-one intervention offered daily for 30 minutes with a trained Reading Recovery teacher. Reading Recovery is a 12 to 20-week program and a lesson series cannot be terminated if another student is performing at a lower reading level. When the lesson series concludes, student scores on the OS will qualify them to either discontinue, meaning they met grade level expectations, or be recommended for further support.

The 18 lowest-performing students in the remaining two first grade classrooms will be placed in Title I Reading groups, seven of which will participate in the study based on their similar initial Text Reading Level. Title I groups are comprised of one to three students based on similar instructional reading levels from the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark assessment. Title I Reading groups meet daily for 30 minutes and teachers administer the Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) curriculum. Title I Reading groups do not have a distinct time constraint for the length of the intervention series. Students continue to receive Title I support based on their instructional reading levels. A child who makes accelerated progress may be removed from Title I support even if they are still reading below grade level if one of their grade level peers is performing at a lower text reading level and is not receiving support. Title I Reading teachers are required to support the lowest performing students in their assigned grade level. Each grade level has three Title I Reading teachers for their one hour small group reading block.

Schedule. The two trained Reading Recovery teachers in the building and the district's Reading Recovery teacher leader will administer the OS on all 15 students selected for the study. This assessment takes approximately 30 minutes and is administered one-on-one. The OS will be administered before students receive their intervention, after 10 weeks of instruction, and at the conclusion of the 12 to 20-week Reading Recovery intervention. Title I Reading students may still receive services after the OS assessment is administered.

Ethical issues. According to Reading Recovery Standards and Guidelines, the lowest achieving students in the class/age group should be tested and considered for selection. Prior to this year, all three first grade classrooms have been included in the selection process. By fully implementing Reading Recovery in one classroom, higher achieving students may be selected for Reading Recovery than Title I Reading. Classroom teachers may feel uneasy about this selection process as they advocate for the needs of their students.

Anticipated response. Classroom teachers will be assured that although their lowest performing students may not be receiving Reading Recovery, they will still be receiving support through Title I Reading along with classroom small-group instruction. The selection process still adheres to Reading Recovery Standards and Guidelines by looking at one individual class rather than the entire age group. The district's Reading Recovery teacher leader has also stated that should this method for selection be considered for future use, in the result that Reading Recovery is not fully implemented the next school year, the classroom teacher that received full implementation would not be included in the random selection process the next year.

Chapter Four

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Description of Data At the beginning of the 2018-2019 school year, all first grade students were assessed using the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark assessment in order to find their instructional reading level. The lowest performing students in three first grade classrooms were selected for participation in the study based on this assessment. All 15 students were reading at level AA or A, which meets the beginning of Kindergarten district standards for the instructional reading level (APPENDIX A).

One first grade classroom was randomly selected to receive Reading Recovery as its early intervention. Within this classroom, the 10 lowest performing students were tested using the Observation Survey of Early Achievement. These scores were compiled and analyzed in order to select eight students to receive Reading Recovery. The school has two Reading Recovery teachers, each providing a 20-week intervention for four students at a time.

The lowest performing students from the remaining two first grade classrooms received Title I Reading as their intervention. These students were placed in four groups of three students each based on their instructional reading level. Once these groups were determined, the seven students were assessed using the OS to collect baseline data before their intervention began. After all 15 students in the study received 10 weeks of LLI in Title I small groups, they were again assessed using the OS.

Student Achievement

Table 1

Reading Recovery OS Assessment Scores

Student	Т	Ľ	LI		W	WT		CAP		WV		HRSW	
			Max=54		Max	Max=20		Max=24				Max=37	
	Reading Recovery Students												
	BP	MP	BP	MP	BP	MP	BP	MP	BP	MP	BP	MP	
RR 1	0	3	48	51	1	10	6	16	5	24	17	27	
RR 2	1	3	42	48	2	4	11	11	1	19	0	26	
RR 3	0	7	52	52	6	12	12	19	9	31	19	31	
RR 4	0	7	50	53	2	12	10	18	6	33	20	32	
RR 5	0	5	52	54	2	6	7	13	3	40	2	34	
RR 6	0	3	36	52	0	3	10	15	2	15	8	25	
RR 7	2	5	41	50	4	9	17	18	13	36	7	28	
RR 8	0	1	41	50	0	2	11	15	1	23	8	23	

Note. BP=Beginning Program, MP=Middle Program (10 weeks)

Table 2Title I Group OS Assessment Scores

Student	Т	Ľ	LI		WT		CAP		WV		HRSW	
			May	x=54	Max	x=20	Max	x=24			Max	x=37
	Title I Students											
	BP	MP	BP	MP	BP	MP	BP	MP	BP	MP	BP	MP
TI 9	0	0	49	49	4	2	8	9	8	6	12	18
TI 10*	0	-	50	-	8	-	9	-	16	-	30	-
TI 11	2	1	51	52	3	5	14	14	3	9	20	31
TI 12	0	0	41	45	1	2	7	10	2	2	3	11
TI 13	1	3	53	53	3	12	13	16	4	36	25	33
TI 14	0	1	42	51	3	4	11	9	3	20	9	23
TI 15	1	3	41	52	5	8	17	14	5	24	5	25

Note. Student TI 10 moved during the period of study.

BP=Beginning Program, MP=Middle Program (10 weeks)

Results and Findings

Research Question 1: How do scores from the Observation Survey of Early Achievement compare among students who receive Reading Recovery and students who receive Title I Reading?

When comparing the baseline scores for Reading Recovery and Title I students, the scores on the six subtests of the OS all varied except Text Reading Level. When the data is closely analyzed, it is clear that all students made growth in multiple areas of which they were assessed. Close consideration of the data favors Reading Recovery for the fact that students made greater gains on the OS, resulting in accelerated growth. This data is favorable because students performing below grade level need to not only make one year's growth in reading, but growth beyond that will ensure that students are closing the achievement gap toward operating at grade level expectations in both reading and writing. Figures 1-6 illustrate student growth on each of the six subtests of the OS.



Figure 1. OS subtest: text reading level (TL)

Running Head: QUANTITY VERSUS QUALITY











Figure 3. OS subtest: Ohio word test (WT)



Figure 5. OS subtest: hearing and recording sounds in words (HRSW)

The Concepts About Print subtest from the OS is designed to assess students' knowledge on features of print, such as hierarchical knowledge and early behaviors. When analyzing scores on this particular subtest, some students did not make gains, had limited gains, or scores decreased. In order to further understand why this occurred in scores, further data was obtained from the interventionists in both Title I and Reading Recovery. As students are exposed to higher level texts during instruction, their knowledge of books continues to grow. The scores on the CAP aligned with whether or not students were exposed to increasing levels of texts during their ten weeks of lessons. Figure 7 shows the Text Reading Level that students were performing at with teacher support in the intervention setting. This level is often lower than where they can perform independently during the assessment.



Figure 6. OS subtest: concepts about print (CAP)



Figure 7. Intervention reading levels

Research Question 2: What is the difference between the average entry and exit scores on each of the subtest of the Observation Survey of Early Achievement?

After all of the data was collected, averages were calculated for the initial and 10 week scores for the two groups of students: Reading Recovery and Title I. The scores for student TI 10 are reflected in the initial score averages and the child's absence is reflected in the 10 week scores since the child moved from the district. The average scores illustrate that students in both groups made gains on all six subtests of the OS. The data again favors Reading Recovery as students made significantly greater gains on each of the subtests. Table 3 shows the average increase in scores on each subtest and Figures 8-13 show the average scores among both groups before the intervention and after 10 weeks of instruction.

Table 3Average OS Gains in 10 Weeks

	Letter	Ohio Word	Concepts	Writing		Reading
OS Subtest	Identification	Test	about Print	Vocabulary	HRSW	Level
Reading Recovery	+6	+5	+5	+23	+18	+4
Title I	+3	+2	+1	+10	+9	+1



Figure 8. Average text reading level gains *Note.* Fall scores are both 0.

Tovt







Figure 11. Average letter identification gains



Figure 10. Average concepts about print gains



Figure 12. Average writing vocabulary gains



Figure 13. Average Ohio word test gains

Research Question 3: During the 10-week study period, how many students in Reading Recovery and/or Title Reading achieved the district goal of making one year's growth in Text Reading Level? How many students made accelerated growth by achieving more than one year's growth in Text Reading Level?

All 15 students selected to participate in this study started the first grade school year reading at an instructional level that meets the standards for the beginning of Kindergarten. Our building's schoolwide literacy goal states that 75% of students will make at least one year of growth in one calendar year according to their instructional reading level. The study participants meet this goal by reading at text level 4 on the Text Reading Level subtest of the OS. Figure 14 illustrates text level gains with a trend line at level 4 to show which students met their first grade goal after 10 weeks of intervention.



Figure 14. One year's growth in text level reading

The data shows that four Reading Recovery students both met and exceeded the goal of making one year's growth in Text Reading Level. Although no Title I students made one year's growth during the 10-week study period, two students are within one level of meeting this goal, along with three Reading Recovery students.

Conclusions and Implications

Throughout this study, all 14 students received a 30-minute daily intervention in reading and writing instruction. The goal of early literacy intervention is to close the achievement gap toward meeting grade level expectations in both reading and writing. After compiling the data from this research study, it is evident that all students made progress in multiple areas that were assessed after 10 weeks of instruction, both in the classroom and in the intervention setting. The data favor Reading Recovery over Title I as an early intervention because Reading Recovery students made accelerated growth, meaning the gains were greater during the time of the study. Accelerated progress in reading and writing is important for struggling readers because they are working toward closing the gap between below grade level and meeting grade level expectations. Reading Recovery lessons are designed to meet the child's individual learning needs and competencies. The program is tailored specifically to the individual child and the Reading Recovery teacher is making expert decisions in order to accelerate students. While Title I groups serve more students, the data suggest the lack of individualized instruction is hindering accelerated progress.

Chapter Five

Action Plan and Plan for Sharing

Plan for Taking Action As one of the Reading Recovery teachers providing instruction for this study, I plan to continue the data collection process. Reading Recovery is a 20-week program, so all students will be reassessed at the conclusion of the 20 weeks and this data will be included with the current data that was collected for this study. Our building plans to continue the selection process from a smaller pool of students (one of three first grade classrooms) for the remainder of the 2018-2019 school year. The data collection process will continue with Second Round Reading Recovery students. In addition, Reading Recovery and Title I students who were selected to participate in this study will be assessed using the OS at the end of the 2018-2019 school year to measure growth after the intervention setting. I predict that the Title I students from this study will remain in Title I small groups for the entire school year based on their scores. Reading Recovery students will be recommended for further support as determined by the building Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) team or discontinued from support at the end of the 20-week intervention period.

Plan for Sharing There are many stakeholders interested in the data that is collected from this study and that will continue to be collected. The information from this study will be shared with the team of first grade teachers at our building along with the principal, administrative intern, and student performance strategist with the goal of promoting the Reading Recovery program and advocating for full implementation. The data will also be shared with the district Reading Recovery Teacher Leader. Together, we plan to share the results of this study with program directors from our school district, along with all elementary principals in order to promote the Reading Recovery program and advocate for full implementation for our district. The research clearly states that early literacy intervention, specifically in first grade, plays a role in the growth that a child can make toward reaching proficiency. It is promising that all students within this study made growth in many areas, however the students who received Reading Recovery, where the child's individual needs are the focus, resulted in accelerated gains. This increases their chances of closing the achievement gap and finding continued success in school, which is why promoting full implementation of programs like Reading Recovery is so important.

References

- Agre, R., & Peterson, S. (2016). *Reading recovery practices and procedures: Fargo public* schools reading recovery training and professional development site.
- Askew, B. J., & Simpson, A. (2004). Does one-to-one teaching really matter?. *The Journal of Reading Recovery*, 4(1), 36-42.
- Baker, J., & Brown, K. A. (2018). Broadening the sphere of influence: Reading recovery as part of one district's comprehensive intervention approach. *The Journal of Reading Recovery*, *17*(2), 17-23.
- Bryk, A., DeFord, D. E., Pinnell, G. S., & Seltzer, N. (1994). Comparing instructional models for the literacy education of high risk first graders. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 29, 8-39.
- Bufalino, J., Wang, C., Gomez-Bellenge, F. X., & Zallud, G. (2010). What's possible for first-grade-at-risk literacy learners receiving early intervention services. *Literacy Teaching and Learning*, 15(1&2), 1-15.
- Clay, M. (1994). An early intervention to prevent literacy learning difficulties: What is possible?. *Running Record*, *6*(3), 4-5.
- Clay, M. (2002). *An observation survey of early literacy achievement* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Clay, M. M. (2016). *Literacy lessons designed for individuals: Second edition*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Effective Implementation (2018) In *Reading Recovery Council of North America*. Retrieved from https://readingrecovery.org/reading-recovery/implementation/effective-implementation/

Fountas and Pinnell. (2018). Benchmark assessment system (BAS).

Retrieved from http://www.fountasandpinnell.com/bas/

- Fountas and Pinnell. (2018). *What is Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) and how is LLI used.* Retrieved from http://www.fountasandpinnell.com/lli/
- Gomez-Bellenge, F. X. (2006). Few interventions can match reading recovery research record. *The Journal of Reading Recovery*, *6*(1), 74-77.

Jesson, R., & Limbrick, L. (2013). Can gains from literacy interventions be sustained?: The case of reading recovery. *The Journal of Research in Reading*, 37(1), 102-117. doi:10.1111/1467-9817.12017

- Juel, C. (1988). Learnnig to read and write: A longitudinal study of 54 children from first to fourth grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(4), 437-447.
- Lovett, M. W., Frijters, J. C., Wolf, M., Steinbach, K. A., Sevcik, R. A., & Morris, R. D. (2017). Early intervention for children at risk for reading disabilities: The impact of grade at intervention and individual differences on intervention outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 109(7), 889-914.
- O'Connor, E. A., Briggs, C., & Forbes, S. (2013). Response to intervention: Following three reading recovery children on their individual paths to becoming literate. *Early Education and Deveopment*, *24*, 79-97. doi:10.1080/10409289.2011.611450
- Park, Y., Chaparro, E. A., Preciado, J., & Cummings, K. D. (2015). Is earlier better?:
 Mastery of reading fluency in early schooling. *Early Education and Development*, 26(8), 1187-1209. doi:10.1080/10409289.2015.1015855
- Schwartz, R. M., Schmitt, M. C., & Lose, M. K. (2012). Effects of teacher-student ratio in response to intervention approaches. *The Elementary School Journal*, *112*(4), 547-567. doi:0013-5984/2012/11204-0001

- Sharratt, L., Coutts, J., Hogarth, B., & Fullan, M. (2013). Reading recovery: A high return on investment for cost-conscious and student achievement-oriented education systems. *The Journal of Reading Recovery*, 13(1), 53-60.
- Sylva, K., & Hurry, J. (1996). Early intervention in children with reading difficulties: An evaluation of reading recovery and a phonological training. *Literacy, Teaching and Learning*, *2*(2), 49-68.
- Thornton-Reid, F., & Duncan, S. (2008). Passing the test: Early intervention spells success for struggling students. *The Journal of Reading Recovery*, 8(1), 51-58.

APPENDIX A: Fargo Public Schools Reading Level Correlation Guide

FPS Reading Level Correlation Guide

This table roughly illustrates how different reading assessment system levels correlate to each other and to school grade levels. Teachers are encouraged to use professional judgment when matching students to instructional text levels.

Grade Level	Fountas/Pinnell LbD	DRA	ElL Levels Reading Recovery	Lexile *	Stage
	A	A	1		
r	<u> </u>	1		- 1	
P	8	2	2		Emoreont
	C	3	3-4		emer@ent
	D	4	5-6	100	
	E	6-8	7-8		
	F	10	9-10	200	
1	G	12	11-12		Ende
	н	14	13-14	300	carry
	1	16	15-16		÷
	1	18	17-18	400	3
	ĸ	20	19-20		
2	L	24		500	Early Fluent
	M	28	1		
	N	30	1		
3	0	34	1	600	
	P	38	1		
	Q		1	700	
4	R	40			
	S				
<u></u>	T		1	800	
5	U	44			Fluent
	V				
	W		1	900	
6	x				
2	Y				
7				1000	
8	Z			1100-1200	

* A student's Lexile measure marks a point in a reading range and then extends about SOL above to 1005 below it.

Updated Reading Assessment Task Force - June 2012

APPENDIX B: Stanines for the Observation Survey of Early Achievement

Letter Identification (LI)

Purpose: To find what letters a child knows and the preferred mode of identification.

Task: Identify upper- and lower-case letters and print forms of "a" and "g".

Scoring: Maximum score = 54.

	Stanine Groups												
Period	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9				
Fall	0-43	44-47	48-49	50-51	52	-	53		54				
Mid-Year	0-50	51	52	-	53	-	-		54				
Year-End	0-51	52		53	-	-	-		54				

Concepts about Print (CAP)

Purpose: To find what a child has learned about how spoken language is put into print.

Task: Perform a variety of tasks during book reading by the teacher.

Scoring: Maximum score = 24.

Stanine Groups													
Period	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9				
Fall	0-7	8-10	11-12	13-14	15	16-17	18	19-20	21-24				
Mid-Year	0-12	13-14	15-16	17	18-19	20	21	22	23-24				
Year-End	0-15	16-17	18	19-20	21	22	-	23	24				

Ohio Word Test (OWT)

Purpose: To find if a child is developing a personal resource of reading vocabulary.

Task: Read a list of high-frequency words.

Scoring: Maximum score = 20.

Stanine Groups													
Period	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9				
Fall	0	1	2-3	4-5	6-9	10-14	15-18	19	20				
Mid-Year	0-6	7-9	10-12	13-15	16-18	19	-	-	20				
Year-End	0-14	15-16	17-18	19	-	-	-	-	20				

Writing Vocabulary (WV)

Purpose: To find if a child is building a personal resource of words that can be written. Task: Write all known words in 10 minutes.

Scoring: Count of words in a 10 minute time limit.

Stanine Groups													
Period	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9				
Fall	0-3	4-6	7-9	10-14	15-20	21-27	28-34	35-44	45+				
Mid-Year	0-16	17-24	25-30	31-37	38-45	46-52	53-61	62-72	73+				
Year-End	0-26	27-35	36-43	44-51	52-59	60-68	69-78	79-91	92+				

Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words (HRSIW)

Purpose: To assess phonemic awareness by determining how well a child represents the sounds of letters and clusters of letters in graphic form.

Task: Write a dictated sentence, with credit for sounds correctly represented.

Scoring: Maximum score = 37.

Stanine Groups													
Period	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9				
Fall	0-8	9-15	16-22	23-27	28-31	32-34	35	36	37				
Mid-Year	0-26	27-30	31-33	34	35	36	-		37				
Year-End	0-31	32-33	34	35	36	-	-		37				

Text Reading Level (TRL)

Purpose: To determine an appropriate level of text difficulty and to record, using a running record, what a child does when reading continuous text.

Task: Read texts representing a gradient of difficulty until the highest text level with 90% or better accuracy is determined, with teacher recording behaviors during the oral reading.

Scoring:	M	laximum	score	=	30

				Stanine G	roups				
Period	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Fall	0*1	0*2	1	2	3	4-5	6-12	14-20	22-30
Mid-Year	0-2	3-4	5-6	7-9	10-12	14-16	18-22	24-28	30
Year-End	0-6	7-10	12-14	16	18-22	24	26-28	-	30

*The raw scores in this stanine do not correspond to the mean and standard deviation for this task. They have been adjusted for the purpose of student selection.

APPENDIX C: Informed Consent



JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY 1701 4th Avenue South Fargo, ND 58103 701.446.4700 • FAX: 701.446.4799 www.fargo.k12.nd.us/jefferson

Mr. Brad Franklin, Principal • 701.446.4704 Mrs. Jennifer Stein, Administrative Assistant • 701.446.4705

Consent Form

Participation in Research

Title: Quantity Versus Quality: Comparing Reading Recovery and Title I Reading as a First Grade Early Literacy Intervention

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to promote full implementation of the Reading Recovery program and to compare the relationship of fully implemented Reading Recovery and Title I Reading services among struggling first grade readers.

Study Information: This study will compare scores on the Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement (OS) among first grade students who receive Reading Recovery and Title I Reading as a literacy intervention. Data will be collected by the interventionist and retrospective data will also be used. The Investigator will be looking for accelerated growth in scores on the OS.

Time: The participants will complete this study during their scheduled 30 minute intervention. This study will take place during the fall of 2018.

Risks: Participation in this study does require participants to conduct academic tasks perceived as challenging. While the purpose of the study is to improve student achievement, the outcome of the study is unknown. Increased achievement is not guaranteed to the participant.

Benefits: Participation may help improve participant's classroom performance in reading and writing. This study may help improve student's achievement.

Confidentiality: Participant's identity will not be shared with anyone beyond the principal investigator, David Kupferman, All individual information will be recorded and tracked under an identification number and not the participant's name.

Participation and withdrawal: Participation in this study is optional. All children will participate in the intervention but only those whose parents/guardians have given permission below will be included in the data analysis.



JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY 1701 4th Avenue South Fargo, ND 58103 701.446.4700 - FAX: 701.446.4799 www.fargo.k12.nd.us/jefferson

Mr. Brad Franklin, Principal • 701.446.4704 Mrs. Jennifer Stein, Administrative Assistant • 701.446.4705

Contact: If you have any questions about the study, you may contact any of these people.

Jenna Meyers	David Kupferman
Co-Investigator	Principal Investigator
Email: meyersj@fargo.k12.nd.us	Assistant Professor, School of Teaching and
	Learning, Lommen 216K
	College of Education and Human Services
	Minnesota State University Moorhead
	Ph. 218.447.4252
	Email: David.Kupferman@mnstate.edu

Any questions about your rights may be directed to Lisa Karch, Ph. D., Chair of the MSUM Institutional Review Board, at 218-477-2699 or by <u>lisa.karch@mnstate.edu</u>. You will be given a copy of this form to keep.

"I have been informed of the study details and understand what participating in the study means. I understand that my child's identity will be protected and that he/she can choose to stop participating in the study at any time. By signing this form, I am agreeing to allow my child to participate in the study. I am at least 18 years of age or older."

Name of Child (Print)

Signature of Parent/Guardian

Date

Signature of Investigator

Date

APPENDIX D: OS Subtest: Letter Identification (LI)

A	F	K	Р	W	Z
В	Н	0	J	U	
С	Y	L	Q	М	
D	Ν	S	х	I	
E	G	R	v	Т	
a	f	k	р	w	z
b	h	o	j	u	a
с	у	1	q	m	
d	n	s	x	i	
e	g	r	v	t	g

LETTER IDENTIFICATION SCORE SHEET
(ENGLISH)

										Date:
Nam	ne:					Ag	e:			TEST SCORE: /54
Rec	order:					Da	te of E	Birth:		STANINE GROUP:
	А	s	Word	I.R.		A	s	Word	I.R.	Confusions:
А					a					
F					f					
Κ					k					
Р					p					
W					w					
Ζ					z					Letters Unknown:
В					b					
Н					h					
0					0					
J					j					
U					u					-
					a					
С					с					Comment:
Y					y	1.0				
L					1					-
0					a					-
M					m					-
D					d					-
N					n					Desertion
S					s					Recording:
X					x					A Alphabet response: tick (check)
1					i					S Letter-sound response:
E					e					United Word Becord the word the
G					σ					child gives
R					r					I.R. Incorrect response:
v										savs
т					+					
					, 					
					9					
				TOTAL	s					TOTAL SCORE

APPENDIX E: OS Subtest: Ohio Word Test (WT)

	OHIO WORD TEST SCORE SHEE	T
		TEST SCORE: /20 STANINE GROUP:
Date:		
Name:	Classroom Teacher:	
Record incorrect responses. Choose appropriate list of words.	✓ (Checkmark) Correct Response	(Dot) No Response
LIST A	LIST B	LIST C
and	ran	big
the	it	to
pretty	said	ride
has	her	him
down	find	for
where	we	you
after	they	this
let	live	may
here	away	in
am	are	at
there	no	with
over	put	some
little	look	make
did	do	eat
what	who	an
them	then	walk
one	play	red
like	again	now
could	give	from
yes	saw	have

APPENDIX F: OS Subtest: Writing Vocabulary (WV) and Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words (HRSW)

Prompts for 4 WRITING VOCABULARY

Beginning Time: _____ Ending Time: ____

WRITING PROMPTS: I, is, a, to, the, we, me, at, on, in, go (going), my, cat (cats), sat, can, it,

love, mom, dad, and, yes, no, dog, good, you, ball, he, she, play, car, for, come, like, see, here, up,

. 32

look, this.

.....

Color words - red; number words - ten; names of family members or friends; animal words - pig, cow; prompts from the Word Test; Basal word prompts.

Note:Do not require the child to read the words s/he has written. COMMENTS:

.

Directions for 5 HEARING SOUNDS IN WORDS (DICTATION)

"I am going to read you a story. When I have read it through once I will read it again very slowly so that you can write the words of the story." -- Read through the sentences at normal speed. "Some of the words are hard. Say them slowly and think how you can write them."

BEGINNING OF THE YEAR TESTING, FORM D	1. The bus is coming. It will stop here to let me get on.
ENTERING OR DISCONTINUING, FORM A	2. Ī have a big dog at home. Today I am going to take him to school.
DISCONTINUING, FORM C (Use this form only when Form A was used to enter the child)	3. I can see the red boat that we are going to have a ride in.
END OF THE YEAR TESTING, FORM E	4. The boy is riding his bike. He can go very fast on it.

If the child has difficulty say, "You say it slowly. How would you start to write it? What can you hear? What else can you hear?" If the child cannot complete the word, say "We'll leave that word. The next one is . . . "

O Clay, 1985; Adapted with permission by The Ohio State Univ /SFrRev.93

APPENDIX G: OS Subtest: Concepts about Print (CAP)

Sand Stones			CONCEPTS ABOUT PRINT SCORE	SHEET		
Moon Shoos					Date:	
Name:			Age:		TEST SCORE:	/24
Recorder:			Date of Birth:		STANINE GROUP:	
PAGE	SCORE		ITEM		COMMENT	
Cover		1.	Front of book			
2/3		2.	Print contains message			
4/5 4/5 4/5 4/5		3. 4. 5. 6.	Where to start Which way to go Return sweep to left Word-by-word matching			
6		7.	First and last concept			
7		8.	Bottom of picture			
8/9		9.	Begins 'The' (<i>Sand</i>) Begins 'I' (<i>Stones</i>) Begins 'I' (<i>Moon</i>) Begins 'Leaves' (<i>Shoes</i>) bottom line, then top, OR turns book			
10/11		10.	Line order altered			
12/13 12/13 12/13		11. 12. 13.	Left page before right One change in word order One change in letter order			
14/15 14/15		14. 15.	One change in letter order Meaning of a question mark			
16/17 16/17 16/17 16/17		16. 17. 18. 19.	Meaning of full stop (period) Meaning of comma Meaning of quotation marks Locate: m h (Sand); t b (Stones); m i (Moon); m i (Shoes)			
18/19		20.	Reversible words 'was', 'no'			
20 20 20 20		21. 22. 23. 24.	One letter: two letters One word: two words First and last letter of word Capital letter			

APPENDIX H: OS Subtest: Text Reading Level 1 (TL)





 Level:
 1
 A BIRD CAN FLY

 E:
 2
 "This backs is about things people and animals can do, I'll reads the first hore pages, then your can help."

 RW:
 16
 "Eacher seaks of to copes 2 and 3. On pages 4. 5. and 6, the teacher points to and ands the little or od outs the hild to was the second lus. The child read of to page 7.



A fish can swim.



So can I.



A frog can hop.



So can I.

3



A horse can run.



So can I.

4



A dog can dig.



So can I.



5



A monkey can swing.



So can I.









7

So can I.

49

APPENDIX I: Sample Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment

		Meakle +	LIVELA					Recording Form	Recording Form	Bost Friends + Love A + Frances
	Studen	nt				_	Grade Date	fours	Form 447 1 3 1 4	
	Teache	er					School	scading	Rate Below and Attack	
	Part 0	Dne: On	al Readi	ng					10 50% 3/16 34% 3/16 100%	
	Place th	he book i	n front of	the sta	dent. Read the title and int	oduction.				
	hhods	cline: le o	at what th	cy like	pls tell all the things they i to do. Point under each we	ke to do toge ed as you rea	cher. Read to find ad.	Sources of Information Used	S:B-Correction Ratio (E + 5C) + 5C = 1:	
	Page	Teat					Bost Friends Louid A, RWE 32 E SC	E SC M S V M S V		
	2	We	like	to	run.					
	4	We	like	to	dance.					
	6	We	like	to	swing.					
	8	We	like	to	climb.			A second and	a sudabyre	
	10	We	like	to	slide.			Ni pąr my lu	ar (. Pastas ed	
	12	We	like	to	ride.			H13baan	Cry to House Pry	
	14	We	like	to	paint.			the dL Patiencel	sarra, Minak	
	16	We	love	to	read.			wfos art (or 51	ann fleigea	
	4						Total	Contract Criteria	av te presunt	
									ь.	
	Founter	a Hood B	inec lasses i /	newto	në Syduar t				Fuentes & Plend Benchmark Association System 1	
Building								In case of the second		Berthiest - Inn I - Donn
est meas	1.148	44. M * J	1.004					seconding ratio	Recording Form	Bus Provide - Link A - Piciture
Part Two:	Com	preh	ension	Cor	wersation				Student	Date
Part Two:	Com	with the	ension • student	Con	wersation g the key understanding		Camprehension Scaring Key		Besselen Write about what the two girls like	to do together. You can draw
Part Two: lave a convert the student co orderstanding	Com sation presse s the s	npreho with the s. Use p dudient o	ension : student rumpts a fors not	Col notic s hito	tversation g the key understanding ted to stimulate discuss u. Score for evidence d	5 os of all	Comprehension Scaring Key 8 Reflects an understanding of the test. ID table of the tage.	for does not scipped or	Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
Part Two: live a conver indextanding indextanding indextanding to ware color	Com ration presse s the s s express na the	npreho with the s. Use p dudient o ecced - v at reflect	ension student rampts a fors not with or w h the lev	Con notic s heb expre thout d of a	tversalion g fie key under standin ded to stimulate discuss s. Score for evidienze d a prompt. Citcle the nu rederstanding demosciti	s us af afl eber in fæd.	Comprehension Sciency Key 8 Micros are understanding of the test. El Jalia of the tests. 1 Micros way Bailing and extendeng of the iso han but does not appears the target 1 Micros and automations of the test	fier dats not respond at the tot Rientures after facts fact information or inform (includes recording i	Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
Part Two: live a conver le stadiet ex edentanding edentanding le wore colui locher: Talk	Com orision presse s the s s expre na that about	npreho with the s. Use p dudient o cosed-w at reflect t what h	ension e student rangts a foes not ath or w s the lev appened	Con notic s has expose thout d of a in the	tversation Ig the key understandin led to stimulate discuss or. Score for evidence d a prompt. Circle the nu orderstanding demonstr is utbry.	t al der in fed.	Comprehension Scoring Key B Minist me unterstanding of the test. ID Salis of the tape. I Minist multiple under starting of the in Minist and under starting of the ta- himmation and stars to tapilita the I Minist assessment and stars to tapilita the	för des i nit regiond av för des i nit regional av för inst Biordans af det sta information av fören f. br. hades standings för anderstandings	Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
Vart Two: late a conver e ductar exp edentaviling edentaviling he scare colar cocher: Talk	Com presse s the s s espre- na that about	npreho with the s. Use p dudient o cosed -o at reflect t what h	ension student rampts a fors not ath or w a the lev append	Con notice s here thouse d of a len the	sversation g the key understandin de to azimulate discesa o. Score for evidinase d a prompt. Carde the na orderstanding domoscia i utory.	s on of all ober in fad.	Comparchemism Scoring Key Befords are understanding of the test. It safes of the tests. In Method way Babled and extracting of it or items but items are special for based to the state of the same spectra and the information and states and material toportees biomediate and materials.	Ber des referand ar be tes Referan Alas faits far ideation ar idea (a lockair agostrai i ley andratisading) net. Initiale, devot al	Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
tart Two: we a conver le dadatt en nderstanding nderstanding le some colu scoter: Talk	Com presse s the s s copro about	npreho with the s. Use p dudient o exced-so at reflect t volue h Key U	ension student rangts a fors not able ran the lev append Juderst	Con netir s has spore thout d of a in the and	wersation g the key understanding led to simulate discuss is. Scote for evidence of a prompt, Carlot the nu- nderstanding demonstr is story.	5 on of offerin fod	Comprehension Scoring Key 8. Minut we unterstanding of the test. If adds of the test, 9. Minut we parallel and extending of the extension but discusses preventioned before appelled uncertaining of the intervention of adds of the parallel and the discusses and many cleans. Although 9. Minut extension and many cleans Proceeds	Ber des nd migend ar be led. Berdien a start fatt, dat identition af after, dat kinnensten after i rey undestandings, toc. Include almost aft Score	Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
Part Two: we s convert to shaded ex- edentanding edentanding to color: Tak within the Does as in	Com rease s the s s coprime the about e Text	npreho s. Use p dudent o cosed -v at reflect t volue h Key U	ension student rangts a loss not ath or w t the lev appened Judees Judees	Cor notic s not expre thout d of s in the and	wersation g the key under dasche het to stimulate discuss is. Score für evidense d g pronet, Greit beit nederstanding demostra is story. hgs	s on of all there in field.	Congredention Scoring Key 8. Minut we unterstanding of the test ID table of the test. ID . Minut we parameters and the test ID . Minut we parameters and the test of the second second second second second . Minut we address and near second second . Minut we address and near second . Prompts 	Ber des red regent ar be bot Rectars also f at der lött Rectars also f at der lötter der der ter verde standing, tert. Indukt einen di	Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
Part Two: two a converse to stadent exp edentanding edentanding to converse to converse to converse to converse to converse Within the There are in (Gress 2-3 of	Com reste s the s s capt na that about e Text ts of 4	NPTCHO with the s. Use p divident of eccord - v at reflect t what h Key L d Offerent fer such	ension rangts a fors not with or w b the lev append Underst dat not,	Con notic s hou expre di of a lin the bandi te grit bandi	wersation g the key understanding bed to simulate discous s. Score for evalutions it is proving. Carle the no inderstanding demonstra is story. ngs like to do together uning, climit, tido,	o di all nber in fad. Telloar Can ve	Congredention Scoring Key 8 Minut we understanding of the text ID Jake of the spin. In Article way Balaka indexisating of the original score and the spin of the Interfere spin of understanding of the Interfere spin of understanding of the Interfere score and score score of the Prompts Prompts the finance score score score score score and the spin like to do together, and many times, then like to do	for des retrigent ar to tot. Review shart at arbitration arbitration tot. Review shart at the bot. Review shart at the second standard, tot. Include shows at Score 0 1 2 3	Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
Part Two: lave a convert la stadest exp indenstanding indenstanding to score columniation to score columniation to score columniation (Gaves 2-3 a risk, paint, a late score columniation)	Com sation presse s the is s expre- na that about e Text fs of 6 mampi end re	NPTCH with the s. Use p dudient o toold with toold with Key U d offerent des such tod()	ension - student ranges and above and above append Inders Inders things th as may, o	epre thout d of a andi andi	wersation g the key understanding bed to simulate discous s. Score for evalutions of a prompt Carde the no understanding demonstra is story. ngs like to do together, using, clieb, side,	s al d al ther is fad. Tell san Can yo togethe	Congredention Scoring Key 8 Minut wavernaming of the text ID Solid of the spin. In Altern wy Baland anderstanding of the order of the spin set operator for spin 1 Minute and an out-making of the interment and alase too tradients of the first solid and another spin of the 1 Minute and another spin of the Prompts Prompts her fings the girls like to do together, a tell more things they like to do 10	for des retrigent ar to tot liketiev sha f at del des retrigent tot but liketiev sha f at del denotes ar tot in the second star Score 0 1 2 5	Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
Aart Two: we a convert is stadent ex- ederstanding inderstanding is scatte collar scatter collar within the There are in (Gares 2-4) nder, point, a Anter any ad	Com ration presse s the s s expr ins that about e Test e Test (dress)	npreho s. with the s. Use p dodant o record - v decord - v d at reflect t solar b Key U d d different files solar of d and end	ension rangts a fores not obser not the leven append undersi things th as man, o levelage	Cor netir s too expre thout d of a landi	wersation g the key understandin led to simulate discuss is Scont her widdness prompt. Citel the nu nderstanding demostra is utery. ngs like to do together, uning, clieb, side,	s on of all ber in fed. Tell sur Can yo tugethe	Comprehension Scoring Fory 9 Minds are advertiseding of the text. It which is an advertiseding of the text. It which we maked addresseding of the 9 Minds advertised of the text. It 9 Minds advertised of the text advertised of the 9 Minds advertised of	for desind segmed or the left Bertone also Lat. Caldenauto or these Labelet segmed and the second second also Score 6 1 2 3	Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
tart Two: we scanor is statistic en adorstanding indextanding is scane columniation in the scane columniation (Gaves 2-3 in (Gaves 2-3 in))))	Com ration presse s the s s expre- na that about t about ts of 4 manipi red re- fit-end inter Teo	nprehu with the s. Use p dudent i ecced-with ecced-with a reflect a reflect a reflect a reflect d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d ecced-with p dudent i ecced-with p dudent i ecced-with a reflect d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d	ension erges a does not ath or w a the lev uppened Underst things th as num, i tendings	contra sate expre di of s in the andi andi	wersation g the key understandin hof to strandard document is. Score for evidence of neerstanding demostra in utery. hgs ilie to do together, using, clieda, sider,	5 on of all ober in fed. 7ell car Can yo togethe	Comprehension Scoring Key 9 Mich as a contractioning of the text B with of the text B 10 Mich and particular data to text B 10 Mich and the text B	for desind superior of the desind of the des	Seudent Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
tart Two: we s convert le stadent en edestanding destanding le score colar coder: Talk Within the Deer are in (Gaves 2-3 o note, point, o Autr any ad Beyond th De gris like	Com origination provide a single about about e Test for an optimized re- dataset (drawa) the Test	npreho with the s. Use pudent of eccoder of eccoder of eccoder of eccoder of a subject of Key I d Offerent des such erst of a subject of offerent of the standard of eccoder of	ension student orangta a bors not bors not bors not things th doubless things th as run, r toutings not east	Col notic s not those di of a landi landi landi	wersation g the key understandin bot to simulate discuss is Score for valendame de inderstanding demostra in utery. Ngs Ngs Ngs Ngs Ngs Ngs Ngs Ngs Ngs Ng	s on of all all her in fad. Idlisor Can yo togethe How co friends	Comprehension Scoring Key 9 Models as an internationality of the local Eu- adre of the local complexity of the 10 Models appendix understanding of the 10 Models appendix understanding of the 10 Models appendix understanding of the 11 Models appendix understanding of the 12 Models appendix understanding of the 13 Models appendix understanding of the 14 Models appendix understanding of the 15 Models appendix understanding of the 16 Models appendix understanding of the 17 Models appendix understanding of the 18 Models appendix understanding of the 18 Models appendix understanding of the 19 Mo	for desind support or the local development of the last cardination of the last cardination of the last cardination of the last last behavior and of last Score 0 1 2 5 0 1 2 5	Student Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
Art Two: we a convert to stadiet ex- enderstanding inderstanding in scatter coldu- ing scatter coldu- nice, paint a mice, paint a mice, paint a mice any ad Beyond th The gets like The gets like	Com adion provide s the s s expen- na that about e Text (dense) the Text to do	npreho with the s. Use prident of essed-st essed-st essed -st essed -st esse	ension e stadent rampta a bers not bers not bers not ablers to a not underst faings th as not, tendings mith ead	c Col netir s soc expre thout d of a landi landi landi landi t other t other	wersation g the key understandin bot is simulate discuss is Score for valendama d inderstanding demostri is utery. Ngs (like to do together, using, climb, side, s to do other things.	5 on of all here is feel. Tell som Can yo togethe How co	Comprehension Sciency Ray Subic damage and the local list of list of local list of list list of	Rectans.nd.mpeed.or https://www.second.org/ for the line of information of the second for the line of the second of the second information of the second of the second of the second Score I 0 1 2 5 0 1 2 5 0 1 2 5	Seudent Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
Part Two: twe s covers two dataset or solution of destanding destanding to some columnic confer: bill Within the Dece are in (Gives 2-3 or More are in (Gives 2-3 or (Gives 2-3 or (Gi	Com ration prose s the s s sign na that about es Ted through the Ted to no chronol	nprehi with the s. Use p dudent of ecced-s duced a reflect t what h Key U d dfBreat des sudh set d a thing a d a thing a d a name	ension e student does not does no	a Con a son operation of a son andi	wersation g the key understandin bot is strandard scoses is. Score for evaluations of orderstanding demostra instary. It like to do together: using, climb, side, s. to do other things.	s or of all there is tead. Tell some Can year together the design of the tead of	Comprehension Sciency Exy Sub-off an excitational of the text Exits Sub-off heaps, and text Exits	there does not emposed or the less the emposed in the less for information of the emposed is behavior and the emposed is behavior and the emposed the production of the emposed the production of the emposed is the behavior and the emposed is the	Seudent Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
Part Two: taxe a convert taxe a convert tax stadent convert tax stadent convert tax stadent convert tax states columnic tax stat	Com station presses s the s s super ma the about es feet the feet internel internel internel	nprehi with the sound we accound we accound we are not a sound we are an are different at a thing and a sound we are an are a sound we are a sound a sound we are a sound we are	ension e student compts a fors not does no	a Con a notic s not	wersation g the key under taskin bid to simulate discus s. Score for valence in a prompt. Circle the no oderstanding demonstre is story.	5 on di ali fed. 3 disor Can yo togethe brendo or aliti what's	Comprehension Scoring Key 9 Media we networkstanding of the test El with of the test of the test El 10 Media we network of the test El 10 Media we network of the test El 10 Media public during testing of the 10 Media public during testing testing 10 Media public during testing 11 Media public during testing 12 Media during testing testing 13 Media during testing testing 14 Media during testing testing 14 Media during testing testing 14 Media during testing testing 15 Media during	for des retrigend or the Bit Rectars at his Law test Rectars at his Law test Rectars at his data test Rectars at his data test Rectars at his data test Rectars	Student Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
Part Two: taxe a convert taxe a convert tax stadent convert tax stadent convert tax stadent convert tax states columnic tax stat	Com station presse s the s s expen ma the about the Ted to read (thread to read (thread to read (thread	such the such the second of a second of a	ension e student fors not the w append Judens Judens things th touchop mith ead than th touchop	a Cor natir s not espre thout in the tandi tandi	wersation g the key under taskin bid to simulate discus s. Score for valence of a prompt. Circle the no inderstanding demonstra is story.	o of all there is feel	Comprehension Scoring Key 9 Media we neterioraning of the text E which of heavies 10 Media we neterioraning of the 10 Media wells and the text E 10 Media wells and the text E Prompts Prompts Prompts Prompts Prompts Prompts Bey like to do together, ther favorite fixing to do? Why? Subtratia Add 1 for any additional understand	for des retrigend or the Bol Rectains at his 1 and the Bol Rectains the Bol Rectains th	Student Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
Part Two: the a could be added to a added tanding added tanding added tanding added tanding added tanding the scale column (Greep and A Attent are to (Greep and A Attent are added The gets like Attent are added The gets like Attent are added Attent	Com ordine presse s the is s capit in the about e Teol for all for all the Teol to do to to mail dataset	nprehu with the s. Use p dudieti d cord	ension student forstor thory of sthory of sthory of sthory of structure mith east touchings	t Cor andi s note s note s note d of a in thi landi andi t ofte ry like	wers ation g the key under tasking bit is simulate discuss is. Score for valentisme it g prompt. Carle the no nderstanding demonstri is story. The bit of the test of the sone of the son	o of all all there is teed. Teel series teed teed teed teed teed teed teed te	Comprehension Scoring Exy 9 Minds are advertiseding of the text ID 10 Minds are maintenanced of the text ID 10 Minds and the text ID 10 Minds and the text ID 10 Minds and text and agrees the search 10 Minds and text and text and text 10 Minds and text and text 10 Minds and text and text 10 Minds and text and text and text 10 Minds and text and text and text and text 10 Minds and text and text and text and text 10 Minds and text and	Ber des nd maped ar be int Bertans alse Las de laboration ar direc de Laborationalities de laboratio	Seudent Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
Part Two: two a conserve two addets and addets and and addets and and addets and and addets and and addets and and two and addets and addets within the These are in (Gives 2-3 of addets and addets Addets any add Beyond the The girls like Addet any add	Com ration presses s the s separation is that about the Teol of reading into readin	nprehu with the s. Use p duckets i exceed-a a reflect t volue h d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d	ension control a loos not how with or w append dings th as mus, o control of control with each control	a den	wersation g the key understandin bot is stronger tervisioner d so score for evisioner d so score for evisioner d netratanding demostra songer tervisioner d netratanding demostra stronger netratanding demostra netratanding demostra netratandin	n of al fait of al fai	Comprehension Scoring Exy 9 Mich as an anti-training of the text El 20 Mich and the second second second second 20 Mich and the second seco	Rer des nd maped ar the incl. Review also Lan. de la bleven also de la factoria de la bleven ter particular de la bleven C. Corre 6 1 2 3 6 1 2 5 0 1 2 5 Scare: Scare:	Seudent Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
Part Two: two a converte two addets and addets and and addets and addets addets and addets within the Dece are in (Gives 2-3 o more are in (Gives 2-3 o (Gives 2-3 o	e Ted to manufacture about e Ted to of d manufacture (drawa)	nprehi with the s. Use p doublet is escore-+ escore-+ a reflect is escore-+ d f d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d d	ension states to loss to to sthor with the lev append indeest things th an maximum with ead t than th to antique with ead t than th to antique About	t other	wersation g the key understandin hol to simulate discuss s. Score for valence in a prompt. Circle the nu oderstanding demonstr is story.	o of all all here is ted. Tell some of all	Comprehension Scenerg Exy Subia de service service de la	there does not mapped or the link. Revelation a law is derived weat standarding to be the second standarding to be believe at the second standarding to be beside to be	Sevent Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
Part Two: two a converte two addets and addets and and addets and addets addets and addets with the second of The gets like Marr any add The gets like Marr any add Part Threes teal the estile	e Test about to do about to do to do	nprehi with the s. Use publication s. Use publication s. Use publication at an effect at an effect at an effect at at at an effect at at at an effect at at at an effect a	ension stadent renets fors not s the lev append dings the ensity entities the lev append dings the ensity e	t Cor andre sopre thost of of a in the problem transfit andi transfit t	wersation g the key undertandin hol to simulate docume a prompt. Carle the nu- nderstanding demonstra is story. ngs ilie to do together: uning, clieb, side, c to do other things. Carle to Tobet Some 4-2 De Held Some 4-3 Deather Some 4-3 Deather Some 4-3 Deather Some 5-3	2 or of all there is test. The first operation of the set of the s	Comprehension Scoring Key Generations and the text II Solution and text of text II Solution III Solution II Solution II Solution II Solution II	there does not support or the list. Revelation of the list of information or the list of information or the list of information or the list of information of the linformation of the list of information of the	Sevent Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
Part Two: twe s covers two destroyers advertanding orderstanding the score column (souther: Table Within the Decreare lo (Sours 2-3 of (Sours 2-3	Com relation processor setup in sector is sector is about the Teol of remain internal	nprehu with the s. Use publication s. Use publication s. Use publication at andre of the standard different di different different different di different di	ension student renets fors not store to store to store to append diagest di diagest di	a Cor a note is note the oper the oper th	wersation g the key undertandin hol to simulate discuss is Score for velations it a prompt. Carle the nu- nderstanding demonstra is story.	2 or of all all there is tead. Tead of the set of tead of te	Comprehension Scoring Key 9 March and managed file back like in the like indication of the back like like back like indication of the back like back like indication of the back like ba	there does not encoured or the last. Revelation of the last for lock-and income of the last for lock-and income of the last the lock-and income of the last 0 1 2 5 0 1 2 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Student Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
Part Two: two s covers two s deletions advertanting orderitanting two score columns within the Dece are in (Gives 2-3 - nche, paint, a Autr any add Beyond th The gets like Autr any add Autr any add	com satisfies sequences is experi- manufil about to de to d	subs the first state of the second se	ension student romata is been not define so the lindeers! faings th an mail an	andi in the andi in the andi in the ry like ry like the ne	wersation g the key under taskin bid to simulate discuss is. Score for valence in a prompt. Circle the no observationed g demonstra is. story.	5 or of all there in ted. Self-our can yo together theredo Of all di what's of all our can yo what's of all our can yo of all o	Comprehension Scoring Key 9 Mode as existentialing of the text E 10 Mode as existentialing of the text E 11 Mode as existential and existential of the text E 12 Mode as existential and existential of the text E 13 Mode as existential and existential of the text E 14 Mode as existential and existential of the text E 15 Mode as existential and existential of the text E 14 Mode as existential and existential of the text E 15 Mode as existential and existential of the text E 16 Mode as existential and existential of the text E 17 Mode as existential and existential as existential as a field as a statential a definition as a used and a statential a definition as a partial as a lifetime as a definition as a statential a statential a statential a statential as a field as a fi	there dees not expend or the test free dees not expendence or the test the test free dees not expendence the test indexestion or the test test indexestion or the test test indexestion of test test indexestion test indexestin test indexestion t	Seudent Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
Part Two: two a coust me to stadiet exp solution of the solution of the solution of the solution of the solution of the these are to (Gree 3.2.4.6. Anter are to (Gree 3.2.4.6. Anter are solution (Gree 3.2.4.6.6. Anter are solution (Gree 3.2.4.6.6.6.6.6.6.6.6.6.6.6.6.6.6.6.6.6.6	Com setters sespen sespen about about to de to de to de to de to manuel de Tec to de to manuel de to de to	system in the second se	ension student rompts a bers not sithe for w append Juddenst filings th angest filings th angest filings th angest and student	andi andi andi andi andi andi andi andi	wersation g the key undertaeding bet to simulate discuss is Score for valence in a prompt Carle the nu- nderstanding demonstra is story.	2 or of all all there is teed. The form of	Comprehension Scoring Key Comprehension Scoring Key Comprehension Scoring Key Comprehension	her des nd myord or he inci liketions also Leis for ideas and myord for your strangers, be inci liketion and all Score 0 1 2 3 0 1 2 3 Score S	Seudent Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
Part Two: two a converte two a converte two a converte two according two converted two converted within the There are in (Green 2-3 or rides, paint, 1 Anter arey and Beyond th The girls like Anter any and Part Three teads for write if time for the alternation.)	Com setters sequences about about to do to do to do to do to do to do to do to do to do to	system in the second se	ension student rompta a bers not different tith or w appende underst underst faings ti en non, nothings to non, nothings entith ead of the student provident to an non, nonhings entith ead of the student to an nonhings entith	t Cost organization of the state of the stat	wers ation g the key under tasking bid to simulate discuss is. Score for valentisme it a prompt. Carle the no inderstanding demonstra is story. The bid ob the bid bid is do other things. Carle to 'bid Score - 2 Carliet Score - 2 Carl	2 on of all there in fact. Tell our Can yo together the fact. How con the fact. How con you together the fact. The fac	Comprehension Scoring Exy 9 Mich do service unique of the text Exits of the service of the serv	there does not mapped or the incl. Receiptor a bits it and fact bitmention or inform for production of the column for the column form of the colu	Student Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw
Aart Two: we a converse to stadiest each output and the stadiest each with the the scale column with the the scale column (Gives 2-3 on the point, 100 Beyond 0 The girls like Star any add Star any a	Com ration s about about about te Ted (strong) ind re (strong) ind re (str	npreh- suits the s. Use product a standard of the standard of	ension estident romata a loss not dels or w its the low is the low ingented frings it as run, e frings it as run, e inderest frings it as run, e inderest is chan the chan the	t Res corr /	wersation g the key understandin hold to simulate discuss is Score for valentisme is a prompt. Carle the nu- nderstanding demonstra is story. ngs ilie to do together: using, clieb, side, c to do other things. Cade to Tablet Score 4-2 De thet Score 4-3 De thet Score 4-3 De thet Score 5-3	2 or of all there is test. The set of all the set of the set	Comprehension Sceney Exy Generations and the text II Solution and the text II Solution and the text II Solution and text of text of text II Solution Solution II Solution II Solution Solution II Solution	And designed and an experience of the set of defendence of the set of d	Student Write about what the two girls like a picture to go with your writing.	to do together. You can draw

APPENDIX J: Fargo Public School Fountas and Pinnell Assessment Protocol

F&P Assessment Protocol

Fall Assessment Window (Grades 1-5)

- Assess all new students to FPS.
- Assess students based on previous year's spring score:
 - Grade 1: Level F and below
 - Grade 2: Level J and below
 - Grade 3: Level M and below
 - Grade 4: Level P and below
 - Grade 5: Level S and below
- Teacher/team should consider if F&P is necessary for students who do not meet the above groups and have red and yellow AW+ measures in the fall.

Spring Assessment Window (Grades K-5)

• Follow spring guidelines