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ABSTRACT

Learning how to read fluently was a goal the researcher had which led to the research question; How does the intervention of repeated reading impact oral reading fluency rates in students who are reading below a 2nd grade level? The purpose of the action research was to implement the intervention of repeating reading to see if the oral reading fluency rates in struggling students increased. Struggling readers were identified through the Dynamic Indicators Of Basic Early Literacy Skills assessment (DIBELS). Struggling readers were considered to be reading below 52 words per minute, which was the 2nd grade benchmark for the fall.

The study had five participants who were reading below 52 words per minute. The participants worked with the researcher during the guided reading part of their school day. The group met three or four times a week for at least 15 minutes. At the end of each week a running record was taken to monitor the participants’ progress in their fluency rates. All data was charted on a fluency graph and analyzed by the researcher. The data showed an increase in fluency rates in each participant over the five-week study. Students read anywhere from 38% to 225% more words per minute at the end of the study compared to the beginning.

An in depth look at the study is given in this paper along with background research. Keywords used to accumulate research were fluency, reading rates, elementary reading fluency, oral reading rates, and fluency strategies.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Introduction

In the field of education, especially elementary education, fluency is a critical factor in literacy success. Students are given grade level benchmarks in regard to the words per minute they are to be reading at the end of that year. When students fall short of the benchmark goal, or are not showing adequate progress towards the goal, teachers implement interventions to strengthen their fluency. The interventions are targeted strategies and activities that best fit the students’ needs. One such intervention is repeated reading. Repeated reading works by breaking apart a passage into smaller chunks that can be read and reread multiple times in one minute. Students focus on reading one part of the story accurately and quickly before reading the next part. The repetition this model provides can naturally increase fluency rates and comprehension levels of the story (Cohen, 2011). Knowing the importance of reading and the benefits of reading fluently, the goal of the researcher’s study was to improve fluency rates in 2nd graders through the intervention of repeated reading.

Learning to read is an important skill for children to develop and master as it brings about a sense of achievement and helps them experience success in and out of school. This skill is much more than decoding syllables and stringing words together to form a sentence. Rather, reading involves many components such as word accuracy, fluency rates, comprehension levels, and vocabulary acquisition. When these elements are cohesively put together, children are truly able to read. The benefits of reading include many things such as a stimulation of the brain, the increase of imagination and curiosity, a reduction of stress and anxiety, and the building of self-confidence for the child (WETA Public Broadcasting, 2020). To fully experience the benefits of
reading, young children must learn to read fluently. Fluency is defined as an ability to read with speed, accuracy, and appropriate expression (Stevens et al., 2017). When students are fluent readers, they are opened up to a new world of learning and enjoyment.

**Brief Literature Review**

The importance of fluency and its benefits were commonly addressed within literature. Many articles gave defining characteristics that identify a fluent reader. Fluent reading sounds effortless, just as if the reader was speaking normally in a conversation, also called prosody (WETA Public Broadcasting, 2020). This natural reading leaves no room for choppy sentences or short phrases strung together. Researchers defined fluency as an ability to read with speed, accuracy, and expression (Stevens et al., 2017). When fluently reading, children quickly decode words and simultaneously gather meaning from the sentences to develop an understanding of the story’s content. They no longer focus on decoding individual words, but rather read sentences smoothly and focus on comprehending the story. This fluent reading enables students to ask and answer comprehension questions as well as make their own personal connections (Paige, 2020).

Because fluency is needed to be a successful reader, it is vital that educators measure reading rates regularly. There were many articles that addressed the ways to assess fluency. One way to measure fluency is with a words read per minute (WPM) rate given a timed reading passage. Students who are truly fluent readers have more than just a high word per minute reading fluency rate. They read for understanding as “it allows the reader to focus their mental attention on understanding the text rather than on pronouncing the words” (Paige, 2020, p. 5). Lock and Welch (2006) showed that children are not fluent readers. There was an overall concern brought up across America’s classrooms that stemmed from these findings. Students were not meeting benchmark fluency goals and were not progressing in their words per minute
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reading rates as they should have been given their grade level. In addition, it was found that difficulty with fluent reading was a main reason why these students were referred for special duration services (Lock & Welsch, 2006).

To support students in the mainstream classroom instead of referring them for special education, it is sometimes necessary to provide interventions. Teachers must give strategies, instruction, and activities that are differentiated to meet each student’s needs. They can include things such as reading controlled decodable texts, using reader’s theater, assigning morphological word work, modeling fluent reading, and using the repeated reading method (Ming, 2018). Regardless of the intervention chosen, they must intentionally support student progress in oral reading fluency. With targeted fluency interventions, students are able to practice reading in a comfortable environment where they can find success and make progress in their fluency rates (Hudson et al., 2020).

The specific intervention that the researcher explored in depth was repeated reading. The purpose of repeated reading is to increase oral reading fluency rates so students can accurately read more words per minute. Repeated reading involves reading a small portion of a passage as many times possible in one minute. Once a minute is reached, another portion is read and reread for the next minute. This repeats until the entire passage has been read. Passages are selected by the classroom teacher. The teacher is also responsible for managing the increments of text and timings. Repeated reading can be implemented with any grade level and can be successful for all students as long as the text selected is at their instructional level (Cohen, 2011).

**Statement of the Problem**
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The problem that the action research surrounded centered on oral reading fluency rates in struggling readers. Within the researcher’s elementary school and their own second grade classroom it was noted that many students were performing below grade level in the area of oral reading fluency. The goal of the research was to increase the number of words per minute read by implementing a targeted intervention. Struggling readers were students who were reading below the grade level benchmark after an initial fluency test was given. The fluency assessment used was Dynamic Indicators Of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) and was given to all students. Once struggling readers were identified, the intervention of repeated reading was used. This was implemented three to four times per week with a small group of students. To measure progress in oral reading fluency, the DIBELS assessments was given once per week to track the number of words read per minute given a grade level appropriate passage.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the action research was to implement the literacy intervention of repeating reading to see if the oral reading rates in struggling students increased. The researcher knew that words per minute rates generally increase from the start of the year to the end, but the intent with this study was to compare the fluency rates to other students who were not receiving the repeated reading intervention. The intervention was used consistently with the same group of students. Although not the main goal, the study also aimed to boost student confidence in their reading ability and help them prepare to read independently.

Research Question

How does the intervention of repeated reading impact oral reading fluency rates in students who are reading below a 2nd grade level?

Definition of Variables
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**Variable A:** The independent variable was the usage of repeated reading for a small group of students. The group of students remained the same throughout the research. This intervention was explicitly taught and modeled first. Students practiced repeated readings three to four days a week for seven to ten minutes each day. The teacher/researcher was close by each student to monitor performance and give instruction as needed.

**Variable B:** The dependent variable was the oral reading fluency rates that the group of students showed throughout the study. The rates were measured in words per minute and were found by administering the DIBELS assessment at the end of each week after three or four work sessions. The DIBELS passages used were the same for each student but changed weekly.

**Significance of the Study**

The study is significant for the participants because fluent reading allows students to read at an adequate rate. More than that, however, fluent reading brings about many other benefits. These positive outcomes can be vocabulary acquisition, phonemic awareness, and comprehension of stories among other literacy components (Ates, 2019). The study is significant for the researcher and other educators because it reveals the effectiveness that repeated reading has on fluency. It can be noted that teachers who prioritize fluency interventions in their classroom seem to have students who are well rounded in all academic areas. There has been a direct correlation shown between fluency, reading comprehension, and overall academic proficiency (Scammacca et al., 2016).

**Research Ethics**
Permission and IRB Approval

In order to conduct this study, the researcher was given MSUM’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval to ensure the ethical conduct of research involving human subjects (Mills & Gay, 2019). Likewise, an authorization to conduct this study was given by the school district where the research project took place (See Appendices A and B).

Informed Consent

Protection of human subjects participating in research was assured. Participant minors and their parents were informed of the purpose of the study via the informed consent letter (Appendix C) that the researcher read to participants before the beginning of the study. Participants were aware that this study was conducted as part of the researcher’s master degree Program and that it would benefit her teaching practice. Informed consent means that the parents of participants had been fully informed of the purpose and procedures of the study for which consent was sought and that parents understood and agreed, in writing, to their child participating in the study (Rothstein & Johnson, 2014). Confidentiality was protected through the use of pseudonyms (e.g., Student 1) without the utilization of any identifying information. The choice to participate or withdraw at any time was outlined verbally and in writing.

Limitations

One limitation that this research had was the sample size of the group of participants. In order to maintain a control group, the small group of students was limited to five students. The second-grade class was not larger than 25 students and only a portion of them were identified as below grade level, which reduced the number of participants the study could have. Another limitation was the time allowed to implement the intervention and assessment. The small group met with the research three or four times a week for 15 minutes. The researcher still needed to
meet with other groups for regular guided reading as part of the literacy curriculum, which limited the time allotted for the study.

Conclusion

This chapter introduced the research topic of fluency, described briefly the literature that surrounds fluent reading, and listed the problem, significance, and limitations of the study. In the next chapter, a more detailed review of literature will be found. Specifically, the research will give positive benefits associated with students being able to read fluently, strategies to increase words read per minute, and an in depth look at the intervention of repeated reading.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Fluent reading has many benefits associated with it other than being able to read at an adequate rate. These positive outcomes can be vocabulary acquisition, phonemic awareness, and comprehension of stories among other literacy components (Ates, 2019). Students in a rural school district came into second grade with lower-than-average fluency measures. Teachers reported this information based on a universal screening and assessment program. The program, called Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), was used to assess all second-grade students in the beginning of the school year. The DIBELS assessment uses one-minute timed readings, letter naming, nonsense word reading, and sight word identification (University of Oregon Center on Teaching and Learning, 2019). When students were monitored with the DIBELS tool throughout the school year, they did not meet their grade level benchmark reading rate. The researcher was curious to find out more about fluency measures and learn possible interventions to increase oral reading rates through targeted interventions and explicit teaching strategies. The research was done in effort to support struggling students who were reading below the grade level benchmark rate and provide interventions targeted to increase their overall fluency.

There was an abundance of research found regarding fluency, especially research surrounding the elementary grade levels. Quality articles shared data results from classroom studies and teacher surveys. Keywords used to accumulate research were fluency, reading rates, elementary reading fluency, oral reading rates, and fluency strategies. One barrier to the research was finding recent publications. Because fluency has been an important topic in the world of
education for many years, there were older publication dates to sort through. Another barrier was sorting through and eliminating articles centered around fluency in English Language students. The action research was conducted in a district with a majority of students whose first language is English. There was only a small percentage of students who were English Language learners. Overall, the research found was peer reviewed, relevant, and centered around the topic of reading fluency and strategies to support fluency.

**Body of the Review**

**Context**

The articles used in this research define the word fluency, give the benefits that fluent reading has for students, describe various interventions that promote an increase in reading fluency, and offer ways educators can assess a student’s fluency. These subtopics will be described in further detail.

Fluency is defined as an ability to read with speed, accuracy, and appropriate expression (Stevens et al., 2017). In further detail, fluent reading includes rate of reading, the accuracy of pronunciation, and the expression that words are read with. (Paige, 2020, p. 1). Each of these components can be individually taught, practiced, and assessed on their own, but come together to produce fluent reading. Students who are truly fluent readers have more than just a high word per minute reading fluency rate. They read for understanding as “it allows the reader to focus their mental attention on understanding the text rather than on pronouncing the words” (Paige, 2020, p. 5).

According to Acosta-Tella (2019), “Without fluency, children are basically decoders who are able to decipher what the letters in a word say, letter by letter, or syllable by syllable, and who can then hopefully recognize what the word means” (Acosta-Tella, 2019, p. 87). Reading is
more than decoding a sentence one word at a time. Rather, reading is decoding a string of words accurately to form meaning. This shows the value that fluency has in developing readers.

**History**

According to various authors, fluency in the United States has not always been seen as an important instructional component of the literacy realm. Fluency “has often been neglected and misunderstood in the reading curriculum” (Rupley, et al., 2020, p. 1). In the late 19th century, physicians and teachers discovered children were unable to read regardless of their high IQ scores. This mystery was the beginning of the search to understand why average children struggled to read (Scammacca, et al., 2016). The beginning of the 20th century placed an emphasis on silent reading, causing students to read for information rather than read for fluency and word recognition. Because of this, textbooks contained basic high frequency words and words that could easily be decoded (Rupley, et al., 2020). Over time, fluency gained importance in schools due to new research findings. The benefits of fluent reading are now well known across America. There has been a direct correlation shown between fluency, reading comprehension, and overall academic proficiency (Scammacca, et al., 2016).

**Assessments**

As stated by Martins and Capellini (2021) in their research, teachers can identify students who are struggling to read based on one – minute assessments that show their oral reading fluency rates. “These measures help provide an overview of each student’s academic development” (Martins & Capellini, 2021, p. 2). One-minute timed readings are commonly used in elementary classrooms. The readings can be administered quickly and provide insight into which students need explicit interventions. Fluency is scored and tracked with a words per minute rate. By the end of each grade level, students should have reached the benchmark goal to
be considered a fluent reader. Assessments are given multiple times throughout the year to track the pace of their fluency progress. Those who are not meeting progress monitoring goals will most likely not reach their grade level goal (Hawkins, et al., 2015). After determining an oral reading rate from the timed passages, a multidimensional fluency rubric can be used to score students in more than just their oral reading rate. The chart is broken into point values one through four with descriptors for each. It measures many areas of fluency including expression and volume, smoothness, phrasing, and pace (Zutell & Rasinski, 1991). Students who receive a score of ten or more have made progress in their fluency. If they scored lower than a ten, interventions should be put in place to support these struggling students.

**Interventions**

A study done by Hudson et al., (2020), looked into the oral reading fluency rates among elementary students. Students who showed difficulty in oral reading fluency tended to struggle in other academic areas as well such as reading comprehension and vocabulary development. The students in the study read fewer words per minute than their peers and also scored lower on reading comprehension assessments. The students were then supported with strategies to build up their fluency. The study implemented choral reading, repeated reading, verbal cueing, and error correction as targeted strategies. From the authors’ findings, “students engaged in summarizing, generating questions, and retelling texts” (Hudson, et al., 2020, p. 20) after learning and using the strategies listed. Furthermore, it was suggested that elementary students with reading difficulties benefit most from one-on-one instructions. The time spent working on specific, targeted interventions increased the students’ overall literacy skills in terms of their fluency rates and comprehension levels (Hudson, et al., 2020).
One-on-one instruction was also implemented by researcher Timothy Weih (2013). He described in his study the findings of a targeted intervention program for a fifth-grade boy who struggled with reading. Decoding the words seemed to be the main focus for the boy while reading, which left little memory to actually comprehend the story. Weih worked with the student to provide intense interventions that built upon each other until the boy was able to use multiple strategies at the same time. The findings showed that this blend of multiple literacy strategies worked together to provide the maximum support and confidence when able to provide explicit interventions (Weih, 2013).

There are many interventions that can be used in instruction. Reading controlled decodable texts, using reader’s theater, assigning morphological word work, modeling fluent reading, and using the chart reading program (Ming, 2018, p. 14-17) are some activities designed to intentionally support students’ progress in their oral reading fluency. They can be used with students who need more confidence to decode unknown words.

To improve reading confidence, another strategy called ‘interval sprinting’ was shown to increase oral reading fluency when students were given a one-minute timed reading assessment. According to researchers Kostewicz and Kubina (2020), interval sprinting requires a text passage to be broken into parts that can be read and reread while maintaining the story’s content (Kostewicz & Kubina Jr., 2020, p. 88). In their study, students read each part as many times as they were able in one minute before moving onto the next part. Students worked their way to the end of the text in the same fashion. The continuous repetition of each part resulted in an increase in student fluency rates (Kostewicz & Kubina Jr., 2020).
Repeated Reading

One intervention in particular had a large amount of research behind it. The method of repeated reading had been shown to be successful in relatively short periods of time for young, developing, and mature readers. Repeated reading works by breaking apart a passage into smaller chunks that can be read and reread multiple times in one minute. Students focus on reading one part of the story accurately and quickly before reading the next part. The repetition this model provides can naturally increase fluency rates and comprehension levels of the story. Repeated reading can be implemented with any grade level and can be successful for all students as long as the text selected is at their instructional level (Cohen, 2011). Research showed that the amount of time spent reading correlated directly with the level of success a student finds in their reading skills. The best way to improve reading skills involves having many opportunities to read meaningful text. To best support struggling readers, teachers should provide ample amounts of time to practice reading and rereading a text selection. From this research, it was stated that the strategy of repeated reading builds fluency when implemented consistently (Koskinen & Blum, 1986).

According to researcher Therrien (2004), once repeated reading is implemented teachers can further fluency growth by adding a feedback component to the intervention. The feedback is focused on student errors to explicitly model how to fluently read the misread portion of the passage. Students are given ample time to practice these individual parts until they can read it without error. When consistently providing feedback to struggling readers, Therrien stated that reading rates will increase faster than if no feedback was provided (Therrien, 2004).

Theoretical Framework

The theory that best focuses on the variable of fluency is automaticity. Fluency is “identified as the ability to decode and comprehend a text at the same time” with regard to the
automaticity theory (Aldhanhani & Abu-Ayyash, 2020, p. 381). Students climb a learning ladder from the bottom up in order to automatically decode words and comprehend a story. Students will first memorize letters and letter sounds. They will then decode sight words and short phrases until they are able to string sentences together to read a short passage. They will accomplish this by repeated practice as “the roles of drilling, repetition, and error correction are vital” (Aldhanhani & Abu-Ayyash, 2020, p. 382) until it becomes automatic for a student to read fluently.

**Research Question**

How does the intervention of repeated reading impact oral reading fluency rates in students who are reading below a 2\textsuperscript{nd} grade level?

**Conclusion**

This chapter reviewed literature that supported research in building fluency in struggling students. The literature along with the data that was collected by the researcher provided quality interventions and literacy strategies that target the increase of oral reading fluency. The ability to read and understand a text passage goes beyond the direct work students do with the teacher. Comprehending information is how people learn. And most often, it requires reading of some sort. The more fluent a student is, the more they will learn (Kinniburgh & Shaw, 2007). The next chapter will look at how the researcher collected, interpreted, and utilized the data in their study.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Introduction

The study described in this action research paper focused on fluency in young elementary students. More specifically, the study aimed to increase fluency rates through the intervention of repeated reading. In repeated reading, students read and reread a short text or part of the text for a set period of time (no more than one minute) or until they meet their fluency goal. Fluency goals are measured in words read per minute (WPM). This oral reading, or fluency rate, is found by recording the total number of words read correctly by a student in one minute. It is important that students can fluently read in order for them to gain a solid understanding of the text. When they are reading to learn instead of learning to read, students can make connections to the characters and story structure, engage in a conversation about the book, and read for enjoyment. Without fluency, “children are basically decoders who are able to decipher what the letters in a word say, letter by letter, or syllable by syllable” (Acosta-Tella, 2019, p. 87).

Children grow up surrounded by literacy. At school, dramatic play centers, textbooks, and libraries are filled with literature. At home, many media sources such as movies, advertisements, and games have print on them. Being surrounded with a print rich environment helps to foster the skills needed to read. Learning to read requires three components. These components are letter–sound knowledge, phonemic awareness, and quick automatized naming skills (Hulme & Snowling, 2015). Each skill in itself is learned and practiced individually. The skills can then be cohesively used together to learn to read. Research shows that “deficits in each of these three skills appear related to problems in learning to read” (Hulme & Snowling, 2015, p. 1). Early interventions can help support children who are struggling to read. If children are
showing difficulty to read, there are other factors that are also affected such as comprehension and fluency. Strengthening skills in those two areas will improve a student’s ability to read. Research shows that fluency and comprehension are closely connected. Fluency is similar to a bridge, “connecting word recognition to reading comprehension” (Padeliadu et al., p. 49, 2021). Fluency is defined as an ability to read with speed, accuracy, and appropriate expression (Stevens et al., 2017). When fluent reading takes place, children are able to focus less on decoding and more on comprehension. They read for understanding as “it allows the reader to focus their mental attention on understanding the text rather than on pronouncing the words” (Paige, 2020, p. 5).

This chapter reviewed the research question and provided an insight to the research design that was chosen. The setting of the study and details of the participants including how they were selected are explained. The chapter also gave details in regard to data collection and analysis. Finally, a detailed procedure is provided by the researcher.

Research Question

How does the intervention of repeated reading impact oral reading fluency rates in students who are reading below a 2nd grade level?

Research Design

The research design used quantitative data gathered through a correlational approach. Given the independent variable (repeated reading intervention), the dependent variable (words per minute fluency rates) was best measured with quantitative data. Quantitative research involves the “utilization and analysis of numerical data using specific statistical techniques to answer questions like how” (Apuke, 2017, p. 40). When using numerical data, the measures are represented with units. This study measured oral reading or fluency rates. The rates were
expressed in terms of the number of words read per minute by the student. The unit was WPM (words per minute) for each fluency measure. The quantitative data was collected by the researcher using a correlational approach which aims to determine the relationship between two variables (Apuke, 2017). In the case of this study, the correlational approach examined the variables of fluency rates in relation to the intervention of repeated reading. The quantitative data collection with the correlational approach was the selected research design because it best fit the study’s purpose of finding out how repeated reading impacts fluency rates in struggling readers.

Setting

The study took place in a central Minnesota town. The town has a population of 14,000 and is mostly known for its lakes area recreation and farmland. The town is considered a rural community, with many farms surrounding it. Crop fields, tractors, and farm animals are commonly seen when driving to and from the town. The town is also considered the ‘gateway to the lakes’ as there are many lakes near it. Things such as water skiing, boating, ice fishing, and snowmobiling are popular recreational activities. Adults in the town generally work a full-time job in the education, business, or manual labor industries. Families are most commonly made up of two married parents with at least two children.

There are six public schools in the town. The total enrollment for the district is 3,000 students. The schools are organized by grade levels. The school where the study took place is the first and second grade building and has a student population of 350. Of the total enrollment, 40% of the students are economically disadvantaged, meaning they qualify for free and reduced priced lunches. Of the study body, 10% are minority students, 40% are eligible for free/reduced lunches, and 10-15% receive special education services. The student body ethnicity is 90% White, 3% Black, 3% Hispanic, 2% Asian, and 2% mixed racial, meaning they are more than
one race. There are 14 general education classrooms in the school, a gym, music room, two special education rooms, and cafeteria, making the total number of licensed teachers 18. The study was done in a second-grade classroom of 21 students. There were 11 girls and 10 boys in the class. Of those students, three were receiving special education services.

Participants

The participants of the study were all 2nd graders in the researcher’s general education classroom. The small group that the researcher worked with consisted of five students. They were seven or eight years old. Of those five students, two were girls and three were boys. The ethnicity of the participants was 80% white and 20% mixed racial. One of the students was receiving special education services for their emotional behavior disorder and two students were receiving title one reading services. The special education student was pulled out each day for 30 minutes to work on reading skills. The title one students were pulled out each day for 25 minutes to work on reading skills. Additionally, two of the participants were receiving free/reduced lunches. Three of the participants came from a family where the parents were married and lived together with the child. The other two participants lived with their single mother. One of the two saw their dad on the weekends and the other student had no contact with their dad.

Sampling

There were five students participating in the study, all a part of the researcher’s second grade class. These students were selected to participate in the study because they were considered struggling readers. To determine this, a universal screening tool was used on all students of the class to measure their reading rate in words per minute. The students were screened within the first three weeks of school. Based on the DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) assessment, students entering second grade should be reading 52
words per minute. After the DIBELS tool was used, the researcher grouped students together who were reading above grade level, at grade level, and below grade level in terms of fluency. The students who scored below the benchmark of 52 words per minute were selected to be in the study.

This study utilized convenience sampling. Convenience sampling was chosen for this study because the researcher only had access to her own class of 21 students. The purpose of convenience sampling is to “collect information from participants who are easily accessible to the researcher” (Etikan, p. 2, 2016). In addition, convenience sampling is nonrandom, meaning the participants were selected based on qualifying characteristics (Etikan, 2016). This study used purposive sampling because the researcher chose students who met certain criteria. Participants were selected based on their fluency rate. Reading below the 2nd grade benchmark meant that the student qualified for the study.

**Instrumentation**

To collect data, the instrument of DIBELS was used. The DIBELS assessment uses one-minute timed readings, letter naming, nonsense word reading, and sight word identification. Adults, usually teachers, administer the assessment. Teachers give subtests to determine a score/rating for each topic listed above. Each of these components has its own score/rating scale (University of Oregon Center on Teaching and Learning, 2019). For the purpose of this study, the one-minute timed readings were used to determine a fluency score. Students were given an unfamiliar passage set forth by the DIBELS company at a second-grade level. These passages, along with the scoring sheet, were found online through the DIBELS website (https://dibels.uoregon.edu/materials/dibels). The researcher downloaded and printed various grade level passages to use for the study. To administer the assessment, the researcher gave
directions for the student to read the passage out loud until the timer went off. Students were not expected to finish the passage. The researcher was sure to tell them this to ease any anxiousness. The students also knew they may encounter unknown words, but to do their best using strategies to decode the word. If the student struggled for more than three seconds without reading a word correctly, the researcher read the word for them. Each time this happened, or if a word was read incorrectly by the student, a mark was placed above the word to indicate an error. At the end of the one-minute timer, the total errors (mispronunciations, substitutions, eliminations, etc.) were subtracted from the total number of words that the student read through to find their fluency rate. Fluency rates were measured in words per minute. The rate was then plotted on a graph and labeled with the title of the passage and date it was read. On average, each fluency test took a total of 3 minutes per student. At the end of the study, each participant’s fluency graph had five reading rates charted over the course of the five weeks. A sample of the DIBELS passage and fluency graph can be found in appendices E and F.

**Data Collection**

To identify the participants of the study, the DIBELS assessment (Appendix D) was used as a universal screening tool on each student during the 2nd week of school. This gave the researcher a baseline to determine the groupings of students who would be selected for the study based on the words per minute they were reading.

Once the struggling students were identified the intervention of repeated reading was implemented. The researcher tested the students consistently to find how many words per minute they were reading. To collect this data, a DIBELS progress monitoring passage (Appendix E) was given at the end of each week, after three or four daily work sessions. The passages that were used were different each week but were always the same for every student.
on any given week. The data collection took place over five weeks. The researcher used running records (Appendix G) to track student reading. Observational notes were made on the running record sheet to provide additional insight.

**Data Analysis**

The data was analyzed each week by the researcher after the DIBELS timed reading were given. The researcher charted and compared fluency rates. The fluency rates were charted on a graph in words per minute read. Trend lines were found on the graph after the study was conducted. The benchmark reading rate for the fall, winter, and spring of second grade of 52, 80, and 94 words per minute were also plotted on the graph to give a visual of the students’ fluency progress in comparison to their grade level goals. The researcher also looked at the running record sheet used to record errors to find patterns and make observational notes. A sample of the fluency graph and running record are found in appendices F and G.

**Research Question and System Alignment**

Table 3.1 provides a description of the alignment between the study’s research question and the methods used in the study to ensure that all variables of study have been accounted for adequately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Independent &amp; Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Validity &amp; Reliability</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1: How does the literacy intervention of repeated reading impact oral reading</td>
<td>IV: Repeated reading for a small group of students.  DV: Oral reading fluency rates that the group</td>
<td>Correlational research design using quantitative data collection.</td>
<td>Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Progress (DIBELS) assessment with timed readings to find the</td>
<td>Participants were all assessed weekly, on the same day of the week, after the same amount of work sessions. The same</td>
<td>Running records, DIBELS fluency data, and observational notes.</td>
<td>Five second grade students reading below the benchmark of 52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
fluency rates in struggling students? | of students showed throughout the study. | words per minute fluency rate. Running records were used by the teacher. | reading passage was used on all participants each week. | words per minute. 
---|---|---|---|---

**Procedure**

The study was entirely done during guided reading time in the classroom. The researcher was the only adult working with the participants. The initial universal screening tool was given to all students in the researcher’s second grade class during the 2nd week of school. The DIBELS assessment gave the researcher a fluency rate for each student. The students were to read as far as they could in a selected passage for one minute. The researcher used a running record to mark errors. The words per minute fluency rate was then found by subtracting the errors from the total number of words read. The class data showed which students were reading at, above, and below grade level. The DIBELS program provided three benchmark fluency rates throughout the school year. According to DIBELS, students at grade level should be reading 52 words per minute entering second grade, 80 words per minute in the middle, and 94 words per minute by the end of second grade. Five students who scored below 52 words per minute were considered to be struggling readers and were selected for the study.

The study consisted of five students reading below the grade level benchmark. Those students were placed in the same guided reading group to work with the researcher. During the five weeks of September 20th – October 22nd, the group of participants met at the guided reading table three to four times a week for at least 15 minutes. Some work sessions were longer, depending on the needs of the group. The researcher implemented the intervention strategy of repeated reading when working with the students. It was taught and modeled with guided
practice and feedback until the students understood and were comfortable with repeated reading. Repeated reading works by breaking apart a passage into smaller chunks that can be read and reread multiple times in one minute. Students focused on reading one part of the story accurately and quickly before reading the next part. This repeated until the entire passage had been read. Passages were selected by the classroom teacher. The teacher was also responsible for managing the increments of text and timings of the readings.

The researcher made binders for each participant that had printed passages and short stories to use at the kidney table. The passages were broken apart with colored markers to indicate the different sections to read. During work sessions, students would read and reread the first section for one minute. The reading was in a whisper or a quiet voice level. Once the time was over, the researcher checked in with the student, providing feedback and asking questions to gather an understanding. Students then moved onto the next section of the passage and repeated this process. The researcher was in charge of setting a one-minute timer for the first few days of work. Once the students were comfortable with the repeated reading process, they were given their own timers to use. Students read a new story from the binder each work session. If they were completed, they either started a new story or went back to previously read stories to read again. Work sessions took place in the morning hours during guided reading time in the classroom. Other students not in the study were given routine tasks to complete as part of guided reading time.

At the end of each week, after three or four work sessions, the participants were assessed to collect data on their fluency rate. To measure progress in oral reading fluency, the DIBELS assessments was given. The researcher gave the participants the same grade level appropriate passage to read. The passage was new for the participants to ensure a genuine data collection. A
running record was taken to mark reading errors and take observational notes based on the student’s attitude, comments, reading, and behaviors. The fluency rates were charted on a graph in the student binder. The chart also listed the title of the passage and date it was read. Over the course of five weeks, there were five DIBELS running records done tracking fluency progress. Samples of the passages, running records, and fluency graphs are found in the appendix.

**Ethical Considerations**

Even with the conscious efforts to protect all participants, ethical considerations still were made. The minimal risk of harming participants involved the level of anxiousness that students may have felt during the DIBELS timed readings. The students may have also felt uneasy/silly about repeatedly reading a small portion of a story and worried what their classmates may think. The study was conducted with no intentions on harming participants in any way and confidentiality of the participants and their fluency scores were of high priority for the researcher. Once struggling readers in the class were identified, parents of those students were sent an informed consent letter of which gave details of the study and asked if their child could be a participant in the study. The researcher was available to answer clarifying questions and give more details regarding the study in order to ensure all parents felt comfortable. Once the letters were signed and returned, the participants met with the researcher to introduce the work they would be doing over the next few weeks. Students and parents were able to decline to be a part of the research and were able to exit the study at any time during the process with no consequences. To protect the wellbeing of the students, the researcher made sure the study was done during the classroom’s normal guided reading time, so the participants did not miss out on any other routine tasks or school activities.
Conclusion

This chapter focused on the methodology of the action research. The researcher gave an in-depth look into the chosen design process, setting, participants, data collection, procedure, and ethical considerations. The next chapter will summarize the study’s findings.
CHAPTER 4
DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Introduction

Chapter four includes data collection methods, procedures, results of the study, an analysis of the results, and implications for future research. This chapter interprets the study’s findings. The problem that prompted the study initially began when the research observed low fluency rates in the students’ oral reading. The start of the 2020 – 2021 school year was the first-time students were back for in person learning since online distance learning took place the spring prior. Students had spent the latter part of the year learning via video calls and online assignments. The researcher observed that many students were coming into second grade performing below grade level in oral reading fluency. Based on this observation, the goal of the research was to increase the number of words per minute read by implementing a targeted intervention. The intervention used in this study was repeated reading. The purpose of the study was to implement repeating reading to see if the oral reading fluency rates in struggling students increased.

Data Collection

The study used the data collection method of one-minute timed reading tests to determine the fluency score in student’s oral reading rates. To collect this data, a DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) progress monitoring passage was given at the end of each week, after three or four daily work sessions using the practice of repeated reading. Repeated reading works by breaking apart a passage into smaller chunks that can be read and reread multiple times in one minute. Students focused on reading one part of the story accurately and quickly before reading the next part. This repeated until the entire passage had been read. At
the end of each week, a new passage was given to the student to record their fluency score after allowing them one minute to read as far as they could. The data from each week’s timed reading passage was charted on a fluency graph. Students worked with the researcher to complete this study for four weeks. During those four weeks, students practiced using repeated reading on many passages and were given a DIBELS progress monitoring passage at the end of each week.

Results

RQ 1: How does the intervention of repeated reading impact oral reading fluency rates in students who are reading below a 2nd grade level?

From the study conducted, results showed an overall increase in oral reading fluency rates based on an increase of words read per minute over the course of the study’s timeline. Students all entered the study reading less than 52 words per minute, being identified as a struggling reader. With the practice of repeated reading, students showed growth in the number of words they could read per minute given a DIBELS progress monitoring passage.

Table 1 shows the fluency rates for each study participant over the course of the five-week study. Students were given numbers to protect their identity. The five students came into the study reading anywhere from 7 words per minute to 50 words per minute. Each participant was given the same amount of practice with repeated reading using the same passages and each participant was given the same progress monitoring passage from the DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators Of Basic Early Literacy Skills) assessment at the end of each week to find their fluency rate of oral reading. At the end of each week, the fluency rate was charted on Table 1. The table shows fluency rates over the course of the five-week study for each participant.
Table 1

*Words Per Minute Fluency Rates*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Fluency Rate</th>
<th>Week 1 Fluency Rate</th>
<th>Week 2 Fluency Rate</th>
<th>Week 3 Fluency Rate</th>
<th>Week 4 Fluency Rate</th>
<th>Week 5 Fluency Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the number of errors that each student made during the DIBELS progress monitoring assessment. Errors were considered words read wrong, words not read at all, or words added into a sentence. After 3 seconds of the student not attempting to read the word, the researcher read the word for the student to keep them moving along. The words that were read by the researcher were also counted as an error. Some students self-corrected themselves as they were reading. Self-corrections were not counted as errors.

Table 2

*Errors Made During Progress Monitoring*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Week 1 Errors</th>
<th>Week 2 Errors</th>
<th>Week 3 Errors</th>
<th>Week 4 Errors</th>
<th>Week 5 Errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 shows the initial and ending fluency rates for each participant based on their oral reading words per minute rate. The table then shows the percentage that the fluency rate increased for each participant. The percentage was found by subtracting the initial rate from the ending rate, dividing the difference of rates by the initial rate, and multiplying the answer by 100 to get a percentage of increase. Percentages of increase ranged from 38% to 225% based on the results of the study.

Table 3

*Fluency Rate Comparison with Percent Increase*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Fluency Rate</th>
<th>Ending Fluency Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 1</strong></td>
<td>7 words per minute</td>
<td>19 words per minute</td>
<td>171%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 2</strong></td>
<td>13 words per minute</td>
<td>37 words per minute</td>
<td>185%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 3</strong></td>
<td>16 words per minute</td>
<td>52 words per minute</td>
<td>225%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 4</strong></td>
<td>49 words per minute</td>
<td>70 words per minute</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 5</strong></td>
<td>50 words per minute</td>
<td>69 words per minute</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis

Based on the study’s data collection results, it can be determined that each participant increased their oral reading fluency rate over the course of the five-week study using the method of repeated reading. These results were expected by the researcher given the effectiveness of repeated reading found from the prior research of literature. From the literature, it could be concluded that repeated reading overall increases oral reading fluency in young students. It was also noted in the literature that any reading practice can increase fluency rates, no matter the
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type. This study happened to focus on repeated reading. Overall, the researcher expected some form of increase in reading rates given the nature of the effect reading practice has on young students.

Each participant showed an increase in oral reading fluency rates. Table 3 shows this increase in percentages. The researcher was surprised to see the high rates of increase for some of their students. For example, student 3 increased their oral reading rates by 225% over the course of the five-week study. Student 3 ended the study reading 52 words per minute, which is right on track for the fall of 2nd grade. Even if students did not reach the benchmark of 52 words per minute, there was still significant increase. Students 1 and 2 showed this by increasing their reading rates by 171% and 185%, respectively. Student 1 read 19 words per minute by the end of the study and was student 2 was reading 37 words per minute. Although clearly still below the benchmark, the high level of growth showed that repeated reading does work to increase student fluency scores. Two students started the study just below benchmark. Student 4 was reading 49 words per minute and student 5 was reading 50 words per minute. These two students showed less growth compared to the other participants, as their percentages of increase were 43% for student 4 and 38% for student 5. However, the smaller growth was expected by the researcher because these students started the study reading at a much higher rate compared to the other participants. Nonetheless, students 4 and 5 both increased their fluency and ended the study reading well above the 2nd grade benchmark of 52 words per minute.

During the data collection, there were minimal problems that needed to be worked out by the researcher. Minor issues such as students needing to leave the room to use the restroom or students becoming distracted needed to be worked out. The researcher had each participant use the restroom prior to meeting to ensure the time could be spent effectively. The researcher was
also inclined to help the participants focus on their repeated reading. The researcher gave a short agenda at the beginning of each meeting to help the students know exactly what to expect. To minimize other classroom distractions, the researcher assigned independent desk work for the rest of the class to complete while the study was happening. These things all helped the participants focus for the time they spent meeting with the researcher. Overall, the researcher does not believe these issues impacted the study’s results or data collection processes.

The instrument tool utilized to collect data was the DIBELS progress monitoring assessment. This is a universal tool used to screen all students in the class to determine the participants. To keep the data collection uniform, the passages for repeated reading and passages for progress monitoring were all from the DIBELS assessment. Each DIBELS passage used was new to the participants, meaning the students never saw the same passage twice. This ensured accurate fluency rates. There were only minor problems associated with the data collection tool. Because the DIBELS passages are lengthy, averaging over 120 words, a few students became overwhelmed when given the progress monitoring checks each week. Students were frustrated because they knew they would not get to the end of the passage. So help ease their worries, the researcher was sure to explain to the students that 2nd graders are not expected to read the entire passage. The students were also reassured that their fluency scores would not be shared with any other student. This seemed to help the students feel more at ease with the DIBELS progress monitoring.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The researcher understands that the results of this study are relative only to their action research setting, given the current students, study participants, classroom environment, DIBELS passages, etc. These elements are a limitation of the generalization of the study. Nonetheless,
there are conclusions that can be made from the study to help guide the researcher’s next steps in improving fluency rates through the practice of repeated reading.

To start, the study should be continued further into the school year to form general trend lines for each participant. These trends will tell if the increase of reading rates continues to climb at the rate of the initial study or if reading rates level out after students reach a certain words per minute rate. It should be noted that each participant will most likely have their own personal ‘peak’ to reach before maintaining a steady fluency rate. By lengthening the study’s timeline, the research could result in more accurate averages and effectiveness of repeated reading.

If the study was to be done again, there are improvements that could be made to help ensure each student was getting the most out of the meeting times. By creating a more effective study, the progress monitoring results would be a true reflection of the practice of repeated reading. To start, the study could have more than five participants. The participants could then be broken into two smaller meeting groups to eliminate distractions when practicing repeated reading. However, it should be noted that this improvement would take more time during the school day to complete. Another improvement that could enhance the data collection would be the time of day that the progress monitoring passages are given. In the study, the passages were given right after a work session with repeated reading. The work sessions lasted up to 15 minutes. If students were losing focus by the end of that time, their progress monitoring passages may not have been entirely accurate. To fix this, the passages could be given later in the school day to allow participants a break from their focused repeated reading work.

Furthermore, this study revealed more questions regarding children’s ability to read fluently. Some of the participants were still not reading at grade level by the end of the study. Although that in itself was not surprising considering the starting fluency rates of these students,
it made the researcher wonder; If the study were to be continued, would all students eventually reach the grade level oral reading fluency benchmark? And how long would it take for the lowest reader to reach that benchmark? From the literature found and analyzed in chapter 2, additional questions regarding the effectiveness of repeated reading could be asked such as: How much does the practice of repeated reading increase oral reading fluency rates compared to other literacy practices? The literature reviewed was heavily focused on struggling readers who read below grade level. The researcher also wonders if repeated reading also increases fluency rates in students reading at grade level, or even beyond grade level. These questions are additional pieces that the researcher is curious to find out more on after completing the action research study.

Conclusion

All in all, the research question of “How does the intervention of repeated reading impact oral reading fluency rates in students who are reading below a 2nd grade level?” was successfully studied and answered through the action research. To answer the research question, it can be stated that repeated reading does indeed increase oral reading fluency rates in students reading below a 2nd grade level. All of the students who participated in the study increased their reading rates over the course of the study.
CHAPTER 5

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

Introduction

Chapter five outlines further implications for practice and offers an action plan to proceed with the study’s results. It also gives a plan for sharing the action research. The researcher’s study was formed on the desire to increase oral reading fluency rates in 2nd grade students. The action research set out to answer the question: How does the intervention of repeated reading impact oral reading fluency rates in students who are reading below a 2nd grade level?

Participants of the study were reading below the benchmark of 52 words per minute. Five students worked with the researcher to practice the method of repeated reading over the course of five weeks. Students used repeated reading three to four times a week before they were given a progress monitoring passage at the end of each week to chart their words per minute fluency rates over the course of the study. The overall purpose of the study was to implement the intervention of repeating reading to see if the oral reading fluency rates in struggling students increased. Struggling readers were identified through the Dynamic Indicators Of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) assessment.

The study revealed data to suggest that oral reading fluency rates do in fact increase when students implement the practice of repeated reading. The results showed fluency rates increasing 38% to 225% depending on the student. Students came into the study reading 7 to 50 words per minute. At the end of the study, those same students were reading 19 to 69 words per minute.
Action Plan

Based on the results of the study, the procedures that came with the action research, and the prior literature that was analyzed, the researcher learned valuable knowledge that they plan to implement into their teaching and instruction going forward. The repeated reading method proved to be successful. The researcher is going to continue with this concept of repeated reading with all her students to help build reading fluency confidence and higher oral reading rates. The passages are going to be shorter to eliminate the possible feeling of students being overwhelmed. The passages are also going to focus on the specific phonics skill that aligns with the researcher’s district literacy curriculum. This will positively impact the students. With shorter passages that focus on one phonics skill, students will be able to practice repeated reading while reading words that match the curriculum’s lessons.

Due to the successful nature of the action research, other teachers that work with the researcher are interested in the broad topic of increasing reading fluency. As a 2nd grade team, the teachers have a desire to create a list of effective and enjoyable ways to increase reading fluency. This will impact both teachers and students. Teachers will be able to help each student increase their words read per minute, with the goal of having every student reach the grade level benchmark by the end of the school year. Further research and training will be needed to generate a list of effective practices.

The team of teachers also really liked the procedure of graphing fluency scores each week for the students to see a visual progression of their reading abilities (see Appendix F). Some teachers are going to start this in their own classroom, myself included. Each student will have their own fluency graph that they will add to after each progress monitoring passage is done. It is the intention for these graphs to be motivating for the students to work hard and focus
on their reading skills so they are able to build up their fluency graph throughout the duration of the year.

**Plan for Sharing**

The researcher’s plan for sharing the study includes presenting an overview of the work that was done and the results that were found to their grade level teammates during their next team meeting. The general procedure of the study, the data collected, and the success rates will all be highlighted. The team of teachers have been interested in the topic of repeated reading since it began, and this will provide an opportunity for everyone to gain some insight into the results and share their own ideas for the plan of action moving forward.

The researcher also plans to share an overview with their family and friends. These people are genuinely interested in the researcher’s master degree progress and have been looking forward to hearing the outcome of the study. Lastly, the researcher’s principal has inquired about the study and timeline for completion. They have expressed the desire to read the final action research paper when it is completed.
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Please get in touch at any time with questions about this study. You may contact me at 218-405-0112 or by email at sara.vanerp@go.mnstate.edu. You may also contact principal investigator Dr. Tiffany Bockelmann at 218-780-0757, or by email at tiffany.bockelmann@mnstate.edu. Any questions about your rights may be directed to Dr. Lisa I. Karch, Chair of the MSUM Institutional Review Board, at 218-477-2699 or by email at irb@mnstate.edu. I look forward to working with your child on reading fluency and hope to see growth with the use of repeated reading. Please sign and return this form within two weeks.

Thank you,
Mrs. Van Erp

I give Mrs. Van Erp permission to work with my child and use their fluency data for the purpose of her action research project through Minnesota State University Moorhead.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Teacher Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix D

Data Collection Instrument

DIBELS 8th Edition Oral Reading Fluency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examiner script</th>
<th>Reminders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please read this (point to passage) out loud.</td>
<td>Start timer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you get stuck, I will tell you the word, so you can keep reading. When I say 'Stop' I may ask you to tell me about what you read, so do your best reading.</td>
<td>When student says first word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start here (point to first word of first paragraph of passage). Ready? Begin.</td>
<td>Prompts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student hesitates: wait 3 seconds; give correct word; mark the missed word as incorrect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discontinue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student does not get any words correct within the first line: discontinue ORF.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Church Pears

The church on our street has a big parking lot. On a patch of grass at one end is a pear tree. The church lot and its tree are our playground.

Most days there are no cars in the lot. On those days, my brother and I ride our bikes around and around. But our favorite thing is to climb the church pear tree. We have climbed that tree a hundred times.

In the summer we help ourselves to the green pears. They never taste like the sliced pears that come in a can or the ones our mother buys at the store. They always taste sour. My brother spits on his pears. Then he wipes them on his shirt before taking a bite. I just eat mine as is.

We used to bring the green pears home, but we don’t anymore. The last time we brought some home Mom threw them in the garbage. Mom says the pears are sprayed with bug poison, and if we eat them we’ll get sick. But we have eaten plenty and never gotten a tummy ache.

We never eat the pears we find on the ground. Once I picked one up and found it covered with tiny ants. Sometimes we throw the fallen pears in high arcs across the lot, trying to see who can throw the furthest.

Total words read _____  Total errors _____  Total words correct _____
Appendix E

Sample DIBELS Passage

Saving Money

People have a lot of ways they try to save money. They put money away so that they don't spend it. Then they can use it later.

One way to save money is to put it in a bank. Banks keep people's money safe. Banks also can loan money to people who need it. Banks charge money to keep your money safe. You will need your parents help to put your money in the bank.

Another way to save is to have your own mini-bank. People call them piggy banks. Piggy banks are good for holding coins. Some piggy banks are even shaped like little pigs! Piggy banks may or may not have a lock on them.

Another way to save money is to use a safe. Safes are strong, heavy boxes with a lock. Because they are heavy, they are hard to steal. A lock helps keep your money safe from thieves.

You can also use a secret spot to hide your money. Make sure it is somewhere that only you know. But don't forget where you hide your money! If you forget, your money won't be any use to you.
Appendix F

Sample Fluency Graph

[Graph showing weekly words per minute for 7 days, with data points for each day and week.]
Appendix G

Sample Running Record

The Plane

The first plane was made by two brothers. Their plane was the first to have an engine. It was also the first one to be flown for more than a few seconds. Before then, people flying had only been a dream. The brothers became famous and rich as a result.

We now know that planes can fly because of the shape and length of their wings. The body of a plane also needs to be long and thin. This way the air moves around the plane and under its wings helping it to fly. Engines make airplanes move faster. The stronger the engine, the longer and farther the plane can fly.

Today, planes are very common. They move people and things faster than a car, train, or boat can. Some planes take people to places far away. Some planes carry boxes full of all kinds of things. There are also planes that are used in times of war. They fly fast and carry guns. When we are not at war, they fly in displays that show off how well the pilots fly.

- 0 words were teacher given after 3 seconds
- 1 words were misread
- 5C words were self corrected

Total Words: 22 - Errors 8 = Words Correct 14