

Term Project Summary

Background of Students

The two students from my second grade class I chose to work with for this term project are Beth and Kurt. Beth and Kurt are both seven years old and struggled in reading and writing this year. Beth is an English Language Learner. Her first language and primary language at home is Spanish. Beth does not receive any special education, speech services or support, however she does receive ELL services. Her verbal English is very understandable, however her reading and writing in English are very big struggles for her. Beth's DRA Reading Score at the end of the second grade was level G, this is far below grade level. Beth is a very shy girl that lacks confidence and motivation to work independently on many tasks. The biggest challenge facing Beth's education is her lack of willingness to try. There are many days that Beth does not complete any work and only looks around the room. Even activities that I did on the board together with the students Beth struggled focusing on and completing. As the year went on Beth wanted to do less and less work in school and at home. Her mother eventually gave in and did not make Beth do her homework, finish class work, read and practice math facts. Her mother's lack of help and push on Beth to do well negatively impacted Beth's education and learning.

The second student, Kurt is an African American boy who was adopted as an infant. English is he first and only langue spoken, however it is very difficult to understand his speech at times. Kurt only receives speech services with the speech pathologists. Kurt's reading and writing abilities are extremely low. His DRA Reading Score at the end of the year was level D, Kindergarten level. Kurt is a very outgoing student, he always works very hard to complete his work, even if does not understand the work. Kurt does not like to be corrected and many times

will shut down or start crying if I try to correct or reinstruct what he has done. The biggest instructional challenge Kurt presents is his poor behavior at times. Many times Kurt's behavior negatively effects what he does in class. His poor behavior has stopped instruction and stopped learning numerous times. He can become violent towards other students, myself, other school staff members, and at times he will leave the school and school property without permission.

Classroom Climate/Learning Community (Standard IV)

Reading groups and Reader's Workshops were implemented in my classroom at the beginning of the year. Students understand what reading group they are in and what their expectations are for being in that reading group. Some reading groups have work that needs to be done prior to coming to reading group, while others (struggling students) do all of their reading group work together with myself. While in reading groups students know they will be expected to work both independently and cooperatively with others in their group. Students are grouped in reading groups based on their DRA reading score so students are working at the same ability level and feel comfortable taking risks. I spent a lot of time discussing the importance of the class noise level during reading groups so everyone is being respectful of other's learning.

Assessment Instruments Selected

I began this term project by completing a lot of reading and writing surveys with Kurt and Beth (Standard III). They both struggle in reading and writing and I was curious what attitudes they had towards learning. Beth had very positive attitudes towards reading and mostly negative attitudes towards writing. Beth enjoys reading, going to the library, and sharing with me what she is reading about. She struggles with writing and she is aware of this struggle. Kurt had negative attitudes about both reading and writing, but he thinks that he does very well in

both of those areas. Many times Kurt says that he is reading a book but he will just skim over the pages and look at the pictures. When Kurt writes a sentence it is very hard to understand because of the lack of sentence structure. If I reread the sentence and ask him if it makes sense he knows it does not make sense but he does not want to fix it, or get help to fix it.

I gave Kurt and Beth many pre-assessments to find where the most weaknesses were and if there were any common weaknesses. The pre-assessment that I gave to both students were; Phonemic Awareness Assessment (Rhyme Choice, Rhyme Supply, Onset/Rhyme and Phoneme Blending), Yopp-Singer Test of Phoneme Segmentation, Letter/Sound Identification, Concepts of Print, Sight Word/Decodable Word List, Core Reading Maze Comprehension, and Oral Reading Record (Standard V).

Kurt and Beth both did very well on all of the pre-assessments except for the Sight Word/Decodable Word List, Core Reading Maze Comprehension, and Oral Reading Record. I decided to use these three as the basis for my two lessons. When I compared the Sight Word/Decodable Word Lists (K1 & B1 Artifacts) of Kurt and Beth I looked for words they both missed. Kurt missed 46 sight words from the Preprimer, Primer, First, and Second Grade lists out of a possible 80 words. His accuracy percent was a 42%. Beth missed 22 words out of the possible 80. Her accuracy rate was much higher at a 72%. I compared the two word lists and created a list of the words that both students missed a total of 20 words. As I looked at the words they missed I was surprised how they continued to pronounce words incorrectly because of the incorrect vowel sound being pronounced. Most of the words that they both got wrong followed the same vowel pattern, when two vowels go talking the first ones does the talking. From the data that I collected from Kurt and Beth's Sight Word/Decodable Word List used as a pre-assessment I decide to teach short and long vowels and one vowel rule for the first lesson.

I knew from working with Beth and Kurt all year that they both struggled with comprehension and that I wanted the second lesson to focus on comprehension. Beth only had six correct responses on the Core Reading Maze pre-assessment (B6 Artifact). Using the scoring chart this put Beth at the “Intensive” performance level for the pre-assessment. Beth did much better on the Oral Reading Record pre-assessment (B8), her accuracy rate of the book “Shopping Day” was at 81%. This book was a DRA level D, so the book was a few levels below her reading level. Kurt missed seven words on the Core Reading Maze pre-assessment (K6 Artifact) putting him in the Intensive performance level. I had Kurt read the same book, “Shopping Day” which was at his reading level. Kurt made many errors and only had one self correction, his accuracy rate was 77% on his Oral Reading Record pre-assessment (K8 Artifact). It was obvious from the comprehension pre-assessments that a lesson on comprehension was very important. One of the strategies from the reading that really stuck out to me when I was reading was the “Clink and Clunk” comprehension strategy. The focus of this strategy is student collaboration, where each student identifies words they do and do not know. Together in the group the students help determine the meaning of the unknown words each student has. I knew that teaching this comprehension strategy would not necessarily help Beth and Kurt to perform better on the Maze Reading Test so I decided that talking about other comprehension strategies could be included during the lesson as a review.

Instructional Goals

The instructional goals for the two lessons I taught were very different. For the lesson on phonics the instructional goals were that students would; understand, recognize, and use short and long vowel sounds, understand the vowel rule of when two vowels go walking the first one does the talking, and finally apply the vowel sounds and vowel rules in their own reading to

determine new words and sight words. The instructional goals for the comprehension lesson were that students would; learn the new comprehension strategy Click and Clunk to understand vocabulary, review old comprehension strategies, understand why comprehension strategies are important and known when and how to implement comprehension strategies.

All of these instructional goals were selected because they were areas of weakness for Beth and Kurt based on all of their pre-assessments (K1-K11 & B1-B11 Artifacts). I referred to the Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCE's) to determine if the instructional goals were state standards. I was able to find a state standard that matched all of the instructional goals I wanted to focus on (Standard II). These instructional goals relate to the curriculum because they are concepts and strategies covered in second grade that Beth and Kurt had not mastered by the end of the year.

Student Support during Lessons

There were some things that I did in both of the lessons to support the success of Beth and Kurt. The single best thing that I think I did was slow down the pace of the lessons. I was aware that many times I rush through reading groups and my struggling students became frustrated so I wanted to slow the pace down for the lessons. Each lesson that I taught was about thirty minutes, this is a little longer than the usual time I have with my students in reading groups because I have so many. Having a full thirty minutes enabled me to take our time during the lesson and not rush through directions, instructions, or the work they completed. The students never reached a point of frustration, however I kept the pace moving quickly enough that students would not be bored or loose attention. "Students with and without learning disabilities value teachers that slow down instruction when needed, explain concepts and assignments

clearly, teach learning strategies, and teach the same material in different ways so that everyone can learn,” (Klingner & Vaughn, 1999, p.23). I broke the first lesson up into about three days then I assessed the students. The first day I introduced short and long vowels. The second day we reviewed short and long vowels and I introduced the vowel rule. The third day we reviewed short and long vowels, the vowel rule, and completed the vowel rule chart.

The teaching method for the two lessons were similar. They each began with direct instruction, modeling, and then moved to peer-mediated learning. It was important that during the lesson students received direct instruction. After students had a good understanding of the concept they had the opportunities for guided practice, group work, and independent work.

For the phonics lesson I used index cards with the sight words as teaching aids. These were very easy for the students to look at, compare a few different words at the same time, mix up the order of words, and divide up the amount of words. I also used a dry erase board during my direct instruction of short and long vowels to create a quick reference chart that they could refer to during the lesson. The following days we used this dry erase board and co-created the short and long phonics charts.

At the end of each lesson I prompted the students to summarize the lesson and make generalizations. Together as a group they were usually able to explain to me what they learned and what activities or tasks they completed. I always asked the students if they liked the lesson and activity and if they wanted to do it again. I was overwhelmed with positive feedback from all of the students about how much they enjoyed the lessons and wanted to do them and use them again. I also asked the students if they felt they were leaving reading group with information that they understood and if it would help them in their reading. My students have always been honest

in telling me if they were still confused after a lesson and each day they left reading group they understood what we did and expressed to me that they were not confused about any of the material we covered. I always told the students that what we would work on the next day.

Overall I believe that my efforts to support my students were beneficial. Every student in the reading group participated and enjoyed the lessons. The lessons moved at a pace that was perfect for Beth and Kurt. When students struggled with a concept I slowed the lesson down and provided more instruction and practice. During the Click and Clunk activity Kurt was struggling writing the definitions of his click words and he asked me if he could draw pictures. I allowed him to draw pictures, but I also made him verbally explain to me the meaning of his pictures. This way Kurt did not become frustrated and I was aware if he really did have an understanding of the word. When the students were catching on I increased the speed of the lesson and challenged them with bigger words or had them expand on their explanations. The lessons included direct instruction, modeling, peer-mediated learning, and prompting. All of these techniques are effective teaching strategies. Each day I was able to see the progress that Kurt and Beth made. Their understandings of the concepts were shown from the improvements on the post assessments (see assessment data table at end).

Meaningful Contribution

I was very surprised how well the Beth and Kurt enjoyed both of these lessons. Each day they were asking if we were going to play the sound game with cards. They were referring to the first lesson when I held up a word card and they had to use a chart and record the word, vowel pattern, and long or short vowel sound. They also really enjoyed the Click & Clunk activity and how they worked together to figure out the meaning of the words. Beth, Kurt, and the other

students in their reading group were so focused and motivated during these two reading lessons. I am unsure if these lessons made a meaningful contribution to their overall reading progress only because I taught these lessons the very last days of school. I was never able to go back weeks or months later and re-asses, monitor, and check if they were using these strategies in their own reading. I think if I had taught these lessons earlier in the year and been able to revisit them throughout the year they would have had a very meaningful contribution. I am sure that Beth and Kurt left second grade with a very positive experience with reading, phonics, comprehension, confidence, and motivation. I hope that their last positive experience in reading carries over into their summer and especially into next school year.

Evidence of Student Achievement

When I compared Kurt's data of pre-assessments to post-assessments I concluded that he made gains in sight words, short/long vowels, understanding the vowel rule, and oral reading of the story "Shopping Day". Kurt did not make gains in the Core Maze and the meanings of the vocabulary words from the story "Shopping Day". Kurt's gains were minimal in most of the assessments so I do not feel comfortable saying he mastered or achieved in all of my instructional goals. I do feel that he achieved the instructional goal of understand, recognize, and use short and long vowel sounds. Prior to the phonics lesson Kurt had no understanding of short and long vowels. Kurt scored an 80% on the Short & Long Post Assessment (K3 Artifact) that I created to assess this instructional goal. I feel that was a great gain for any student and a remarkable gain for Kurt himself. The second instructional goal that I feel Kurt achieved was the application and implementation of short and long vowel sounds and comprehension strategies. The first time Kurt read the story "Shopping Day" for the comprehension lesson his Oral Reading Accuracy was 77% (K8 Artifact). After the lesson his Oral Reading Accuracy rate

was 97% (K9 Artifact) which is a 20 percent improvement. When he read the story for the post-assessment he read fluently, self-monitored, and was able to correctly re-tell the story.

Based on the sight word assessments (K1 & K2 Artifacts) Kurt made improvements in recognizing words but the instructional goal was not mastered or achieved completely. On the pre-assessment Kurt was able to identify 34 words out of 80, 42% accuracy. Kurt was only able to recognize three more words on the post-assessment for a total of 37 words and 46% accuracy. Although he made improvements they are very minimal, he still only knows less than half of the sight words at the end of second grade. After the completion of the phonics lesson Kurt scored a 71% on the vowel rule post-assessment (K5 Artifact). His score was below the 80% which is what I was striving for in all areas, however he never heard of this vowel rule prior to the lesson I taught and only had a few days of instruction so I feel that Kurt's progress shows some success in learning the goal. Kurt would need more instruction and I would need to re-assess him to determine if he was able to completely achieve the goal.

Out of the six assessments I feel that there were two assessments that show Kurt still has very little understanding of the concepts and goals. Kurt scored very low on the Maze Comprehension pre and post assessments (K6 and K7 Artifacts) as well as the Vocabulary post assessment (K8 Artifact). Kurt was only able to correctly pick seven words on the Core Maze pre assessment and made 12 errors. On the post assessment he had fewer errors, but he also had less correct, Kurt had five correct responses and eleven errors. Kurt scored "Intensive" for the Core Maze on both the pre and post assessment. On the Vocabulary post assessment Kurt was only able to identify four out of the ten vocabulary words. There was not a pre-assessment but looking at his Click and Clunk worksheet (K10 Artifact) there were only two vocabulary words Kurt knew prior to lesson, so overall he only learned two words and their meanings.

When I compared Beth's data of pre-assessments to post-assessments I concluded that she made improvements in all areas covered by the two lessons. She made gains in sight words, short and long vowels, understanding the vowel rule, Core Maze Comprehension, Oral Reading of the story "Shopping Day" and the Vocabulary from "Shopping Day". There were some post-assessments that Beth did much better on than others. I feel that Beth achieved four out of the six instructional goals I had for the two lessons. The instructional goals Beth mastered were Sight Words, Core Maze, Oral Reading, and Vocabulary. I feel that Beth mastered these four because her accuracy was 80% or higher on three of the assessments, and on the fourth assessments (Core Maze) her score doubled. Beth learned and mastered all ten of the vocabulary words on the post assessment (B11 Artifact) for the comprehension lesson. This was her highest area of performance in all of the post assessments. Beth's accuracy rate on the Oral Reading Pre-Assessment (B8 Artifact) was actually very high to begin with, it was 81%. According to the assessment the book "Shopping Day" was at her instructional level the first time she read it because of her accuracy rate. Beth scored a 95% on the Oral Reading Post-Assessment (B9 Artifact) which bumped her up to the "too easy of text" level. Beth identified 58 words out of 80 on the Sight Words Pre-Assessment (B1 Artifact) which is a 72%. She made huge improvements on the Sight Words Post-Assessment (B2 Artifact) by identifying 12 more words for a new total of 70 words correct and 88% accuracy. On the Core Maze pre-assessment (B6 Artifact) Beth had six correct words and four errors. She made more correct responses and more errors on the post assessment (B7 Artifact) with a total of eleven correct responses and seven errors. Beth's errors increased which is the opposite of what I wanted to see, but her number of correct responses doubled which is a big improvement. On the Core Maze pre assessment Beth was in the "Intensive" level and on her post assessment she moved up a level to

“Strategic.” Beth was only two correct responses away from being “Benchmark” on the Core Maze.

Beth made improvements in the understanding of short and long vowels and the vowel rule, however because her post assessments were below 80% I feel that she did not master or achieve the instructional goals. These two assessments did not have pre assessments because they were developed after completion of the lessons. It can be seen on Beth’s Sight Word list pre-assessment (B1 Artifact) that she had little to no understanding of short and long vowels or the vowel rule that was taught in the phonics lesson. Beth correctly identified six out of ten words on the Short and Long Post Assessment (B3 Artifact). This 60% is a big increase from her little knowledge prior to lesson but she is only able to distinguish the difference between long and short vowels a little more than half of the time. On the Vowel Rule Post Assessment (B5 Artifact) Beth correctly used the vowel rule five out of seven times, a 71% accuracy. This is very close to the 80% cut off I was striving for, so with a little more instruction and practice Beth would be able to master this instructional goal also.

There were many differences between the learning that took place for Beth and Kurt. Overall Beth achieved more of the instructional goals for the two lessons. Beth achieved four of the instructional goals and Kurt achieved two instructional goals. Beth scored higher on more of the post assessments, but her scores on the pre assessments were also higher than Kurt’s pre assessment scores. Beth’s overall achievement was higher than Kurt’s on the Sight Word, Core Maze, and Vocabulary Post Assessments. Kurt scored higher than Beth in two areas, Short and Long Vowels and Oral Reading Post Assessments. Kurt and Beth both scored a 71% on the Vowel Rule Post Assessment.

I was not surprised that Beth made more progress and met more instructional goals. Beth was very motivated and on task during the lessons I taught. Beth participated a lot more in the comprehension lesson than Kurt which played a key role in her achievement in the Vocabulary Post Assessment she scored a 100% on. Kurt's behavior got in the way of his learning one of the days when he refused to come to reading group. Kurt was causing a big disruption in the classroom and refused to do any work in class as well as refused to even sit at the table with his reading group. He eventually had to leave the classroom because his behavior was such a distraction to the learning of the other students in the class. Kurt missed the second lesson on short and long vowels. The following morning he was having a much better day and I went over the lesson he missed one-on-one before his reading group met for the next phonics lesson.

Beth took the assessments much more seriously than Kurt. Beth always read everything on the test (in addition to me reading it), took her time, and checked her work. Kurt always rushed through his tests and assignments so he would be done. "Students with disabilities very often do not monitor their comprehension and may continue reading a text even though they do not understand it," (Ehren, 2005, p. 317). I have seen Kurt's lack of self-monitoring throughout the year and while teaching these lessons. There were many times I told Kurt that he needed to reread or rewrite his answers because he finished the assignment too quickly to be successful. His handwriting on the majority of the artifacts are very sloppy and hard to read. On the Maze Kurt finished in one minute, I watched him take the test and he just circled answers without reading. I asked him to check his work two times. He did not make any corrections when he went back to check and he still had time remaining. Kurt was always confident that he knew the material and did not need to check over it.

Reflection of Lessons

If I were given another opportunity to teach these lessons with students I would defiantly use them again. There are only a few changes that I would make looking back on how the lessons went. The first change I would make in the lessons is that I would want to explain to the students the different ways they were going to respond during the lessons, choral response, turn-and-talk to your partner response, round-robin response, raise your hand response, or written response. Prior to each activity or task I would tell the students what response strategy to use and review what that response strategy was. Many times all of the students shouted out answers and if I had discussed behavior management strategies I think there could have been more control over the responses and there could have been more effective participation. Looking back on the lessons there were two things I could have done to promote more active participation and student interest. I think that after direct instruction in the phonics lesson a great idea would be for the students to take turns being the card holder. The card holder would show a word card, ask the questions, and tell the group if their responses were right or wrong. I think that it would be a good exercise for the students to get a chance at the “leader” role and to explain when someone makes a mistake and to help them correct the mistake. The second thing that I could do to make the lessons more engaging is have the students respond in partners. Using the round robin technique for reading and responses limits the number of students engaged and participating. The more students able to participate at the same time, the more engaging the activity. Oral reading can be integrated with choral reading, this way less time is spend on waiting to read or waiting to respond, (Archer, Gleason, & Vachon, 2003, p.97). The last thing that I would want to do differently is use the post-assessments that I created as pre-assessments. As I taught the lessons and they developed I created the Short and Long Vowel Post Assessment, Vowel Rule Post Assessment and Vocabulary Post Assessment. I thought of these during or

after teaching the lessons and thought they would be good measures of assessing the instructional goals. Now that I have taught the lessons and created the post assessments I would want to use them as pre assessments for the next time I teach these lessons.

Student's Needs

Kurt is a student that benefits greatly from one-on-one instruction much more than whole group or even small group instruction. Working with Kurt one-on-one provides him the support that he feels he needs to be successful. Many times just sitting next to him can provide him support because he knows that he is able to ask questions and get clarifications quickly. It would have helped Kurt to follow up each lesson with direct instruction one-on-one, or having a high performing student review the lesson with Kurt. Kurt enjoys being the “leader” in activities so having him explain or teach the lesson back to me or another student would be beneficial also. I would be able to see what misconceptions and gaps in content knowledge he has and instruct him on those.

Beth needs to be pushed so she can make progress. She is willing to do the work but staying focused is a struggle for her. Beth did very well on the comprehension lesson and post assessments. I would have liked to be able to repeat the lesson with her using a book at her DRA level to get a better judge of her progress.

Like all of the students in my class Beth and Kurt always need follow up lesson, reviews of concepts, and reassessments to determine if the knowledge is concrete. Unfortunately I was not able to come back to these lessons to re-teach, re-asses, and begin branching for future lessons because it was the last week of school. It would have been very beneficial to continue using these strategies with new words and new books.

Demonstration of Newly Learned Techniques (Standard VI)

There were many aspects from the reading lessons that I created that were techniques and strategies learned through the course readings. The phonics lesson was based on direct instruction focusing on phonics and modeling which were common themes in the course readings. “Most children need good explicit instruction about at least some aspects of reading,” (August, 2006, p. 352). I have always taught reading strategies and different aspects of reading, but through the readings in this class I discovered I was not providing my students with enough direct and explicit instruction. I was also not providing my students with enough phonics instruction, especially struggling students like Beth and Kurt. “There has been increased attention in the United States and elsewhere to adjust reading instruction so that it provides additional emphasis on phonics and phonics-related activities,” (Vaughn, Klingner, & Bryant, 2001, p. 66). Many of the readings explained the importance of phonics instruction which I was not providing to my students (Standard I). Phonics is an aspect of Phonological Awareness, for example judging whether two words have sounds in common which occurred in my phonics lesson. “Phonological awareness is critical for learning to read,” (Anthony & Francis, 2005, p.255).

The comprehension lesson focused on direct instruction of comprehension strategies, vocabulary instruction, peer-assisted learning groups, and a strategy called “Click and Clunk”. Effective reading instruction includes, “direct teaching of comprehension, vocabulary instruction, comprehension strategies, and frequent writing,” (AFT Teachers, 1999, p. 7). The lesson provided students with direct teaching of the comprehension strategy “Click and Clunk” including how to use it and why to use it. Then students had the opportunity for guided practice using the comprehension strategy. The students were required to correctly write words from the

book on their graphic organizer. After instruction on the comprehension strategy the lesson was devoted to peer-assisted learning groups to determine the vocabulary words. “Research in the elementary grades shows that children’s reading competence improves when they work with each other in a cooperative and structured manner,” (Fuchs, D. & Fuchs, L, 2005, p.34). The cooperative and structured manner that the students were working in was through the activity Click and Clunk. Click and Clunk is an activity used to “preview prior to reading and a self-monitory strategy implemented during reading,” (Vaughn, Klingner, & Bryant, 2001, p. 68). When students click they recognize material that they know, when they clunk they identify words that they do not know. Together as a peer-assisted learning group the students alone work through each clunk word to determine the meanings. The words that students identified as clunks became the vocabulary words that we discussed. “Vocabulary knowledge directly and indirectly (through listening comprehension) predicted reading comprehension,” (August, 2006, p. 356).

The phonics lesson and comprehension lesson both focused on motivating students and attempting to get them excited about words and reading. The lessons varied each day with different activities and a combination of verbal and written responses. Components of student motivation include “self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, and achievement goals,” (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2002, p.313). Although Kurt had low intrinsic motivation and achievement goals, he had extremely high self-efficacy. “Self-efficacy is the belief about performance capabilities in a particular context or specific task,” (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2002, p.315). Kurt was never hesitant to try an activity or answer incorrectly in front of others, he was always confident about his performance in the lessons. Beth had high intrinsic motivation during the lessons based on the interest of the context. Beth’s self-efficacy would fall in the middle range, she was not as

confident about her performance as Kurt, however she was not timid when working in the group or doing independent work. Beth usually has a much lower self-efficacy when she is working independently. Like other students with learning problems Beth usually, “devalues academic tasks, doubts her capabilities, and expends little effort because of repeated academic failures,” (Troia, 2002, p.257).

Pre & Post Assessment Table

The following charts show the accuracy of Kurt and Beth’s pre and post assessments. The final column shows the improvement or lack of improvement the student made. The assessments that do not have a pre-assessment score are assessments that were developed to further assess the instructional goals of the lesson. The instructional goals were taught based on the student’s lack of understanding or misunderstanding of the concept.

Kurt’s Assessments	Pre-Assessment Score	Post-Assessment Score	Improvements
Sight Words	42% (34 words out of 80)	46% (37 words out of 80)	+4% (+3 words)
Short/Long Vowels	X	80% (8 out of 10)	N/A
Vowel Rule	X	71% (5 out of 7)	N/A
Core Maze	7 correct 12 errors Intensive	5 correct 11 errors Intensive	-2 correct -1 error
Oral Reading	77% accuracy rate	97% accuracy rate	+ 20%
Clink/Clunk Vocabulary	X	40% (4 out of 10)	N/A

Beth's Assessments	Pre-Assessment Score	Post-Assessment Score	Improvements
Sight Words	72% (58 words out of 80)	88% (70 words out of 80)	+ 16% (+12 words)
Short/Long Vowels	X	60% (6 out of 10)	N/A
Vowel Rule	X	71% (5 out of 7)	N/A
Core Maze	6 correct 4 errors Intensive	11 correct 7 errors Strategic	+5 correct +3 errors
Oral Reading	81% accuracy rate	95% accuracy rate	+ 14 %
Clink/Clunk Vocabulary	X	100 % (10 out of 10)	N/A

Lesson Artifacts (Attached in Separate Documents)

Kurt's Assessments are a letter K followed by the lesson number.

Beth's Assessments are a letter B followed by the lesson number.

Lesson 1: Short & Long Vowels

1. Sight Word Pre Test
2. Sight Word Post Test
3. Short & Long Vowel Post Test
4. Vowel Rule Worksheet
5. Vowel Rule Post Test

Lesson 2: Click & Clunk for Meaning (Comprehension)

6. Core Maze Pre Test
7. Core Maze Post Test
8. Oral Reading Pre Test
9. Oral Reading Post Test
10. Click & Clunk Worksheet
11. Click & Clunk Vocabulary Post Test