

Melissa Gucker

TE 846 Fall 2010

December 9th, 2010

Term Project

Reading Comprehension Lessons-Description, Analysis, & Reflection

Background Information

As I have come to realize, a “widespread goal of education in the elementary grades is reading comprehension for all students”. (Guthrie, et al, 2004, p. 403) The specific child in which I chose to use as my case study focus has shown difficulty with reading comprehension strategies and the ability to fully understand a text. To wholly recognize the situation, one must know more specifics about this child and the characteristics of the classroom (Standard III).

Sierra (name changed to protect student) is a Caucasian, female student within my third grade classroom at Challenger Elementary in Howell, Michigan. She is currently nine years of age and is performing below grade level in reading. Conversely, she does not fall significantly below grade level, she sits just below what is expected of a third grade student (for example she is performing at a DRA level 28 when most of my students are at a 30-38 range or higher) (Standard II). Sierra seemingly struggles with understanding what she is reading and has trouble remembering parts of her books. Due to her reading ability being just below level, Sierra has received Title 1 support since the first grade. This support is given daily in which students receive additional support on their reading and strategies that supplement reading. During her Title 1 support, she is given intensive, small group instruction on her reading.

In regards to Sierra's attitude about reading, surprisingly she is very enthusiastic about reading and enjoys reading during any down time in school. When given the opportunity to read aloud with an adult or peer, Sierra seems comfortable, appears to know many of the words in context, and is able to decode words easily. She can read the more difficult texts (in relation to peer expected texts), pronouncing words correctly and giving precise meaning, however, there is a break down when it comes to her comprehension ability. Her case has proven to be a difficult case to understand and decipher at first glance. It was my apprehension that although she is able to "simply decode the words on the page" it did "not equal comprehension". (Herrera, Perez, & Escamilla, 2010, p. 135) We also know that "motivation and engagement contribute to reading comprehension" and because this student is sufficient with her motivation, there must be a disconnect with her engagement and the text. (Guthrie, et al, 2004, p. 403) After much interaction and one-on-one observations, I was able to use my awareness of this child and her capabilities to decide what reading comprehension lessons this student may benefit from within a 2-3 week period of time (Standard II).

As one investigates a students' background, it is also equally important to understand the climate of the actual classroom. Within my third grade classroom, students are pushed to become independent thinkers as well as provide opportunities to become risk-takers. Around the room, one may find a variety of different "tools" for each subject area (for example: books, pencils, rulers, graphic organizers, paper, and student samples just to mention a few), all in areas of easy access for each child. Sierra gladly uses these tools and prides herself on being independent. She is often times instructing other students on where to find a supply. This not only helps others become independent, but it promotes an atmosphere of collaboration and cooperation in which we all care to help others out (Standard IV).

By providing two very solid and concrete comprehension strategies, it was my objective to help this student gain an understanding of what they were reading. In addition to this broad goal, it has also been my personal goal for all students to be able to see why it was important to be “metacognitive” about their own reading, “that is, awareness of the knowledge, skills, and strategies they have at their disposal, how to apply them, and when to deploy them for effective and efficient task performance.” (Standard II) (Troia, 2002, p. 254)

Design of Reading Comprehension Case Study: (Broad Overview)

When first deciding the approach to facilitating this case study, it was evident that I needed to scaffold this child’s learning based on specific comprehension strategies (Standards I, II). Two lessons aiding in comprehension were chosen: making connections as we read (text-to-self, text-to-text, and text-to-world) and checking for understanding (CSR strategy, specifically the ability to “click” and “clunk”). To measure the growth of this student during these lessons, each strategy had *both* a pre and post assessment.

The first pre-assessment used was in regards to the text connections strategy. The student and I discussed that “good readers make connections as they read to help with understanding a story better” (Standards I, II). Next, I read a small excerpt from a grade-level expected text and after I had finished reading, I asked the student to fill out a text connections chart as best as she could (see Student Sample 1). This information allowed for me to see where she was at in regards to thinking about her own reading. Not only did the pre-assessment provide for base line data, it also provided valuable information on where this student was at and where potential goals could be (Standards III, V)

Once the pre-assessment for the text connections strategy was complete, it was then that the true teaching took place. Over the span of a week, I modeled “how” to make connections as we read. First, all three types of connections were discussed (text, self, and world). Next, I took the time to model my “self” connections initially. The student observed how I stopped during my reading to think about my own connections. The lesson was furthered by addressing text-to-text and text-to-world connections. As the child became more aware of these ideas, guided and independent practice was used, in which the student was able to write down their own connections on the “Text Connections Workmat” (Standards V, VI) (See Student Sample 5). A post-assessment was then administered (the exact same sheet that was used for the pre-assessment). The post-assessment was used to gauge the growth of this students’ ability to make connections as they read (see Student Sample 2).

The next pre-assessment that was used was in regards to the checking for understanding comprehension strategy or “click” and “clunk”. In order to gain knowledge of how this student thinks while reading, I asked the student an open-ended question about what they do when they come to a part in a text that they do not understand. The child verbalized the answer, but I also had her write down her ideas to have it in a written form as well. This open-ended question allowed for me to have a discussion with this student and really hear what her strengths and weaknesses were in regards to metacognition (see Student Sample 6) (Standard III).

The actual lesson for understanding consisted of discussing what exactly a “click” and “clunk” was. With the student we had a discussion about how “clicks happen when you understand what you are reading or when you can connect and provide more information” and “clunks are parts of texts that we do not understand or may find confusing”. With these terms imbedded, I began modeling how to click and clunk with words, sentences, paragraphs, and

whole pages. At each step, the child was eventually able to click and clunk with me, voicing their understanding. As we came to a clunk, I modeled how to use the four “Clunk Cards” that we used to help “solve” or “make our clunks click” (see Student Sample 8). After a time span of about a week, the student was able to take the post-assessment, which consisted of the same open-ended question that was asked in the pre-assessment (see Student Sample 7). Again, I had her verbalize what she did when she did not understand part of a text as well as write down her answers. Comparing the pre and post-assessment allowed for me to see the new ideas and concepts this student had.

IN DEPTH ASSESSMENT AND LESSON EXAMINATION

The Pre-Assessment for Text Connections Lesson

As mentioned briefly above, the first pre-assessment was done to extract information regarding my sample student’s ability to make connections as she reads. First, Sierra and I had a discussion about how important it was for readers to make connections as they read. She revealed that she had heard this “from her second grade teacher before and that there were different types of connections you could make”. This immediately told me that she had some prior knowledge/background knowledge of this particular strategy. This was a perfect example of the “schema theory” at work, demonstrating how her “knowledge of objects, events, and situations are categorized and retained in” her memory. (Herrera, Perez, & Escamilla, 2010, p. 136) Although she could not verbalize the three specific types of text connections, she knew different types existed. Even though this student had the prior knowledge, when asked if she used this strategy in her reading, she said that she had forgotten how to use it and never did it while she was independently reading. To prepare her for the pre-assessment format, we briefly discussed what each connection was (without giving too much information to skew the results).

After we discussed the crucial aspects of making connections, I began to read an excerpt from a peer expected text, *Horrible Harry and the Drop of Doom*, by Suzie Kline. The excerpt consisted of five pages (that had multiple opportunities to make text, self, and world connections) and after I finished reading, I gave Sierra the “Making Connections” student sheet (See Student Sample 1) to use as the pre-assessment. She was instructed to do the best that she could with writing down any connections she may have had while I read. Sierra took her time and was able to make a few connections of her own. Due to the fact that her written response could be seen as confusing, I asked her to explain her connections to me in order to gain more information verbally. As one can see, Sierra came up with two specific examples consisting of one text-to-self connection and one text-to-text connection. Sierra’s text-to-self connection as stated in her words was that “my sister makes weird noises just like the people on the scary ride did” (noted “Awawawa!” on her text connections student sheet). Although this student did not clarify her thoughts, her voiced idea was a direct correlation to a plausible text-to-self connection, demonstrating that she had an understanding of making a connection with herself. Lastly, Sierra wrote down a text-to-text connection. Again, asking for clarification, this student mentioned that she had “just read a book that had a dropping clock which reminded” her of the “dropping rollercoaster ride” (See Student Sample 1). These simple, but definitive connections confirmed that Sierra had a basic idea of at least two text connections (she was unable to make a world connection).

This specific pre-assessment gave me more information on how Sierra makes connections as she reads. I chose this assessment because it allowed me to see her interactions with connections specifically; it exposed her ability to make connections, but showed how lacking the depth and quality was. Although this student could demonstrate the ability to make

connections, this assessment showed me how she does not use this strategy in her own independent reading. The pre-assessment also gave me a greater understanding of exactly what I needed to focus on within the lessons for this reading comprehension strategy (Standards V, VI).

The Text Connections Lesson (Self, Text, and World)-Lesson 1

To begin the first lesson, the student and I had a conversation about why it was so important to think about our own reading. We also discussed the aspects of making connections while reading and how this helped us as well. The key connection that we discussed was that thinking about our reading and making connections all helped us to understand a text better (Standards III, IV).

Next, I presented the student with the ideas of text connections. I explained how there were three different types of connections that one could make while reading (self, text, and world) (See Lesson Plan 1, Day 1). Immediately, Sierra recognized the text-to-self strategy, seeing that she remembered this “from last year” and that it was “the easiest of all the three” for her to use. We discussed the idea of how text-to-self connections help “readers make connections between the text and their past experiences and background knowledge” and how they were the easiest to make because it connects to “things that have happened to us before”. (Herrera, Perez, & Escamilla, 2010, p. 138)

Once the student felt comfortable with the meanings of each text connection, I explained how I was going to “model” how to make text-to-self connections for her today. She directly asked why I wasn’t going to “show” her how to do the other types of connections and I relayed that we would start off with just one today, seeing not to “overwhelm” her. I then began reading aloud to the student (from the selected text-*Junie B. Jones Has a Monster under Her Bed*),

stopping when I had a “text-to-self” connection. I made sure to discuss what the connection was and why it was a connection with “me”. After I had “built on the importance of first making text-to-self connections”, hence “promoting students’ schematic connections”, we ended the lesson with any thoughts the student may have had (questions, ideas, concerns). (Herrera, Perez, & Escamilla, 2010, pgs. 138 & 140) The next day’s lesson consisted of the same concept as presented in the previous day’s lesson (activating prior knowledge first); however I modeled all three types of connections for the student this time, allowing for the student to make connections as well. I made sure to stop and discuss each type of connection as I saw the opportunity to do so (See Lesson Plan 1, Day 2).

As Day 1 and Day 2 of the lesson presented “modeled” practice, Day 3 presented the opportunity for guided practice with the student. As one knows, “explicit modeling for and practicing with students how to use a strategy” will only “help them see the relevance of the strategy”. (Troia, 2002, p. 258) For Day 3’s guided practice, we first reviewed each of the text connections and what they meant. After doing this, I explained to the student that today we would read together, taking turns as we read. While doing this, each of us would have the chance to discuss any types of connections we might have. However, for this lesson we would be using the “Text Connections Workmat” (See Student Sample 3). Not only would we be “verbalizing” our connections, but we would also be writing them down together. We read through a section of the selected text and right away the student began making connections. She discussed how “she also at one time thought there was a monster under her bed” which was a “text-to-self” connection (See Student Sample 3 for written response). It was astonishing to see all of the connections this student had as she read, not only was she making self connections, but she was able to successfully make text and world connections as well (See Student Sample 3). Sierra was

able to make a world connection-the type of connection that she struggled with initially, “Junie B. had a dino[saur] on her shirt and there were real dino[saur]s a long time ago”. Together we were able to successfully make all three types of reading “together” for Day 3’s lesson. Although we had many more connections, we only wrote down one of each type of connection on the “Text Connections Workmat” and orally stated the rest of our connections (Standards IV, V, and VI).

Due to the fact that Sierra was demonstrating this skill with ease, we continued on to the next day’s lesson. In Day 4, the student used independent practice to demonstrate her understanding of how to make connections as she read. The student was given a blank copy of the “Text Connections Workmat” and was asked to fill this out whenever she had a self, text, or world connection. As one can see, she was able to find at least one type of connection while reading independently (See Student Sample 4). At the end of the designated time, we discussed the connections she had while reading today. She relayed that “she thought she was getting really good” at thinking about her connections. She also noticed that she was able to make more than one connection with some of the different types. I then asked her if this helped her understand her book better. With that question, Sierra explained how it “really was helping her, even though it took a little longer to read through her book” (Standards V, VI).

For the last day of instruction regarding connections, the student and I had a closing discussion about the importance of making connections as we read. We reviewed the three types of connections as well as discussing how this strategy has helped Sierra. I asked her if learning this new strategy would help her in her own independent reading time and she told me that “she really likes making connections, especially when she gets to write them down and tell me about them”. She also asked me if she could have some more of the blank “Text Connections

Workmats” that she could use when she was reading by herself (See Student Sample 5). This comment from the student directly showed that there was a meaningful contribution made to her reading progress. While only a few days were spent facilitating the connections strategy, her comments revealed that she wants to take this strategy and use it in her daily reading. By using this student’s prior knowledge and scaffolding her learning (modeled, guided, and independent learning), we have built her strategy base and if she continues to use this strategy, it will only help her become more aware of her own connections, thus improving her reading comprehension abilities (Standards V, VI).

The Post Assessment for Text Connections Lesson

In order to gain knowledge about student growth for this specific lesson, I chose to use a precise post-assessment that pertained to text connections solely. In order to compare the post-assessment with the pre-assessment results, I administered the same assessment as I did in the pre-assessment (see Student Sample 2). Again, I read aloud the same excerpt from the text *Horrible Harry and the Drop of Doom*. After reading this section aloud to the student, I passed out the same “Making Connections” student sheet as done in the pre-assessment. I explained the directions, however this time I handed the sheet to the student without explaining what each type of connection was briefly and without verbalizing the connections first. Sierra took the sheet and immediately began to start writing down her connections. As I watched her come up with multiple connections for each of the three types (all correctly made), the evidence that this student had achieved my instructional goals was apparent.

After she had finished writing down her ideas, we had a discussion about what she connected with and what other connections she had while I read aloud. The student specifically revealed that the first time I read the story aloud to her, “she didn’t really understand all of the

story” and “some parts kind of confused” her. Now, she spoke of how “it was easy to make connections” and she “actually understood all of the story now” (at least the part read aloud). The post-assessment helped the student realize her ability to comprehend the story and how much one strategy really helped her comprehension.

The written and verbal post-assessment has shown what great strides this student has made with the text connections strategy. As noted previously, this student wanted blank copies of the “Text Connections Workmat” student sheets (See Student Sample 5) to use for her own independent reading time. I am confident that this student will use these sheets while reading. Her motivation to do well is something that has never been lacking. However, I can see this as becoming labor some for this student, so I might urge her to use this sheet on an “every other book” basis. There are many other strategies that could be used and practiced as well and I could see this specific student “over-using” this strategy, thus becoming cumbersome (Standards III, IV).

The Pre-Assessment for “Click” and “Clunk” Lesson (Checking for Understanding)

To gain knowledge of how this student makes choices about their own understandings while reading, a pre-assessment was given. This pre-assessment was structured and chosen to be much different than the previous pre-assessment was (text connections). This assessment consisted of an open-ended question that the student answered both orally and by written response. When asked “What do you do when you come to a part of a story that you do not understand”, the student revealed that she used a few strategies. Sierra spoke of “chunking” or “sounding out” a word she did not know as well as “looking at the picture if it didn’t make sense”. I asked her if she used these strategies while reading independently and she admitted that although she knew of a few “strategies” she sometimes “forgot” to use them when reading. I had

the student write down her strategies that she used to have these in a more concrete format (see Student Sample 6).

The pre-assessment exposed a great amount of information to balance instruction and identify this student's strengths and weaknesses (Standard III). Although this student had some solid strategies to use, she admitted that she was not always using them as she knew she should. Even though we were using "metacognition" to think about her reading abilities currently, this pre-assessment specifically spoke of her inability to be "metacognitive" during her independent reading time. As we know, "students have to activate their metacognitive resources and ask themselves some key questions", which clearly this student was not always engaged in. (Ehren, 2005, p. 315) The information obtained from the pre-assessment helped me to realize that this student needed further instruction on what strategies to use, but more importantly she needed to become aware of using the actually strategies provided (Standards I, III).

The "Click" and "Clunk" Lesson (Checking for Understanding)-Lesson 2

For the last reading comprehension lesson, I explained to the student that we would be looking at a story and specifically looking at places in the story we did not understand. To start off the Day 1 lesson, we had a discussion about why it is important to recognize when we do not understand something in a text (to see example questions discussed, See Lesson Plan 2, Day 1). From our discussion, it was obvious that this student understood that it was important to understand what you were reading. She voiced that "sometimes when I don't understand a story and don't try to make it make sense, I don't want to read the book and just go and get another one". This conversation made it even more apparent that this student was not using her strategies even though she had a few in her knowledge bank (Standard III). illuminating this information

confirmed that I had to adapt the “click” and “clunk” strategy to “force” this student to actually stop and think about her reading at specific times.

After having this initial discussion, I explained that I would again be modeling the strategy for the student first because to have “maximal impact on the student”, “the strategy should be demonstrated for the student”. (Troia, 2002, p. 258) I clarified the idea of “clicks” and “clunks” to the student first, explaining that “clicks were things in the story that *made sense to us* and that we might be able to add more information or talk more about” and “clunks were parts of the story that we *did not understand* because of words or other parts of the story”. Sierra picked up on this concept quickly and next, I went into modeling as well as “thinking aloud” on how to use the click and clunk strategy with whole sentences first because “thinking aloud while reading is an effective strategy for enhancing comprehension abilities”. (Ivey, 2002, p. 241) As I read aloud, after each sentence I would either say “click” or “clunk”. If it was a “click” then I would continue on to the next sentence. When I came to a “clunk” I stopped reading and explained why I was confused. I told the student that I did not understand what the sentence meant after I read it.

At this point, this is when I pulled out the “4 Clunk Cards” and showed them to the student (See Student Sample 8). The four strategies consisted of “re-reading the sentence”, “read the sentence before and after the clunk”, “find the prefix or suffix to help with meaning”, and lastly “chunk the word that you had a clunk on”. (West, 2001, p. 92) I asked the student what she thought I should do to help with the “clunk” I had. Immediately, she said she thought I should re-read the sentence to see if it made sense. I re-read the sentence and discussed how this strategy did help me understand what I had “missed before”. I continued on reading and “finding” clunks,

asking the student to help me “fix” the clunk by using the four cards provided. After we were able to find a “clunk” that addressed each of the four strategies to use, Day 1 lesson was finished.

Day 2’s lesson started off with a more guided lesson, rather than the completely modeled lesson from the previous day. To start off, we did a review of what a “clicks” and “clunks” were as well as reviewed each of the four clunk cards that helped fix our misunderstandings. First, I explained how we would be working together today to read through more of our story (continuing from the Junie B. Jones book selected for the first reading comprehension strategy lesson). However, for today, we would *both* be “clicking” and “clunking” at the end of each sentence together and sharing reading responsibilities. Starting off from the previous day’s reading, I began reading aloud the first sentence, stopping for both of us to voice our click or clunk. We continued this process at the end of each sentence, using the four clunk cards to help with understanding if a “clunk” existed. It became apparent that this student was fully capable of using this strategy and was more than willing and able to use this approach. The session turned into a more “student-lead” opportunity, where she was guiding the lesson and using the four clunk cards even when I might have needed to “fix” and “clunk” (Standards III, IV, V, and VI).

Day’s 3-5 were used to extend the ideas of “clicking” and “clunking (to view more specific instructions, See Lesson Plan 2, Days 3-5). Depending on student progress, each day we moved from clicking and clunking with words and sentences to whole paragraphs and pages. This aspect of the lesson showed the student how one can always “check for understanding” at any place in their reading. Again, I modeled how to use the strategy with paragraphs and pages (we also discussed clicking and clunking at the end of chapters), but this student really took to the more “guided approach” to learning. This aspect of the lesson provided to be a “critical moment” within her own learning as well as mine. She enjoyed acting like the “teacher” and

really gained more knowledge when “helping” me “fix” my clunks. Near the end of Day 5, it was apparent that this student had a solid understanding of this strategy and I allowed for her to read with a partner, explaining the idea of “clicking” and “clunking” and discussing their very own understandings as they read. This student-based practice allowed for her to “understand what was read”, but allowed for a much deeper understanding in which she was ultimately “constructing meaning from the text” by elaborating with another age appropriate peer. (Herrera, Perez, & Escamilla, 2010, p. 133)

The Post-Assessment for the “Click” and “Clunk” Lesson (Checking for Understanding)

More so than in the previous reading comprehension lesson, the post-assessment for the “click” and “clunk” lesson provided more solid information about this child’s actual ability to comprehend what they were reading. The same open-ended question was asked about what this student does when she does not understand parts of a text (just as asked in the pre-assessment). Although I had the student write down strategies she now uses to help with understanding a text (See Student Sample 7), I also had an in-depth conversation with the student about the very same topic. The student explained that now she “has four really good ideas now that she can use when she gets stuck” and “having those cards with her” when she reads “will help her remember to stop now” when she does not understand parts of a text, which proves as evidence of growth. This aspect of the post-assessment, in direct correlation with the pre-assessment reveals that she actually can stop when there is a misunderstanding and now has a cue to help her do so. Due to her independent nature, I feel confident that if this student continues to have these “four clunk cards” available, it will be a constant reminder to stop and think through her texts (Standards IV, V, and VI).

In regards to this strategy instruction making meaningful contributions to this student's reading ability, I believe that this time spent one-on-one with this student reminded her of how she was forgetting to do some crucial steps when reading. The post-assessment shows that she now has the ability to become aware of her own reading. When a student becomes more aware of their own reading, comprehension can only improve with time. These strategies have only added to her "schematic connections to text" where she is now more capable of "drawing on [her] schemas". (Herrera, Perez, & Escamilla, 2010, p. 136) The post-assessment has provided me with great insights about this child and how specific, applied instruction takes her reading comprehension to new levels. It has also given me the ability to see how "teachers need to teach concepts effectively so that students will have a sufficient number of them in their background knowledge to activate them when reading". (Ehren, 2005, p. 313) This just illustrates how Sierra will need more opportunities to learn even more strategies and apply them to her very own reading.

Plausible Changes after Use of Reading Comprehension Strategies

In order to reflect on my engagement with this student and their growth with these specific strategies, I was able to use the pre/post assessments as well as my observations and discussions with the actual student. Largely, this case study provided to be an exceptionally positive experience for this child. Our discussions showed how this student has many of the correct strategies (or at least a basis) to aid in reading comprehension. However, she was not always using the strategies she was fully capable of completing. This experience has given her the opportunity to see that she is capable of making connections and helping with her understanding if she is willing to use tools, skills, and approaches put in place.

Although this case study offered more than I had originally expected, there are a few changes that I might have administered had I done this case again. First, looking solely at the student, I would have placed more activities in the lessons to practice the actual strategy with another classmate. Sierra thrived off of being able to almost “teach” me and help me through my misunderstandings in the “click” and “clunk” strategy as well as being able to aid in teaching a fellow classmate how to use this strategy. Watching her “think-aloud” made me realize that verbalization was her key to consistent and useful strategy implementation. Especially for the text connections lesson, I did not provide Sierra the opportunity to show this idea to a classmate. I now wonder what impact this may have had on the longevity of the strategy. In turn, to meet her unique needs in reading instruction, I have been allowing Sierra to share new strategies as well as old strategies with other classmates and have them practice these ideas during our independent reading time on a weekly basis. This has addressed the needs of not only Sierra, but has allowed for other students to gain a better understanding of their own reading, thus keeping in mind the developmentally appropriate activities for my students (Standards I, III, IV, and VI).

One last aspect I might have changed in regards to the reading comprehension lessons would possibly be the pre and post assessments given to measure growth. By using two different pre and post assessments (one set for each lesson), I was able to hone in on specific growth for each specific strategy. Although this information was exceptionally helpful, it also became a bit tedious at times. In doing this lesson again, I might have chosen one specific pre and post assessment to give after both lessons had been completed. This may have consisted of a set of questions about what this student does while reading or it could have been an actual reading passage in which comprehension was tested. This broad idea of a pre and post assessment might have offered some new information on how well the student uses the strategies to aid in

comprehension, but it might have also allowed me to see where I needed to take this student in the future (Standards V, VI).

Closing Remarks

Reflecting on this case study and its offerings, it is clear that this opportunity has provided for growth not only for the case study student, but for me as well. I have begun to use these two strategies with small groups of students within my classroom to continue to disperse this wonderful knowledge Sierra and I have gained. It has been a powerful teaching tool to be able to reflect on my case study and offer an even more in depth opportunity for other students within my classroom.

These newly learned techniques have provided me with a fresh outlook on reading instruction. Reading has always been a subject area of teaching that I was unsure of and knowing that “any child who doesn’t learn to read early and well will not easily master other skills and knowledge, and is unlikely to even flourish in school or in life”, puts a lot of pressure on teachers. (Moats, 1999, p. 5) Seeing this case study come to fruition, I have gained a newly found confidence that I can provide rich, meaningful, and constructive lessons to improve upon a child’s reading. This case study has provided an opening into future lessons and ways of delivering instruction.

As we know, “outstanding teachers thoughtfully and skillfully make adaptations to their instructional methods, materials, and expectations for student performance”. (Troia & Graham, 2003, p. 81) This class, specifically found within this case study, has shown me that I can strive to be one of those “outstanding” teachers. Meeting the needs of my students while offering lesson rooted in “best practices” will only help me reach this ultimate goal. Not only do I leave

this class with new ideas, concepts, strategies, tools, and lessons, I leave this class ready to take my reading and writing instruction to new levels of accomplishment and success.

References

- Ehren, B. J. (2005). Looking for evidence-based practice in reading comprehension instruction. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 25, 310-321.
- Guthrie, J. T., et al. (2004). Increasing reading comprehension and engagement through concept-oriented reading instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96, 403-423.
- Herrera, S. G., Perez, D. R., Escamilla, K. (2010). Chapter 6 Teaching reading to English language learners: Differentiated literacies. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Ivey, G. (2002). Building comprehension when they're still learning to read the words. In C. C. Block & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices* (pp. 234-246). New York: Guilford.
- Moats, L. C. (1999). *Teaching reading is rocket science: What expert teachers of reading should know and be able to do*. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers.
- Troia, G. A., & Graham, S. (2003). Effective writing instruction across the grades: What every educational consultant should know. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 14, 75-89.
- Troia, G. A. (2002). Teaching writing strategies to children with disabilities: Setting generalization as the goal. *Exceptionality*, 10, 249-269.
- Vaughn, S., Klinger, J. K., & Bryant, D. P. (2001). Collaborative strategic reading as a means to enhance peer-mediated instruction for reading comprehension and content-area learning. *Remedial and Special Education*, 22, 66-74.