



Analyzing DIBELS Data to Inform Instruction

Assignment

- Participants will analyze the DIBELS data of one student group.
- Participants will plan and teach an intervention lesson for one student group
- The Master Coach will assist in organizing the intervention assignments.

Participant Materials

Reading First Notebook

PowerPoint Handout –3 per page

Participant Resources – 3 copies of Resource 3 Observation Chart; 1 copy of all others

Blank Intervention Lesson Plans

- 2nd & 3rd grade Intervention Plans (one for below level 16 & one for above level 16)
- QuickReads directions

Texts

I've DIBEL'd, Now What?

Presenter Materials

- All Participant Materials
- Printed PowerPoint Notes
- Day 1 Intervention Lesson Plans
- Blank Intervention Lesson Plans
 - 2nd & 3rd grade Intervention Plans (one for below level 16 & one for above level 16)
 - Quick Reads directions
- SRC student assessment portfolios or a **copy** of the most recent DIBELS administration for each child with last name blacked out.
- Chart Paper
- Markers

ACT 35 . . .

requires an Intensive Reading Improvement (IRI) plan for **any** student in Arkansas identified as having substantial reading difficulty.

Act 35

Responding to the enormous diversity of instructional needs is one of the biggest challenges that educators face in reading instruction.

Arkansas' ACT 35 requires an Intensive Reading Improvement (IRI) plan for **any** student in Arkansas identified as having substantial reading difficulty. See Rule 7:08 from the ACTAAP Rules:

Based on the evaluation, school personnel shall develop an Intensive Reading Improvement plan (IRI) for any student identified with substantial reading difficulty.

Rules and Regulations for Act 35

- To meet the requirements of Act 35, students exhibiting substantial reading difficulty will be administered the required DIBELS benchmark measures and progress monitoring measures every two weeks in each area in which proficiency is not attained. The Intensive Reading Intervention plan (IRI) and assessment information will be recorded in NORMES. Intervention will continue until the child has reached grade level benchmarks in all essential areas of reading.
- Student achievement in each of the essential elements will be monitored monthly for the remainder of the year after students have reached benchmark goals and are no longer receiving intervention.
- If a student is not making adequate progress toward benchmark goals (on the trajectory for each measure), the IRI should be refined if the child is to reach proficiency.

Periodic Revisions of the IRI Plan

The intervention plan shall be revised periodically to reflect student needs as indicated on progress monitoring assessments.

- Progress monitor every two weeks.
- Revise if not progressing adequately on two successive progress monitoring.

Periodic Revisions of the IRI Plan

The IRI plan must be revised periodically to reflect student needs. The intensity of the intervention should be adjusted if the student is not making adequate progress. This could include:

- working with the student one-on-one instead of small group, or
- providing additional time, such as 30 minutes twice a day or five days a week instead of three.

ACTAAP Rules: 7.08.9.

The intensive instruction shall systematically, explicitly and coherently provide instruction in the five essential areas of reading. The intensity and focus of the instruction shall be based on the evaluation results, teacher observation, and data from progress monitoring assessments. The intervention plan shall be revised periodically to reflect student needs as indicated on progress monitoring assessments.

The intensive reading intervention must **systematically, explicitly and coherently** provide instruction in the five essential elements of reading. This does not mean purchasing a program for each element. Often a teacher developed lesson plan with the right resources is more targeted than purchased programs. Neither does it mean there will be five separate interventions. The intervention must be coherent so that each essential element supports the other. Whatever intervention is used, DIBELS must be used to monitor student and if an area is deficient, intervention must target that area.

If a student is not making progress toward the goal on two successive progress monitoring assessments, the IRI plan should be revised.

All schools in Arkansas must follow the rules and regulations specified by Act 35.

Arkansas Reading First schools are required to assess all children with the DIBELS measures appropriate for their grade level. Those students who are not on target to meet end of year benchmarks receive interventions and are progress monitored every two weeks.

Objective
<p>Improve literacy outcomes for all students by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• analyzing students' DIBELS data• identifying error patterns• designing appropriate interventions• monitoring progress• evaluating instruction

Objective

The objective of this session is to help educators apply scientifically based reading research to make data-informed decisions, to plan and inform appropriate instruction and design intervention strategies for small group instruction. Emphasis will be placed on improving instructional support for our most at-risk readers.

Put Reading First provides a reference for scientifically based reading instruction. It is recommended that each participant study and refer to this document to support research-based intervention.

Struggling Readers Do Not Catch Up!

The probability that a child would remain a poor reader at the end of fourth grade, if the child was a poor reader at the end of first grade was .88. Connie Juel, 1994

74% of children who are poor readers in third grade remain poor readers in ninth grade.

Francis, et al., 1996

Struggling Readers Do Not Catch Up!

Refer to *I've DIBEL'd, Now What?*, pages 7- 8, **The Outdated Wait-to-Fail Model**. Highlight the research shown on the slide (bullets on page 8).

In the past, the educational community (researchers and educators) believed in a “developmental lag” theory. Children who were slower than their peers in learning to read were “late bloomers” and would bloom in their reading at a later time.

It justified the practice of waiting and delaying diagnosis of reading problems until they were too severe to remediate. This reading failure had far reaching consequences. Children who fall seriously behind have fewer opportunities to practice reading and this makes it difficult for them to catch up. Stanovich discusses these consequences as the “Matthew Effect” (the rich get richer and the poor get poorer), in which the poor readers continue to get more behind in reading and the good readers get better, thus, the reading gap widens.

Multiple scientific studies show that children who get a slow start in learning to read are not simply experiencing a developmental lag, but are unlikely to catch up.

On *I've DIBEL'd, Now What?*, page 8, highlight:

The Wait-to-Fail model has failed too many students.

The Good News

We now have the tools and technologies to identify children who are at risk of reading failure.

Early identification and intervention can prevent reading failure.

The Good News

Refer to *I've DIBEL'd, Now What?*, page 11.

The good news from numerous research studies is that it is possible to screen students as early as kindergarten to identify those students who are at risk of reading failure, identify weaknesses and deliver data-informed interventions to prevent almost all of them from reading failure.

The Preventive Model must replace the Wait-to-Fail model.

Highlight *I've DIBEL'd, Now What?* page 11:

- *The Preventive Model is based on extensive critical findings from scientific research.*
- *It is considerably more efficient and effective to deliver intervention earlier rather than later in the elementary school years.*
- *It takes four times as long to remediate a student with poor reading skills in fourth grade as in late kindergarten or early first grade (Lyon and Fletcher, 2001).*
- *That means that the earlier we can provide reading help to a student, the less time that student will need to catch up.*

Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills

DIBELS

- Brief fluency measures of critical early reading skills
- Sensitive to change over time
- Snapshots of students' progress

Dynamic Indicators of Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS)

DIBELS is one of the instruments used to develop and monitor the progress of the IRI. In order to understand the uniqueness of DIBELS, it is important to focus on some key essential features of a good assessment instrument:

- focus on essential, important skills (five essential elements of reading),
- instructionally relevant,
- efficient to administer,
- sensitive to change in skill, and
- measure fluency or performance.

DIBELS indicators are focused on the five essential elements of reading, allowing the assessment to be brief and efficient. DIBELS is dynamic because it's responsive to changes in student performance. It identifies students who need additional support and evaluates students' response to intervention.

DIBELS and the Essential Elements of Reading

Grade	DIBELS	Essential Element of Reading
K	PSF LNF, NWF WUF	Phonemic Awareness Phonics Vocabulary
1	PSF LNF, NWF WUF ORF	Phonemic Awareness Phonics Vocabulary Fluency
2	NWF WUF ORF	Phonics Vocabulary Fluency
3	WUF ORF	Vocabulary Fluency

DIBELS and the Essential Elements of Reading

Refer to *I've DIBEL'd, Now What?*, page 40.

DIBELS measures are closely tied to the five essential elements of reading. The only exception is Letter Naming Fluency, which is tied to the alphabetic principle, a foundational knowledge for phonics.

Why focus on the five essential elements of reading? Because the five essential elements in beginning reading instruction are instructional anchors that when accomplished and routinized or learned to mastery, provide beginning readers with enormous capacity to identify words and translate the alphabetic code into meaningful language. These big ideas are the basic early literacy skills that have the highest impact on learning to read. Because they are instructionally relevant, they must be a priority in curriculum and assessment.

Again, DIBELS measures do not assess all aspects of reading. They are short duration fluency measures that assess the skills that have the highest impact on learning to read, enabling them to be used to predict later reading success.

Why Use DIBELS Data?

- Screening
- Grouping for Targeted Instruction
- Planning Instruction
- Monitoring Progress
- Evaluating

Why Use DIBELS Data?

DIBELS is a powerful tool for facilitating sound educational decisions. It will identify students at risk (screening), validate the need for planning, identify specific skills that will be targeted with intervention, determine if students are learning critical skills at an adequate rate (progress monitoring), and evaluate the effectiveness of the reading instruction.

Highlight *I've DIBEL'd, Now What*, page 13:

*Researchers have confirmed that it **is** possible to predict which children will struggle and then actually change the trajectory for these students by intervening.*

Benchmark Goals

- Students must meet benchmark goals **when indicated**.
- Benchmark goals are **MINIMAL**.

Benchmark Goals

Refer to **Resource 1-2 DIBELS Benchmark Goals** and *I've DIBEL'd, Now What?*, page 33. Highlight:

The assessments administered in the fall, winter, and spring are called "Benchmark Assessment Screenings." The Benchmark Screening is given to all students to determine whether they are on track or at risk of reading difficulty. Benchmark Screening assesses whether the students are achieving certain critical milestones that good readers achieve. Students who do not achieve these benchmark scores are placed in intervention groups.

Each measure has a scientifically based goal (level of performance). It is not good enough that students meet the goal at some point; they need to meet the goal **when indicated** to ensure successful reading outcomes. The student trajectory indicates whether or not students are on target to meet goals.

These measures can be viewed as stepping stones to literacy beginning with the early critical foundation skills all the way to oral reading fluency. If a student makes the benchmark on time, they are more likely to meet the next skill. If not, the odds become stacked against them. Benchmarks are minimal (at the 40th percentile). We should set higher goals for our students.

IDNW page 57:

It is easy to be lulled into celebration that the student finally reached the benchmark goal, when actually by reaching the goal several months later than the recommended time, the student may not be making adequate progress in the next skill.

Kindergarten DIBELS Benchmark Goals

DIBELS Measure	Beginning of Year		Middle of Year		End of Year	
	Performance	Status	Performance	Status	Performance	Status
Initial Sounds Fluency	ISF < 4 4 ≤ ISF < 8 ISF ≥ 8	At Risk Some Risk Low Risk	ISF < 10 10 ≤ ISF < 25 ISF ≥ 25	Deficit Emerging Established		
Letter Naming Fluency	LNF < 2 2 ≤ LNF < 8 LNF ≥ 8	At Risk Some Risk Low Risk	LNF < 15 15 ≤ LNF < 27 LNF ≥ 27	At Risk Some Risk Low Risk	LNF < 29 29 ≤ LNF < 40 LNF ≥ 40	At Risk Some Risk Low Risk
Phonemic Segmentation Fluency			PSF < 7 7 ≤ PSF < 18 PSF ≥ 18	At Risk Some Risk Low Risk	PSF < 10 10 ≤ PSF < 35 PSF ≥ 35	Deficit Emerging Established
Nonsense Word Fluency			NWF < 5 5 ≤ NWF < 13 NWF ≥ 13	At Risk Some Risk Low Risk	NWF < 15 15 ≤ NWF < 25 NWF ≥ 25	At Risk Some Risk Low Risk

First Grade DIBELS Benchmark Goals

DIBELS Measure	Beginning of Year		Middle of Year		End of Year	
	Performance	Status	Performance	Status	Performance	Status
Letter Naming Fluency	LNF < 25 25 ≤ LNF < 37 LNF ≥ 37	At Risk Some Risk Low Risk				
Phonemic Segmentation Fluency	PSF < 10 10 ≤ PSF < 35 PSF ≥ 35	Deficit Emerging Established	PSF < 10 10 ≤ PSF < 35 PSF ≥ 35	Deficit Emerging Established	PSF < 10 10 ≤ PSF < 35 PSF ≥ 35	Deficit Emerging Established
Nonsense Word Fluency	NWF < 13 13 ≤ NWF < 24 NWF ≥ 24	At Risk Some Risk Low Risk	NWF < 30 30 ≤ NWF < 50 NWF ≥ 50	Deficit Emerging Established	NWF < 30 30 ≤ NWF < 50 NWF ≥ 50	Deficit Emerging Established
Oral Reading Fluency			ORF < 8 8 ≤ ORF < 20 ORF ≥ 20	At Risk Some Risk Low Risk	ORF < 20 20 ≤ ORF < 40 ORF ≥ 40	At Risk Some Risk Low Risk

Second Grade DIBELS Benchmark Goals

DIBELS Measure	Beginning of Year		Middle of Year		End of Year	
	Performance	Status	Performance	Status	Performance	Status
Oral Reading Fluency	ORF < 26	At Risk	ORF < 52	At Risk	ORF < 70	At Risk
	26 ≤ ORF < 44	Some Risk	52 ≤ ORF < 68	Some Risk	70 ≤ ORF < 90	Some Risk
	ORF ≥ 44	Low Risk	ORF ≥ 68	Low Risk	ORF ≥ 90	Low Risk

Third Grade DIBELS Benchmark Goals

DIBELS Measure	Beginning of Year		Middle of Year		End of Year	
	Performance	Status	Performance	Status	Performance	Status
Oral Reading Fluency	ORF < 53	At Risk	ORF < 67	At Risk	ORF < 80	At Risk
	53 < ORF < 77	Some Risk	67 < ORF < 92	Some Risk	80 < ORF < 110	Some Risk
	ORF ≥ 77	Low Risk	ORF ≥ 92	Low Risk	ORF ≥ 110	Low Risk

Step 1: Analyze the Whole Picture			
Emily			
First Grade Benchmark Assessment			
	Benchmark 1 Beginning/Fall	Benchmark 2 Middle/Winter	Benchmark 3 End/Spring
LNF	32		
PSF	10	24	
NWF	7	10	
ORF		13	
WUF	9	15	

Step 1: Analyze the Whole Picture

I've DIBEL'd, Now What?, pages 87- 95, provides a detailed description of the analysis of a kindergarten student's DIBELS data. Pages 96 – 104 provide an analysis of a first grader's data. This is essential background knowledge for interventionists. Each participant should carefully study his or her own grade level. Tab this section for additional study.

Refer to *I've DIBEL'd, Now What?*, page 96, Step 1: Analyze the Whole Picture and Resource 1-2 DIBELS Benchmark Goals. Look at Emily's scores on page 97, the beginning of year and middle of year benchmarks.

Ask:

- *What task was Emily trying to accomplish for each measure?*
- *Did Emily meet the benchmarks?*
- *Was there change from Fall to Winter?*

Discuss observations

Observation Chart

DIBELS Measure	Observations	Implications

Sample Observation Chart
(Example of Three Different Student Measures)

DIBELS Measure	Observations	Implications/Questions
Booklet Cover	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - high NWF, low PSF and LNF - high ORF, low NWF - LNF established - deficit PSF - higher NWF than PSF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What could have caused PSF to be so low? - Did student understand the test? - Should the child be reassessed?
LNF First Grade Fall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 74% accuracy - 7 errors on 5 different letters: g,y,z,q,d - low fluency rate - missed more letters at end of alphabet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - develop letter recognition - letter sorts - push/pull letters - develop fluency with known letter cards
PSF First Grade Fall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -some phonemes segmented -10 partially segmented - 2 repeated - fluent – attempts exceed goal - initial sounds correct - 8/12 errors on ending sounds - 7/12 vowel sounds correct 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - placement on phonological awareness continuum - explicit instruction in phoneme isolation, categorization , THEN - blending and segmenting
NWF Second Grade Fall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - most responses sound-by-sound - only <i>u</i> missed - low fluency - initial sounds accurate - final sounds accurate - missed one vowels sound – u 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - model and practice - beginning sounds - systematic phonics instruction - practice with decodable text
ORF Third Grade Fall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - accuracy rate 81% - below fluency goal - only missed one sight word – <u>a</u> - missed vowel patterns <u>ea, a_e, ai</u> - word camp correct on second attempt -<u>camp</u> related vocabulary missed - multisyllabic words missed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - intervention in phonics, decoding - practice in connected text - content vocabulary instruction - teach syllable patterns - develop automaticity with long vowel patterns
WUF Kindergarten Midyear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4/10 correct - better with concrete words - used all time/no response 6 times - 3 and 4 word responses - little variability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -oral language development -echo reading -patterned books, choral reading -respond during direct - vocabulary instruction.

* This is a compilation of three different students' measures designed to provide a sample of different levels & language. Teachers would analyze one student on one page/chart.

TRAINER RESOURCE PAGE

Step 2: Note Areas of Concern or Questions about Big Picture

- Note inconsistencies between measures.
- Is this an accurate reflection of the child's ability?
- Are there areas that should be reassessed with the alternate form?

Step 2: Note Areas of Concern or Questions About the Big Picture

Examine Emily's interim (middle of year) data. Refer to *I've DIBEL'd, Now What?*, page 98:

Emily's letter naming score was below benchmark in the fall. She is considerably below where she needs to be in phonemic awareness, having missed the benchmark of 35 p.s.p.m. in both the fall and winter. The low level of NWF may well be caused by a lack of fluency in both letter naming and sounds. Additionally, her low level of WUF is a red flag.

Emily's winter (Benchmark 2) scores:

- PSF – 24 Emerging (Some Risk)
- NWF –10 Deficit (At Risk)
- ORF – 13 Some Risk
- WUF –15 Compare to Local Norms

Study error patterns in each of the indicated DIBELS measures. Use **Handout 3 Observation Chart**, modified from *I've DIBEL'd, Now What?*, page 107, to record observations and implications.

The observations for each measure are on the indicated pages of *I've DIBEL'd, Now What?*. To effectively practice analyzing the measures, participants should look only at the measure, covering the questions and answers. They should compare their observations and implications to Hall's after theirs are recorded on the **Observation Chart**.

Step 3: Study Error Patterns Phoneme Segmentation Fluency

- Can the student segment phonemes?
 - How many partial segmentations are there?
 - How accurate is the segmentation?
- How fluent is the student?
- How accurate is the student's knowledge of
 - initial sounds?
 - ending sounds?
 - vowel sounds?
- Draw conclusions.

Step 3: Study Error Patterns – Phoneme Segmentation Fluency

Refer to *I've DIBEL'd, Now What?*, page 98. Use **Handout 3 Observation Chart** to record observations and implications. Questions are from **page 105, Questions for Analyzing Student Errors, Phoneme Segmentation Fluency**.

- **Did the student meet the benchmark?** No. The benchmark is 35. The score of 24 would be emerging or some risk.
- **Does the student know how to segment phonemes?** *Emily has no circled words on her scoring booklet (Table 4.9, page 99), which means that she never repeated the entire word back to the examiner. She appears to understand the task and demonstrated that she knows how to segment words into sounds.*
- **How many times does the student partially segment rather than completely segment the word?** *Emily partially segmented blend words "start" and "sled".*
- **How accurate is the student in segmenting phonemes?** *24 phonemes out of 35, an accuracy rate of 69%. (The book is in error- 66%)*
- **How fluent is the student in segmenting phonemes?** *Emily is not very fluent. She attempted only 35 phonemes, which is the benchmark. At that rate, she would have to have 100% correct to meet benchmark.*
- **How accurate is the student's knowledge of initial sounds?** *Emily was almost 100% accurate with the beginning sound phonemes.*
- **How accurate is the student's knowledge of ending sounds?** *Emily is fairly strong in final sounds, with all but two attempted correct.*
- **How accurate is the student's knowledge of vowels?** *Emily's knowledge of short vowels is not well established. She correctly isolated the short **i** three times in the words **give**, **hid**, and **swing**. She made errors on both short **e** words. She missed the short **u** and short **o** once each.*

What are the instructional implications?

- Discuss the importance of using the **Phonological Awareness Continuum (Resource 4)** to decide where to begin instruction. See sample responses and interventions at the bottom of the chart.
- Provide explicit instruction in phoneme isolation, identity and categorization, then move into phoneme blending and segmentation.

Phonological Awareness Continuum

(from most discrete to broadest area)

Type	Description	Example
Phonemic Awareness	Blending phonemes into words, segmenting words into individual phonemes, and manipulating phonemes in spoken words	/k/ /a/ /t/ /sh/ /i/ /p/ /s/ /t/ /o/ /p/
Onsets and Rimes	Blending and segmenting the initial consonant or consonant cluster (onset) and the vowel and consonant sounds that follow (rime)	/m/ /ice/ /sh/ /ake/
Syllables	Combining syllables to say words or segmenting spoken words into syllables	/mag/ /net/ /pa/ /per/
Alliteration	Producing groups of words that begin with the same initial sound.	ten tiny tadpoles
Rhyme	Matching the ending sounds of words.	cat, hat, bat, sat
Words and Sentences	Recognizing sentences as complete thought and segmenting sentences into words.	The dog ran away. 1 2 3 4

Sample Responses Correlated to Phonological Awareness Continuum

Point on Continuum	Prompt	Incorrect Student Response	Sample Intervention
same word	bat	/bat/	match pictures by beginning sound
alliteration	bat	/band/	match pictures that rhyme
rhyme	bat	/sat/	practice segmenting at onset/rime
onset/rime	bat	/b/ /at/	use disks to push sounds (Elkonin boxes)

When a child is proficient at a point on the continuum, the intervention is designed to move the child to the next point on the continuum. For example, a child giving same word responses has the concept of word. He needs to work with beginning sounds.

R 4

Step 3: Study Error Patterns Nonsense Word Fluency

- Is it sound-by-sound or whole word?
- How accurate is letter-sound correspondence?
- How fluent is the student?
- How accurate is the student's knowledge of
 - initial letters?
 - final letters?
 - middle vowels?
- Draw conclusions.

Step 3: Study Error Patterns – Nonsense Word Fluency

Refer to *I've DIBEL'd, Now What?*, page 100. Use **Handout 3 Observation Chart** to record analysis and implications. The questions are from **page 105, Questions for Analyzing Student Errors, Nonsense Word Fluency**.

- **Did the student meet the benchmark?** No. The benchmark is 35.
- **Does the student provide sound-by-sound or whole word? Both?** *Emily read all attempted words sound-by-sound.*
- **How accurate is the student's knowledge of sound-letter correspondence?** *10 correct out of 29 attempted for a 34% accuracy rate.*
- **How fluent is the student in reading nonsense words?** *She attempted 29 letter-sound correspondences, which is only 58% of the 50 letter-sounds-per-minute benchmark.*
- **How accurate is the student's knowledge of initial letters?** *Emily got all consonant letters attempted except /y/.*
- **How accurate is the student's knowledge of final letters?** *She missed all final letters.*
- **How accurate is the student's knowledge of middle vowels?** *She missed all medial vowels.*

What are the instructional implications?

- Model and practice blending sounds.
- Provide systematic, explicit phonics instruction to build fluency with sounds and blending.
- Provide practice with decodable text. Move to chunking and using analogy strategies.
- **DO NOT** practice reading nonsense words. Seeing a word repeatedly places it into visual memory and it becomes a sight word. Nonsense words are designed to measure fluent decoding, not to be learned as sight words.

Step 3: Study Error Patterns Oral Reading Fluency

- How accurate is the student?
- How fluent is the student?
- How well did the student read non-phonetic sight words?
- How well did the student read phonetically regular words?
- Did the student get a missed word correct the second time it was read?
- Draw conclusions.

Step 3: Study Error Patterns – Oral Reading Fluency

Refer to *I've DIBEL'd, Now What?*, page 101. Use **Handout 3 Observation Chart** to record analysis and implications. The questions are from **page 106, Questions for Analyzing Student Errors, Oral Reading Fluency**.

- **Did the student meet benchmark?** No. The benchmark is 20. Emily would be at some risk.
- **How accurate is the student's reading of words in passages?** *Emily read only 13 words correctly out of 20 words attempted for a 65% accuracy rate.*
- **How fluent is the student's reading of words in passages?** *She attempted to read 20 words and would need to read at least 40 to reach the fluency benchmark goal.*
- **How well did the student read non-phonetic sight words?** *She read **and**, **the**, and **said** and seems to be memorizing some of these common words.*
- **How well did the student read phonetically regular words?** *Emily successfully decoded a number of one-syllable phonetically regular words.*
- **Did the student remember a word provided and successfully read it the second time it occurs in the passage?** *She remembered **blew**, but wasn't able to repeat **rained**.*

What are the instructional implications?

- Provide intervention in phonics, decoding and word study.
- Provide many opportunities to practice in connected text.
- Sight word work to develop automaticity
 - With such a low ORF score, it is difficult to draw much from this information. Continuing analyzing progress monitoring probes.

Step 3: Study Error Patterns

Word Use Fluency

- Compare correct utterances to incorrect.
- Compare abstract to concrete words.
- Look at the response time.
- Were responses long or short?
- Did the length of response vary?
- Draw conclusions.

Step 3: Study Error Patterns – Word Use Fluency

Refer to *I've DIBEL'd, Now What?*, page 102-103. Use **Handout 3 Observation Chart** to record analysis and implications. The questions are from page 106, **Questions for Analyzing Student Errors, Word Use Fluency**.

- **How many utterances are correct versus incorrect?** *Emily had 2 correct and 3 incorrect for 40% accuracy.*
- **Was the student equally responsive to abstract and concrete words?** *She was more accurate with concrete words. All the words she missed (real, funny, and doing) were abstract.*
- **Did the student take much time to respond?** *She only attempted 7 words, which means that she most likely took several seconds to think and respond.*
- **Did the student's total points on this indicator come primarily from short or long responses?** *Her correct responses were 4-7 words long; incorrect responses were 3-4 words long.*
- **How much variability was there in the length of responses?** *The length of variability ranged from 3 words to 7 words. There was not the degree of variability sometimes seen in responses.*

What are the instructional implications?

- Provide opportunities for Oral Language development.
- Create opportunities for echo reading.
- Use patterned books and encourage choral reading on repetitive phrases.
- Provide additional opportunities for response during direct vocabulary instruction.

Step 4: Summarize Observations for Intervention Plan

- Progress Monitor LNF.
- Develop phonemic awareness skills within phonics lessons.
- Provide systematic, explicit phonics instruction.
- Practice phonics patterns in reading connected text.
- Boost overall language development.

Step 4: Summarize Observations for Intervention Plan

Refer to *I've DIBEL'd, Now What?*, pages 103-104, **Step 4: Summarize Observations for Intervention Lesson Plan**. Read the following section:

It would be a good idea to give Emily a LNF assessment to see if she has reached benchmark of 40. She needs systematic and explicit instruction in phonics, with some attention to further developing her phonemic awareness as well. Emily may benefit from instruction using a systematic and sequential phonics program delivered in a small group where she gets lots of time to practice each skill along the way. Explicit corrective feedback for her errors, with time for additional rounds of practice applying each phonics concept, is merited to get her reading 40 words per minute by year-end. A quick informal assessment to see if she can isolate and identify sounds in initial, medial and final positions in a word would be prudent. In the context of an intensive focus on teaching phonics, her phonemic awareness skills should also be stressed and linked to the phonics instruction.

The immediate goal is for Emily to rapidly achieve the PSF and NWF goals, and also progress monitor ORF to make sure that she is applying the phonics concepts within text passage reading. Emily's low WUF suggests that her overall language development is problematic, and that she needs daily practice in all areas - listening comprehension, vocabulary, and verbal expression provided through core instruction.

Emily's Group's Intervention Plan					
	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
Vocabulary Fluency Comprehension					
Phonemic Awareness					
Phonics					

Emily's Group's Lesson Plan

Walk through the sample intervention plan on **Resource 5 First Grade Sample Intervention Lesson Plan**. Point out that the time allotted to each component will vary with student need. Note the coherence of the plan across the day and the developing complexity across the week. Discuss how the plan may be different at each grade level.

The intervention plan targets specific skills applied and practiced in the context of scientifically based reading research. The intervention is designed to shore up the processing area that is not working proficiently while attaching it to knowledge within all parts of the four-part mental processing system. Intervention must be comprehensive and coherent so that the systems can support and feed off each other.

Trainer Background Notes for the Four-Part Processing Model

Our written language is based on an alphabetic system, so in order to read an unknown word a child must:

1. Process the written symbols.
2. Link the written symbol(s) to a phonological unit.
3. Link the phonological unit(s) to a word meaning.
4. Construct an ongoing understanding of the text.

Marilyn Adams describes these processes in a four-part mental processing model:

- The **phonological** processor detects, stores and retrieves the phonemes and sound sequences in spoken language.
- The **orthographic** processor detects, stores, and retrieves the graphemes and letter sequences in print.
- The **meaning** processor uses the reader's vocabulary and bits of information to build meaning.
- The **context** processor constructs a coherent, ongoing interpretation of the text.

Beginning to Read, Adams

Emily's Group

Circle Critical Indicators: PSF LNF ORF

First Grade Weekly Intervention Plan

<p>Vocabulary, Fluency, Comprehension* <u>Repeated Text</u> Vocabulary Fluency Comprehension</p> <p><u>Guided Reading Text</u> (rereading) Vocabulary Fluency Comprehension (15 minutes)</p>	<p>Echo read <i>text: Pat-a-Cake</i>. Reread and add actions. Talk about the meaning of poem. <i>Use focus frame and highlight words with a.</i></p> <p>Partner read, <i>I Can Read</i>.</p>	<p>Chorally read <i>text: Pat-a-Cake</i>. Reread and add actions.</p> <p>Use highlight tape to find words with a. List and read.</p> <p>Partner read, <i>I Can Read</i>.</p>	<p>Chorally read <i>text: Pat-a-Cake</i>, Reread and add actions.</p> <p>Oral Language: What is a baker man? What might a baker man do?</p> <p>Partner read, <i>I Can Read</i>.</p>	<p>Choral read <i>text: Pat-a-Cake</i>. Reread and add actions.</p> <p>Oral Language: Semantic map: <i>Things That Are Baked</i>.</p> <p>Partner read, <i>I Can Read</i>.</p>	<p>Sing <i>text: Pat-a-Cake</i>. Reread and add actions.</p> <p>Reconstruct poem, Pat-a-Cake, from cut up sentence strips.</p> <p>Partner read, <i>I Can Read</i>.</p>
<p>Phonemic Awareness** Level of intervention</p> <p>Activity (5 minutes)</p>	<p>Complete Segmentation (focus on medial vowel) –</p> <p>Elkonin boxes using -at and -an family words.</p>	<p>Complete Segmentation</p> <p>Elkonin boxes using -at and -an family words.</p>	<p>Complete Segmentation w/o boxes using shoulders, elbows, wrist taps with -at and -an family words. Blend sounds back together to make the word.</p>	<p>Complete Segmentation with body taps using -at and -an family words.</p> <p>Given the segmentation, students will form words by blending.</p>	<p>Complete Segmentation with taps using -at and -an family words.</p> <p>Given the segmentation, students will form words by blending.</p>
<p>Phonics*** -Feature -Lesson -Sight Words -Decodable Text (10 minutes)</p>	<p>Feature C, words with /a/ rimes (-at, -am, -an) Read and sort by ending sound patterns. Read short a decodable text: <i>At the Mat</i>. Sight words: am, an, at</p>	<p>Feature C, words with /a/ rimes. Sort the words by rime.</p> <p>Read short a decodable text: <i>At the Mat</i>. Sight words: am, an, at</p>	<p>Feature C, words with /a/ rimes. Blending practice with /a/ words.</p> <p>Read short a decodable text: <i>At the Mat</i>. Sight words: am, an, at</p>	<p>Feature C, words with /a/ rimes. Making words and blending practice.</p> <p>Read short a decodable text: <i>At the Mat</i>. Sight words: am, an, at</p>	<p>Feature C, words with /a/ rimes. Assess students' ability to spell /a/ words. Read short a decodable text: <i>At the Mat</i>. Sight words: am, an, at</p>

* Re-teach shared and/or guided texts (instructional level) from previous week's lesson.

** Use core phonemic awareness program and target instruction on continuum to match students' development.

*** Use core phonics program with lesson on students' level

Independent Practice

- Analyze student DIBELS benchmark booklet(s) from your assigned group of students.
- Record observations.
- Record instructional implications.

Independent Practice with assigned SRC student

Each participant should:

- Receive a SRC student Benchmark booklet(s) to analyze. The child should be one of the ones in the group that they have been assigned. Participants may work together for this task of the student's DIBELS probe.
- Refer to **Questions for Analyzing Student Errors, pages 106-107.**
- Record observations and implications on **Resource 3 Observation Chart.**

Trainer's Note: Be conscious of student confidentiality.

Grouping for Instruction

- Use DIBELS data to group students with similar needs.
- Focus on critical indicators.
 - K : PSF
 - 1 st: NWF (BOY) & ORF (MOY)
 - 2nd & 3rd: ORF
- Small group size (3-4) is more effective.

Grouping for Instruction

Because our goal is to accelerate students, we can maximize our intervention by forming groups with similar instructional needs. Refer to *I've DIBEL'd, Now*

What, page 51. Highlight:

One of the benefits of using the DIBELS measures is that the data informs decisions about which students can logically be placed in an instructional group together.

*The intent of small group intervention instruction for students below benchmark is to **focus on one or two key skill areas** for students whose instructional needs are similar.**

***Small groups of three to five students** are more effective than whole class instruction for these students because the instructor can provide each student with immediate corrective feedback on any error, along with follow-up explanations and guided practice until the student learns the skill.*

* While the focus of the instructional group may be one **or two key skill areas**, the 30-minute intervention lesson modeled addresses the entire reading process with support to all parts of the processing system as described by Marilyn Adams:

For the reading system . . . the parts are not discrete. We cannot proceed by completing each individual subsystem and then fastening it to another. They must grow to one another and from one another.

Beginning to Read, Adams, p. 6

Intervention Instruction is Intensive and Focused

The student:

- Practices a limited set of skills
- Receives immediate corrective feedback from the teacher
- Opportunity to respond more often
- Receives explicit instruction and chance to apply immediately

Trainer needs to study Chapter 9 in I've DIBEL'd Now What. *Linking the Instruction to Student Need*. Pages 109-117.

Have Participants Highlight on page 109:

The closer the link between student needs and instruction, the more effective the intervention will be. Teachers must analyze instructional strategies and activities to identify exactly which skill each one teaches.

Intervention instruction is most effective when teachers can take any activity or instructional strategy and clearly pinpoint which skill it is teaching.

Independent Practice

Develop an intervention plan for your group.

The coach will work with the participants each afternoon in planning the interventions for the next day.

Designing Intervention Lessons

Participants who observed the same group of students will think about the group's intervention lesson observed today and discuss the various activities/tasks within the lesson in terms of making the instruction targeted, explicit, opportunities to practice with corrective feedback, and intensity.

Explain to participants that they each will have the opportunity to plan and teach an intervention lesson for their group during Summer Reading Camp. The trainer will organize the intervention assignments.

Bibliography

- Adams, M. (1990). *Beginning to Read: Thinking and Learning About Print*. Urbana: University of Illinois.
- Beck, I., McKeown, M. and Kucan, L. (2002). *Bringing Words to Life: Robust Vocabulary Instruction*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Foorman, B., and Torgeson, J. (2001). *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, (16) 4, 203-212.
- Francis, D.J., Shaywitz, S., Stuebing, K. Shaywitz, B., and Fletcher, J. (1996) Developmental Lag versus Deficit Models of Reading Disability: A Longitudinal Individual Growth Curves Analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 88:3-17.
- Hall, S.(2006). *I've DIBEL'd, Now What?* Longmont, CO: Sopris West.
- Juel, C. (1988). Learning to Read and Write: A Longitudinal Study of 54 Children from First through Fourth Grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 80(4), 437-447/
- Lyon, G. Reid, and Fletcher, J. (2001). "Early Warning System." *Education Matters* 2001 (Summer): 23-29.
- National Institute for Literacy. (2003). *Put Reading First, The Research Building Blocks for Teaching Children to Read*. U. S. Department of Education.
- Stanovich, K. (1986). *Matthew Effects in Reading: Some Consequences of Individual Differences in the Acquisition of Literacy*. *Reading Research Quarterly*, (21) 4, 360-406.
- Torgesen, J.K. (2004). *Avoiding the Devastating Downward Spiral: The Evidence That Early Intervention Prevents Reading Failure*. *American Educator*, Vol. 28, No.3 (Fall): 6-19.
- Vaughn, S. and Linnan-Thompson, S. (2004). *Research-Based Methods of Reading Instruction*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.