

### Brief Background and Reason for Project Focus

The Common Core State Standards are going to drastically change the way public schools in Michigan and across the country teach and assess their students. Reading comprehension is an essential component of these new standards in every subject area. The CCSS are going to require teachers of all subjects to not only incorporate reading and writing, but to also incorporate questions that reach higher order thinking skills such as those described in Bloom's Taxonomy. In order to prepare our students for these new standards, assessments, and their future, educators are being asked to implement a more comprehensive curriculum. As described by Morrow and Gambrell (2011), comprehensive instruction includes application of concepts in addition to strictly skill work, formative and summative assessments that drive instruction, researched based practices, students collaborating with each other, and finding ways to motivate and encourage our students. All students will be held to the same standard, therefore differentiating both instruction and assessments will be crucial in order to reach the level and learning style of each student in the classroom.

At my high school, language arts and math teachers use a variety of sources including formative and summative assessments. These assessments are used to determine if a student is continuing to struggle after research based instructional practices have been implemented and should to be put into our RTI three tiered program. As research has shown, the RTI program is an effective way to differentiate instruction and ensure that each student's needs are being met. The first Tier, research

based differentiated instruction, is crucial and can prevent most students from needing further interventions. As told by Samuels & Farstrup (2011), "Florida implemented a five-year statewide initiative to improve Tier 1 reading instruction. Initially, 31.8% of Florida first graders performed below the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile on tests of reading. However, in response to the increase in Tier 1 instructional quality, this number dropped to only 3.7%" (p.272). Teachers can collect data through observations, formative assessments, and summative assessments to create differentiated instructional groups of students in their classroom. This puts students with similar abilities together and allows the teacher to give them individualized instruction to meet their needs. This will allow the teacher to challenge their high achieving students while still supporting their struggling students. Lastly, it gives the teacher the opportunity to work more closely with each student so they can determine if a student needs further interventions to help them reach their grade level, through way of Tiers 2 and 3. In general, these interventions allow the students to get the support they need while remaining in the classroom. The RTI program is used mostly for language arts and mathematics at my school, but can be applied to any subject area and grade level.

Personally, I do not have much experience with literacy instruction, but the Common Core State Standards are going to require me to incorporate reading and writing into my high school math classroom. Through this project I hope to learn how to identify where my students could struggle with reading, and how I could support them to reach their full potential. If a student is struggling to simply read a word problem and understand what it is asking, then it is going to be even more difficult for me to determine if they understand the math concept that the question is truly testing. I work

with struggling readers every day, but because it is math class, I cannot always easily identify who these students are. The new standards are going to expose these students and I need to be ready to support them. Brittany is a great fit for this project because she is currently a student of mine and she is a struggling reader. She is extremely intrinsically motivated in regards to school and math is one of her strengths, but reading and reading comprehension are not.

### Home and Family

Brittany is a 15 year old sophomore who is in my co-taught freshmen Algebra 1 class. She is currently reading at a seventh grade level as assessed by our school district. She is a white female from a middle class family and has lived in this area of Michigan all of her life. She attended a private catholic school from kindergarten to eighth grade, and started at our public high school her freshmen year. Brittany has a learning disability specific to basic reading skills and has been receiving special education services since elementary school. She has a younger brother who also has a learning disability and an older sister that does not. She lives with both of her parents who read on a daily basis. Her parents are well educated and hold salary positions. Brittany sees her mom reading a book every single night and often sees her dad reading articles and books on his iPad. Brittany, on the other hand, does not read books. She has never liked reading books. She prefers to read a magazine or newspaper and only reads a book when she has to for school. She will often discuss a magazine or newspaper article with her sister, but she does not read them on a daily basis at home.

## Emotional Climate

I have Brittany in math class. She is relaxed and highly motivated. Although she does not interact with those around her, she is engaged in class and participates on a daily basis. She is the only sophomore in the class which could be cause for her low interaction with others. Brittany comes to see me before school at least once a week to go over the material that we are working on in class. We have spent a lot of one on one time together this school year. I saw a very different side of Brittany when we began to work together after school on the literacy lessons. She seemed stressed simply at the sight of the text that I put in front of her. Although she was comfortable reading out loud in front of me, she explained to me several times how much she disliked reading out loud in her classes. Brittany and I have built a positive working relationship which is said to lead to student motivation (Morrow and Gambrell 2011). For the first lesson I let Brittany choose an article from a magazine and her textbook. She chose these texts based on her interest, but also based on length. For the second lesson she did not get to choose the text and she immediately scanned it, not for content, but for length. Brittany was engaged in the lessons and we had great discourse throughout, but she continued to count down how much reading was left. She was motivated to work with me on the lessons but at times it seemed that all of her focus was to just get to the end of the lesson. I made note while observing her that during both lessons Brittany stopped several times to take a deep breath as though to talk herself into continuing on to the next part or to relax. She would ask for reassurance before she wrote down some of her answers. She seemed to think that there was only one right answer and she wanted to make sure that she was on the right track. Although I reassured her that she

was doing well, her experiences with reading have been so negative that even at the sight of text, her stress level immediately increases and her confidence decreases.

Throughout the semester I had several discussions with Brittany's language arts teacher. Brittany is in a class for students with special needs and she is reading at the highest level in the class, seventh grade. The language arts class allows Brittany to feel confident in comparison to the other students in class. She often does not need as much time or directions to work on assignments as the other students do. The teacher often gives Brittany additional independent reading and writing assignments of her choice, while the other students are working on a paper. "The most widespread recommendation for motivation is providing choices" (Morrow & Gambrell 2011, p.187). Although Brittany feels confident reading and writing in her language arts class, she does not feel the same about reading and writing in both history and Biology. Brittany describes her participation and motivation in these classes as minimal. The text in her language arts class is at or below her current seventh grade reading level, while the text in her other classes is usually higher. Her language arts teacher has provided instruction on skills that Brittany should be able to use in her other classes in order to better comprehend the text. Her teacher thinks that Brittany is so frustrated with reading and reading comprehension, that she does not even think to use the skills that she has learned. Brittany may tell herself that she will not understand the material before she even begins to read it.

### Literacy History

From kindergarten through eighth grade Brittany attended a private catholic school where she had low confidence and low motivation for reading. When Brittany had to read a book for school, her dad would help her. He would read one page of the book to her, and she would read the next page to him. Brittany disliked reading so much that sometimes she would try to take a test or do an assignment without reading the book at all. In fourth and fifth grade she was pulled out of the classroom during reading time to work in a smaller group setting on literature that was at her level. Unfortunately, in grades 6-8, she was placed in a regular language arts class but was in a separate support class called the resource room for another hour each day. She describes language arts in middle school as a very negative experience. She became unmotivated in middle school when she realized that her grades did not count yet and that she would be transferring to a public high school. Brittany had shut down and was waiting for high school, hoping that it would be a better experience.

Brittany took the PLAN test midway through ninth grade and scored in the bottom 10 percent for the language arts, reading, and comprehension sections. In ninth grade she was placed in a language arts program specifically for students with special needs who are well below grade level for reading and comprehension. She is currently a sophomore and is still in the special education language arts program. She has the class for two hours a day. As described earlier, Brittany is at the top of this special education class. Her teacher has found ways to challenge Brittany and to keep the content and skills that they learn relevant to her. Pending her IEP at the end of this school year, Brittany will be moving into a general education language arts class next year. She will be tracked into a remedial eleventh grade language arts class. Although

it was necessary for Brittany to be in this special education class, she is now ready to use the skills and knowledge she has gained to be successful and make the transition to general education.

Brittany has developed study habits and test taking strategies for all subjects and now, in high school, her grades are finally important to her. She still has low confidence when it comes to reading and she does not read a book unless she has to. Her history classes often involve a lot of reading over topics that she does not find interesting, so she does not feel confident in that subject area. Like most people, Brittany finds that it is difficult to retain information in a subject area that she is not interested in. She has made big changes from middle school, and is now a hardworking, self-motivated student who advocates for herself. Her goal in high school is to become a member of the National Honors Society.

#### Assessments Given & Summary of Results

Brittany's reading level has already been assessed as a seventh grade reading level by our district. Therefore, I administered a pre and post-test at the seventh grade level and tracked her progress. For both tests I used the AIMSweb Maze Passages assessments. AIMSweb has organized the texts by grade level. I chose texts at the seventh grade level for her pre-test and three different texts at the same level for the post-test. I gave her three maze passages and she had three minutes to complete each one. I scored the passages and took the average of the three. The score for each passage is determined by the number of correct answers selected in the maze. I used the AIMSweb assessment because it is what my school is starting to move towards for

assessments in the literacy program that Brittany is in. The test is also one that I can administer and score on my own. This is a criterion-referenced test where the student's score is measured against a standard for each grade level. By giving Brittany a text that is at her reading level, I am allowing her to demonstrate her current abilities and then track her progress. This is to avoid the floor and ceiling effects as described by Samuels and Farstrup (2011) for summative assessments. If I gave Brittany a text at her actual grade level, tenth, then she would not be able to show me her skill set and what she is currently capable of for reading comprehension.

Brittany completed the first three AIMSweb Maze Passages assessments on Friday February 15<sup>th</sup>. She was given three minutes to complete each one. For the first maze there were 49 times throughout the first text where Brittany had to choose which one of three words given that best fit that sentence in the story. She chose the correct word 37 times out of a total of 49. This includes 8 problems that she did not complete in time. These were counted against her as a wrong answer. For the second text she chose 32 correct words out of 48 opportunities including 14 that she did not get to complete. For the last text she earned 28 out of 45 and was missing 15. The average of these scores was about 32 correct answers. This puts her in the 75 percentile for her seventh grade reading level on the AIMSweb National Norms Table for Maze Comprehension.

If you look strictly at the questions that Brittany was able to answer in the three minutes, she did really well on the assessment. However, it is also important to consider that she missed about one third of the questions because she ran out of time on every single test. The words given as choices for each problem were all words that Brittany



already knew so she may have run out of time for several different reasons. She may not have been using context clues to figure out the meaning of these words. She may take more time to process what she is reading, get caught up in unimportant details, she may have been confused by the structure of the text, or she may need to improve her fluency which would also improve her comprehension.

This pre-assessment and the conversation that I had with Brittany at our first meeting helped me decide to work on comprehension with her, specifically summarizing and extracting only important ideas from a text. Brittany expressed that she struggles in her history class, which includes a text that is not necessarily at her reading level. Given that Brittany is in tenth grade and we had a short time frame to work I decided that it would be more beneficial to work on extracting and organizing information from a text, as opposed to working on increasing her fluency. I chose lessons to help her build skills to read a text, and then be able to organize the main ideas and important details into a summary to give her a better understanding of the text overall. I would like her to be able to use these skills in any class when appropriate. For the first lesson I had her think about the text before she read it with a KWL, then she identified the who, what, when, where, and why of the text, and finally she wrote a summary. For the second lesson I had her look at a cause and effect text and use a graphic organizer to identify the main ideas and details. Throughout both of these lessons Brittany and I had several discussions and “think-alouds” about how I read and work to understand a text.

Brittany completed the three AIMSweb Maze Passage post-assessments on Monday April 8<sup>th</sup>. I gave her three passages with three minutes to complete each one. I chose three passages that were at the seventh grade reading level, but were different

passages than the pre-assessment. I chose to do a post-assessment that was the same format as the pre-assessment so I could directly analyze the two assessments for growth. On the first text Brittany earned 35 correct out of 49, the second a 30 out of 47, and the third a 33 out of 49. Her average score for the three maze assessments was about 33 correct answers. Although Brittany did improve her average score, she still did not get to about one third of the questions on each test because she ran out of time. The short time frame of this project did not allow me to see much growth in her reading comprehension skills.

### Differentiated Lesson Plans and Matrix

<b>Lesson Foci/Date</b>	<b>Objectives</b> (including performance, conditions, and criterion. State the CCSS at the end of each objective)	<b>Instructional materials</b> (what will you use to deliver the main objectives of the lesson)	<b>On-going assessment</b> (to measure attainment of objectives)
Summarizing 03/06/13 03/08/13	<i>MI.CC.RI.10.2</i> - Determine a central idea of a text and analyze its development over the course of the text, including how it emerges and is shaped and refined by specific details; provide an objective summary of the text.  <i>MI.CC.RI.10.3</i> – Analyze how the author unfolds an analysis or series of ideas or events, including the order in which the points are made, how they are introduced and developed, and the connections that are drawn between them.	Article from <i>The New York Times Upfront</i> Scholastic magazine  Section from <i>The Americans</i> McDougal Littell textbook  KWL graphic organizer (2)  5W's graphic organizer with summary (2)  Reflection questions (2)	Comprehension Strategies Rubric: 4 point scale, one rubric completed by teacher for each text
Analyzing cause and effect with main ideas and details 03/25/13	<i>MI.CC.RI.10.2</i> - Determine a central idea of a text and analyze its development over the course of the text, including how it emerges and is shaped and refined by specific details; provide an objective summary of the text.	<i>Gorillas in Crisis</i> article by Kathleen Donovan-Snavely  Fishbone map template  Student self-assessment rubric	Student Self-Assessment Rubric on their summary

	<p><i>MI.CC.RI.10.3</i> – Analyze how the author unfolds an analysis or series of ideas or events, including the order in which the points are made, how they are introduced and developed, and the connections that are drawn between them.</p> <p><i>MI.CC.10.5</i> – Analyze in detail how an author’s ideas or claims are developed and refined by particular sentences, paragraphs, or larger portions of a text (e.g. a section or chapter)</p>		
--	---	--	--

### Reflection on Lesson Plans

I began this case study by trying to get an overall picture of my student’s abilities. I gathered information from several different sources. I looked her at file including her IEP, spoke with her language arts teacher, spoke with her parents, and had a meeting with Brittany where we discussed her literacy history and I administered a pre-assessment. Based on all of this information I decided to focus the lessons on reading comprehension, specifically, the skill of analyzing to summarize a text. The experience of learning about Brittany’s life and abilities inside and outside the classroom was eye opening. When I work with Brittany I now have her past and present experiences in mind. This has changed the way that I interact with her. Even though our discussions were about literacy and I am her math teacher, I have a better understanding of her needs, strengths, and weaknesses as simply a student. I wish that I could get to know every one of my 150 students each semester the way that I now know Brittany.

During my first meeting with Brittany, I very quickly learned that if I wanted her to be engaged in the text we were working on, it would have to be about a topic that she was interested in. For the first lesson I gave Brittany a teen magazine by *The New York*

*Times* and I let her pick an article for us to work on. Giving students a choice is a best practice that has been an overarching theme for this course. She completed the what do you know and what do you want to know of a KWL. Then she read the article out loud. I chose to use a KWL to access her prior knowledge about the topic, to increase her investment in the text, and it was a strategy that she was familiar with. After she read the article, she asked questions about the text and we had a discussion about both of our experiences with the topic of downloading music. Next she completed a 5 W's graphic organizer where she answered the questions who, what, when, where, and why about the text. I did not model how to answer the 5 W's questions. I let her complete it on her own. While she completed it, she only asked me to verify the spelling of words. She wrote each of her answers in complete sentences without my direction to do so (see Appendix # ). I chose the 5 W's because these are questions that she should be able to answer regardless of the type of text that she reads. I explained to her that after she reads a text, if she is unable to mentally answer any of these questions, she should reread and reanalyze the text for a better understanding. She then completed the reflection questions on her own and did not need to refer back to the text more than once or twice. The next time I met with her I had asked her to bring her history book. She showed me the section that she would be working on next in class. I prefaced the lesson by telling her that we would be doing the same activities that we did the last time we met. I reminded her of this to build up her confidence since she had previously expressed to me that the activities were not challenging. I wanted her to have positive thoughts before she started to read about history, a topic that she was not interested in. After she finished reading the text, she was ready to move on to the graphic organizer.

She did not ask any questions about the text. She completed the 5 W's but asked if she had correct answers for the what and who. She did not write all of her answers in complete sentences (see Appendix # ). Finally she completed the reflection questions where she reread parts of the text and the questions themselves several times. Brittany took several deep breaths throughout the second lesson.

It is evident that Brittany was more engaged in the first lesson than the second lesson, even though the activities she was given to complete were the same. The topic and style of the text contributed to her effort, attitude, and motivation. After each session I rated her on a reading comprehension rubric (see appendix # ). She earned 12.5% more points for the lesson about the magazine article than she did for the history text. She had a better understanding of the first text and was able to express that through her work. Her answers for the text about music were more thorough than those for the history text. Brittany and I were engaged in a discussion after reading the first text which may have been one of the factors which led to her better understanding of it. Samuels & Farstrup (2011) list “engage students in discussion” as one of the ten essential elements of fostering and teaching reading comprehension (p.71). Samuels & Farstrup (2011) show that by having students discuss the text with other they will think critically about the text and link other's ideas to their own to create a deeper understanding.

If I was given another opportunity to teach this lesson I would make several changes. For both texts I would still have her complete a KWL, but I would model techniques to use to skim and scan the text in order to get a better idea of what it is about. For the first text she wrote about music but her ideas were unrelated to the main

idea of the text (see appendix # ). For both texts I would also have Brittany reread her work for the KWL before moving on to the 5 W's, and reread the 5 W's before writing her summary, and so on. Taking the time to reread her work allows her to make her work better. It will help her make sure that her ideas are clear, and will help her write a complete and thorough summary. A significant change that I would make is to have Brittany answer different questions for each text. Even though Brittany scored a 62.5% on the reading comprehension rubric for the music text she was more engaged in the topic and lesson than the history lesson. "When students read on the topic of reported interest to them, whether working animals or robotics, they employed a greater number and range of comprehension processes. This tells us that if our goal is to stretch students' comprehension muscles, we should provide them with texts of interest" (Samuels & Farstrup 2011, p.61). I would ask her higher order thinking questions about the text and the author. This type of text, because it was at her reading level and she was interested in the topic, would have been a great opportunity to stretch Brittany and see what she was capable of. For the history text I would still have Brittany complete the 5 W's graphic organizer, but I would have modeled how to analyze the text for main ideas and relevant details and how to make inferences. I would have engaged her in a discussion after reading the text to get her to think more critically about it. I also would have given her more feedback on the ideas that she did write down. Au and Raphael (1998) define five teacher roles as, "(1) explicit instructing (2) modeling (3) scaffolding (4) facilitating and (5) participating. These reflect decreasing control by the teacher and increased activity on the part of the student" (Morrow & Gambrell 2011, p.45). All of these changes are critical moments that I missed. If I would have made these changes

I could have directly impacted the lesson and possibly made Brittany more engaged in the text.

I chose a longer non-fiction text that was not directly related to history for the second lesson. Brittany reads mostly non-fiction texts in school so I wanted to work with a text of this type. I chose a longer text because being able to read a text and identify and organize several main ideas from the text is an important skill. I had her read the first and last paragraphs of the article out loud. Next I asked her to make predictions about the text. She was able to do with ease. I explained that authors write an introduction and conclusion that focus on the overall main idea of the text and this is why she was able to easily make predictions about the text. She related this to a research paper that she was currently working on her language arts class. She said that she has to write the three paragraphs of the body of the paper first. After they are done doing all of the research and writing the middle of the paper, they are going to write the introduction and conclusion. Her teacher has told them that this would make writing the introduction and conclusion easier. We had a discussion about why this would be true and she made comparisons to the article about gorillas that we were about to work with. Then I showed her the fishbone graphic organizer. We discussed what the possible cause and effect could be for this article just based on the introduction and conclusion. She was able to independently identify what the events would be, but she was not sure which event was the cause and which was the effect. I helped her identify which of her ideas was the cause and effect. I also showed her a technique that I personally use to identify them. She wrote down her ideas on the graphic organizer (appendix # ). I told Brittany that I was going to read the paragraph labeled number one

(Appendix # ), model some strategies that I would use , write down the main idea and details, and then she was going to do the same for the rest of the paragraphs. I read the paragraph out loud as she followed along. I could see that she reacted when I read the word “bush” in the text so when I was done reading I spoke as though I did not know what “bush” meant. I talked out loud as I went back through the paragraph, underlined the three times the word was used, and used context clues to figure out the possible meaning. This turned out to be a great teachable moment that was not in my lesson plan. Brittany used this technique later on for paragraph number three. After she read that paragraph she was unable to identify a main idea so I gave her a cue, “what did I do when I did not understand something?” She immediately went back to the beginning of the paragraph, read it out loud again, and underlined what she thought was important. After I had identified what “bush” means I talked about what I thought was the main idea and why. Then I found one detail to support my idea. I wrote both of these on the first line of the fishbone graphic organizer. This is where I missed a critical moment to emphasize that I wrote my main idea in my words, not with words directly from the text. When Brittany completed the graphic organizer and summary she used phrases directly from the text (appendix # ). This made it difficult for me to know if she truly understood the text because she did not use her own words to express her ideas. Brittany read the remaining paragraphs out loud and wrote down a main idea and details for each. Then she looked over the graphic organizer and gave me a verbal summary of the text. Finally, I had her complete a self-assessment of her oral summary (appendix # ). She was surprised when I told her that she was going to grade herself. She said that she did not do this very often. I guided her to read through the description of each point



value. She rated herself at a three. Then I asked her to write why she think she earned a three.

After the first lesson I decided that I wanted to model part of the second lesson and release the responsibility back to Brittany. I knew that this would be a more effective way to increase Brittany's success. For the first lesson I was unsure how much I should support Brittany. I gave her very little support, and she struggled. I needed to find a better balance of instructing, guiding, and independent work time. As Samuels & Farstrup (2011) said, "The point for teachers is to get used to sliding up and down that release continuum a circumstances demand" (p.67). We both found more success with the structure and scaffolding of the second lesson.

If given the opportunity to teach this second lesson again I would emphasize the importance of using her own words when summarizing. This would make her self-assessment more effective as well. She rated herself a three even though she used several phrases directly from the text. On the topic of self-assessments Samuels and Farstrup (2011) said "The aim is for students to gain a clear understanding of the standards for good performance similar to that of their teachers" (p389). I would also encourage Brittany to underline or highlight parts of the text that she thinks are important or that confused her as she read. She only used this technique that I showed her on an as needed basis. This would have also been a tangible activity for her to do to connect with the text.

As an educator, I personally learned from both of these lessons. In my current classroom I do not give my students a choice on assignments or assessments. Brittany

had a positive reaction when she was given a choice in the first lesson and it immediately changed her outlook on the activity. This is a new technique that I would like to incorporate into my classroom. This study was a great reminder of two other strategies; the benefit of explaining my thinking out loud to my students, and the importance of designing my lessons to meet my students' individual needs.

### Recommendations to Teachers and Parents

### Appendices of Work

## **Lesson Plan 1**

**Date:** 3/6/13 & 3/8/13

**Objectives for lesson:**

**MI.CC.RI.10.2** - Determine a central idea of a text and analyze its development over the course of the text, including how it emerges and is shaped and refined by specific details; provide an objective summary of the text.

**MI.CC.RI.10.3** – Analyze how the author unfolds an analysis or series of ideas or events, including the order in which the points are made, how they are introduced and developed, and the connections that are drawn between them.

**Rationale:** My student struggles with reading comprehension. The ability to analyze and summarize a text are important skills that will help her comprehension improve. I had the student do the same strategies (i.e. KWL and the 5 W's) with two different texts. She is uninterested in most of what she has to read at school so first I let her pick a magazine article to practice the strategies. Then I had her do them again but with a section from her History book. I did this to show her that she can use the same skills that she already has to understand material that she enjoys reading with the material that she does not enjoy reading. I wanted her to see the connection and be able to apply it to both.

**Materials & supplies needed:**

Pencil

Article from *The New York Times Up Front The Newsmagazine for Teens*

Section from *The Americans* textbook

2 copies of KWL worksheet

2 copies of 5 W's worksheet

2 copies of Reflection worksheet

2 copies of Comprehension Strategies Rubric (teacher use only)

• **Introduction to the lesson: (5 minutes each day)**

We will do this lesson over two days. The first day we will practice strategies for a text that she chooses and the second day we will practice those same strategies over a text that she would be required to read for school. I explained to Brittany that I wanted to cover skills that she could use with material that she does not enjoy reading or struggles to understand. She will practice the format for the graphic organizers with a text that she feels more comfortable with. She will hopefully be less intimidated to practice these skills on a text that she is struggling to understand. Brittany was already familiar with a KWL so this was another good starting point. Allowing her to choose a text and starting with a strategy that she was already familiar with motivated and engaged Brittany from the start.

• **OUTLINE of key events during the lesson:**  
**(25 minutes each day)**

- After choosing an article from the magazine and briefly scanning it, Brittany completed the "what do you know" and "what do you want to know" part of the KWL. During day 2 of the lesson, Brittany completed the same part of the KWL but for the section out of her history textbook.
  - Next she read the text out loud on both days for both texts.
  - On both days of the lesson, after she read the text, we engaged in a short conversation about what she read. I shared what I already knew after reading the text and what was new information to me. Then I asked her what information she already knew after reading the text and what was new to her.
  - Then Brittany completed the "what did you learn" section of the KWL and the 5 W's of Reading graphic organizer. (She did this on both days for both texts)
- Brittany needed help reading several words in both texts. Although I encouraged her to them on her own, she waited for me to tell her what the word was.
  - We discussed most of her answers for the 5 W's worksheet before she wrote them down. I did not tell her what to write. She just needed reinforcement that she was on the right track. I mostly answered her by

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Finally she wrote a summary of the text in about 20 words. (She did this on both days for both texts)</li> </ul> <p><b>• <u>Closing summary for the lesson:</u></b> <b>(10 minutes each day)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- She completed the Reflection After Reading questions. (She did this on both days for both texts)</li> <li>- On both days we discussed her answers to the reflection questions.</li> <li>- On the first day when we read the magazine article, I asked her how answering the 5 W's helped her to write a summary. I also asked her how her summary might have looked different if she would not have done the 5 W's. I asked her these questions again on the second day after reading the history textbook.</li> </ul>	<p>restating the question on the page such as, "Is that where it happened?"</p>
<p><b><u>Assessment:</u></b></p> <p>Throughout the lesson I monitored Brittany's progress. After the lesson was complete and she had left the room I completed a Reading Comprehension Strategies Rubric and rated Brittany on a scale of level one to level four in each of the following categories: making connections, questioning, visualizing, determining importance, monitoring comprehension, inferring, and synthesizing. I completed one of these for each day of the lesson. This assessment helped me to realize that I needed to scaffold the instruction for the second lesson by first modeling the skill and doing "think alouds." She scored 17.5 out of 28 points. See attachment #</p>	

## Lesson Plan 2

**Date:** 3/25/13

**Objectives for lesson:**

**MI.CC.RI.10.2** - Determine a central idea of a text and analyze its development over the course

of the text, including how it emerges and is shaped and refined by specific details; provide an objective summary of the text.

**MI.CC.RI.10.3** – Analyze how the author unfolds an analysis or series of ideas or events, including the order in which the points are made, how they are introduced and developed, and the connections that are drawn between them.

**MI.CC.10.5** – Analyze in detail how an author’s ideas or claims are developed and refined by particular sentences, paragraphs, or larger portions of a text (e.g. a section or chapter)

**Rationale:** In school Brittany reads mostly long non-fiction texts. I chose a text that was longer than those from lesson one that was both non-fiction and unrelated to history. It is important that Brittany can break down a text to understand each of the parts and still have an overall understanding of the text.

**Materials & supplies needed:**

Pencil

*Gorillas in Crisis* article

Fishbone graphic organizer

Self-Assessment Rubric

• **Introduction to the lesson: (2 minutes)**

I explained to her that we were going to look at a longer text than we did in lesson one but it was not about history. We will break the text down in a different way than we did before but in the end we are still going to do a summary. I showed her the text and the graphic organizer. I told her that I was going to model it for her first and then she was going to complete the rest on her own. She had never done a graphic organizer like this before.

• **OUTLINE of key events during the lesson: (30 minutes)**

- Brittany read the first and last paragraph of the text out loud. I asked her to make predictions about what she thought the text was going to be about.
- Next I referred to the graphic organizer. We discussed what the cause and effect could be for this article strictly based on the introduction and conclusion. She wrote them on the worksheet.
- I read paragraph number one out loud while Brittany followed along. I went back in the paragraph to figure out words or phrases that I did not understand. I decided what

<p>I thought was the main idea of the paragraph and wrote it on the graphic organizer. Then I found at least one detail from the paragraph to support that main idea. I added a line the off the main idea line and wrote the detail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Brittany followed this pattern for paragraphs two through five. She read the paragraph out loud, asked questions or reread parts of the paragraph, decided on a main idea for each paragraph, wrote it on the graphic organizer, and included one to two details to support each main idea.</li> <li>- Finally, Brittany gave a summary of the entire article while referring to her fishbone organizer.</li> </ul> <p>• <b><u>Closing summary for the lesson:</u></b>  <b>(5 minutes)</b></p> <p>After Brittany gave her oral summary of the text I had her fill out a self-assessment of her summary. She rated herself on a scale of one to four and gave a rationale as to why.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I explained that most authors write an introduction and conclusion so that you can quickly know the main idea of the text. She made connection to a current research paper that she was writing.</li> <li>- I did this as a “think aloud.” I explained to Brittany how I figured out what bush meant in the article, why I picked the main idea, and why I picked that detail.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Assessment:</u></b></p> <p>I will use Brittany’s graphic organizer and self-assessment to gauge her understanding of the lesson. I will reflect on how much I had to help her with ideas, how often she used direct words and phrases from the text, and the accuracy of her self-assessment to determine if she really understands what characteristics a summary should have.</p>	

### Bibliography

- Danzer, G. A., Alva J. J., Krieger L. S., Wilson, L.E., & Woloch, N. (2005). *The americans: Reconstruction to the 21st century*. Evanston, IL: McDougal Littell.
- Donovan-Snaverly, K. (2004). Gorillas in crisis. International Reading Association.

Donovan-Snaverly, K. (n.d.). Scaling back to essentials: Scaffolding summarization with fishbone mapping. Retrieved from: <http://www.readwritethink.org/classroom-resources/lesson-plans/scaling-back-essentials-scaffolding-277.html?tab=1#tabs>.

Five W's chart. Retrieved from: <http://www.eduplace.com/graphicorganizer/pdf/5Ws.pdf>.

Gray, C. (n.d.). Get the gist: A summarizing strategy for any content area. Retrieved from: <http://www.readwritethink.org/classroom-resources/lesson-plans/gist-summarizing-strategy-content-290.html?tab=1#tabs>.

KWL chart. Retrieved from: <http://www.eduplace.com/graphicorganizer/pdf/kwl.pdf>.

Majerol, V. (2013, March 11). How the web changed music forever. *The New York Times Upfront*, 21.

Morrow, L. M. & Gambrell, L. B. (2011). *Best practices in literacy instruction* (4th ed.). New York, New York: The Guilford Press.

Samuels, S.J. & Farstrup, A.E. (2011). *What research has to say about reading instruction* (4th ed.). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.