After preassessing students in a third grade classroom, the researcher noted four students, scoring below the 20th Percentile on the reading portion of the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) exam, fall, 2008. As the researcher further assessed these students, it was noted that these students lacked fluency and vocabulary skills. Focussing on fluency first and focussing on fluency combined with individual, vocabulary instruction, the researcher individualized each of the students' reading program within the regular education classroom. Each of the four students was working at their current level of reading, entering the third grade and progressing throughout the school year. The researcher used a combination of the Power Reading program and coupled it with individual, vocabulary strategies to assist readers with fluency and comprehension. As their reading progressed, students were challenged to next levels. Data was analyzed using the NWEA assessment, Houghton Mifflin Leveled Reading Assessment and Kansas State Reading Assessments during the course of the school year to mark progress. All four students exited the bottom quartile of the NWEA, gained two reading levels according the Houghton Mifflin Leveled Reading Assessments and scored in the top twelve percent of the Kansas State Reading Assessments.
Teachers are constantly seeking ways to help students reach their fullest potential. Educators evaluate learners, diagnose the missing concepts or holes of learning and assess students to find best strategies to reach each individual. It is necessary that all learners, especially the lowest learners be diagnosed in the areas of reading with which they are needing assistance and given a plan of action to help guide them to becoming the best readers possible. This sounds like an Individualized Education Plan one would find in the area of special education. What would happen if all educators created individualized educational plans for each of their students? That seems like an enormous requirement for an educator, but in order for a teacher to reach each student in their classroom the educator must know where a student is and how to continue their education through a progressional fashion. To differentiate instruction the starting point is as important to know as the end point. Pre-assessing students is necessary to reach every learner where they are currently and where they should continue to go in the future. With this act in place every child will succeed in the classroom. Furthermore, the goal in education is to reach 100 percent of the student population at “Proficient” or above on state mandated testing by 2012 (Jennings, 2008).

When pre-assessing students at the start of the third grade year, the researcher noted four students in particular who struggled with reading comprehension and more specifically with reading fluency. As the year progressed, the researcher noted that decoding new vocabulary words were a constant struggle. It is in this grade level vocabulary takes a giant leap, especially when preparing for state assessments. Consequently, the researcher examined the question "Does vocabulary instruction combined with fluency instruction increase comprehension results with below quartile readers, compared to fluency instruction alone?"

Within the past decade the focus on reading fluency has gained much attention. Penner-Wilger (2008), state "Reading fluency is the ability to decode and comprehend text simultaneously. Thus, reading fluency forms a bridge from decoding skills to comprehension" (¶. 25). These two researchers offered 40 minutes of independent reading per day, over a six month period, to third through fifth graders. It was discovered that independent reading did improve these grade levels fluency and reading achievement for higher skilled reading students but not for lower skilled readers. Thus, fluency for lower skilled students must be taught explicitly in order to achieve gains in reading comprehension. When a student’s reading is not automatic, they must spend more time processing words individually by decoding the vocabulary, putting it into a sentence, combining that sentence with more sentences and finally at the end of a passage or book, understand what was read. Until this becomes an automatic process, students are unable to comprehend effectively. Penner-Wilger (2008) list the three component skills of reading fluency as "accuracy of word decoding, automaticity of word recognition, and prosody of oral text reading" (¶. 3). Automaticity is defined (¶. 4) as "the ability to quickly recognize words automatically, with little cognitive effort or attention". For students with little exposure to quality literature, vocabulary becomes a struggle to decode and read with no effort. It is further noted in Penner-Wilger’s research that "When decoding is automatic, attentional resources are available for comprehension, and metacognition" (¶. 10).

Scwanenflugel, Kuhn, Morris and Bradley (2006) researched a program called Wide Reading, which incorporated three different fluency programs. The Wide Reading approach required 20 minutes of scaffold oral reading each day using a variety of grade level texts. Not only did the Wide Reading strategy increase fluency, it also increased reading prosody. An increase of reading comprehension was noted as well (¶. 1). "It appears that, as children become fluent and automatic readers, they use their freed attention resources to
produce prosodic reading and improved comprehension" (¶. 3). In Roundy & Roundy's research (2009) repeated reading was the strategy focused on for seventh grade struggling readers. Following sessions, students scores on fluency, comprehension and self-esteem were so high that Roundy and Roundy implemented repeated readings with all their students. As quoted "...the effects of repeated reading are so strong that it should be woven into the very fabric of daily literacy instruction" (¶. 24). Another study that proved beneficial included the Renzulli Learning. Field's (2007) researched offered the Renzulli Learning with 383 third through eigth grade students. Renzulli Learning is defined as "an on-line educational profile and matching database geared to provide enrichment resources, creative productivity and high-end learning that matches student interests, learning styles and expression styles with a vast array of educational activities and resources designed to enrich the learning process" (¶. 1). This sixteen week intervention was used with students for two to three hours per week. "Renzulli Learning demonstrated significantly higher growth in reading comprehension and significantly higher growth in oral reading fluency" (¶. 3). Differentiation of instruction was provided through this computer based program.

Some studies showing increases in reading fluency did not show gains in reading comprehension. For example, Dyad Reading, coupling a lead reader reading with a reader who needs assistance, a strategy used with 40 ELL students and compared with a control group of 40 students not paired, showed a significant increase in the area of reading fluency (Almaguer, 2005). This same research using the dyad intervention, however, did not offer significant results in the area of reading comprehension. Another intervention, QuickReads, researched by Elfrieda & Fisher (n.d.), with second through fourth grade students showed that reading fluency made a significant increase; however reading accuracy and comprehension remained the same after a nine-week time frame. Osborn (2007) researched the usage of word walls and silent reading with a group of second graders. These interventions were implemented for twelve weeks. The research showed that word walls and silent reading alone do not significantly increase reading fluency or comprehension among second grade students. Osborn stated "continued research into identifying effective teaching strategies for the development of other sub skills that contribute to reading fluency development are necessary as early as kindergarten to promote fluency in reading" (p 145). In other words, these strategies should begin in kindergarten WITH an isolated fluency program. Finally, Martens (1997) performed research on one, seven year old student, using the idea of repeated readings with miscue analysis. In the end, repeated reading did help the student "improve fluency scores and recognize words more quickly and accurately"(¶. 32). However, even though the student's fluency increased, the scores did not indicate "an equally steady, controlled and proficient understanding of the story the student was reading (¶. 33).

It goes without saying that past research shows fluency alone is not the best strategy when attempting to increase overall reading comprehension, the ultimate outcome of reading. The question in this research focuses on the combining of vocabulary instruction to words students struggle along WITH working on students' reading fluency, at EACH learner's level. As new readers are learning to read they are being given words repetitavely everyday. By third grade, decoding is an assumed skill and often times it is not emphasized. Non-fluent readers need continued support in decoding and vocabulary instruction to make their reading more fluent. As stated by Curtis and Longo (2008, ¶. 1), "Providing vocabulary instruction is one of the most significant ways in which teachers can improve students' reading and listening comprehension". For under achieveing readers it is necessary to find skills that help them create their own personal, mental dictionaries. Adding vocabulary to fluency instruction is the perfect time to do this. Fluency instruction requires repetition, as does learning new vocabulary. While learning vocabulary during repeated readings, students are able to apply their vocabulary skills, instead of only memorize by rote. Herron (2008) states "Phonemes are not processed by the auditory
system alone; they are articulated sounds" (¶. 7). She continues to explain how pronunciation relates to reading. "The sight of a word triggers its pronunciation, and it is this pronunciation that has been stored in memory for convenient access along with the meaning of the word" (¶. 8). Herron refers to this idea as speech memory. Jennings (2008) research showed that a variety of vocabulary strategies, such as context clues, affixes, journaling, multiple meanings, and identifying basewords all significantly increased student vocabulary and its correct usage. Learning the vocabulary words correctly, including them into a student's speech memory and then reading the same vocabulary words within a passage, help students to read more fluently and thus, hopefully increase comprehension.

As Watkins (2000) states "Without fluent decoding, there is little opportunity for the child to understand the passage" (¶. 5). She continues to state later in her research "The National Reading Panel did find clear evidence that practices encouraging repeated oral reading produce positive effects on word recognition, fluency, and comprehension" (¶. 13). Coupling that with Hastrouck and Tindal (2006) who state "fluency is only one of the essential skills involved in reading" (¶. 8), this research will focus on the fact that it is necessary students learn to decode words they are having a difficult time pronouncing and learn the meanings of those same words. It is logical to say that if a student cannot pronounce a word clearly he/she most likely does not understand the word's definition; thus lose out on comprehension of the text. As Davidson (n.d.) states "Good readers can decode text and comprehend meaning all at the same time. When decoding is automatic, readers can focus on the meaning of what they are reading-which is, after all, the goal of learning "(¶. 4). Throughout the remainder of this paper the term "vocabulary" will refer to decoding and defining words accurately.

For the bottom quartile readers in this research, an isolated reading fluency program coupled with explicit vocabulary instruction individualized for each learner will be implemented during the course of a four month period.

**Methodology**

**Participants**

Participants were four third grade, elementary-school students (three girls and one boy). All four participants tested below the 20th percentile in September, 2008, on the NWEA (Northwest Evaluation Association). At this level all four students qualified for reading lab services while enrolled in the third grade, general education classroom. These classrooms had been in session for seven months. During the course of this research one of the girls qualified for learning disabilities and began services, in late February. She was still a part of this action research. All four students had been identified by the classroom teacher as students experiencing significant reading difficulties. Of the reading difficulties, fluency and comprehension ranked at the top of the concerns for all four students. Classroom-based instruction included modified curricular materials and the Houghton Mifflin Reading Basal. Beginning the action research the students were ranging from a 1.0 to a 2.5 reading level, according to the Houghton Mifflin Reading Program.

The participants are defined as they were in a previous study (Jennings, 2008). They attend school in a district located in a large metropolitan area in the midwest. As of the census of 2000, there were 1,868 people, 632 households, and 523 families residing in this city (Wikipedia, 2008). The racial makeup of the city was 93.47% White, 0.96% African American, 1.23% Native American, 0.32% Asian, 0.91% from other races, and 3.10% from two or more races. Hispanic or Latino of any race were 2.62% of the population.

This district houses four elementary schools, through grades five; two middle schools through grades eight; and currently one traditional high school and one alternative high school. Forest Elementary School consists of eight classrooms each of grades two through five. The student population for the years 2006-2007 was 698. Of these 698 students, 18 are African-American (2.58%); 33 are Hispanic (4.73%); 81 are Other (11.60%) and 566 are White (81.09%) (KSDE 2006-2007). The minority population of the school is higher
than that of the community itself (Wikipedia, 2008). Since the beginning of NCLB Forest has made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

**Instruments**

To measure the effects of fluency instruction combined with individual vocabulary instruction, the articles from the Power Reading Program were implemented. Throughout her research, Davidson (n.d.) defines reading fluency, describes how students acquire reading fluency skills, explains research-based interventions, and finally evaluates and presents Read Naturally, another effective scientifically-based reading fluency intervention. Research has shown that Read Naturally and Power Reading are both powerful reading interventions for the area of reading fluency, which in turn is a bridge to reading comprehension success. Comparisons of the comprehension quiz after week one of instruction without individual vocabulary instruction was compared to the comprehension quiz after week two of the instruction with individual vocabulary instruction. Read Naturally and Power Reading are programs designed specifically for fluency instruction to increase comprehension. As stated by Davidson "Read Naturally can provide the tools to move the reader stalled at a slow word-by-word reading stage into comfortable fluent reading where attention can be focused on meaning. After all, the goal of reading is to gain meaning from what is read. Thus, Read Naturally and/or Power Reading can be a bridge to meaning and ultimately, to reading success" (¶ 26). Because Read Naturally is sometimes utilized in the Reading Lab and Special Education Classrooms, the researcher chose to use the passages from Power Reading for this research. Unlike Read Naturally, Power Reading does not incorporate a vocabulary section so the researcher added vocabulary to the program. Power Reading is part of Carbo's (2008) Reading Styles Program. "Using strategies within this program have shown significant results in the areas of: effectiveness in improving student academic achievement; widespread replication with organizational capacity to continue gearing up; high-quality implementation assistance to schools; and comprehensiveness" (¶ 1).

For teaching vocabulary using the research-based method in this research, the teacher used a spiral notebook for each child, to help individualize each student's vocabulary. Each student recorded mispronounced words from the cold (first) reading. The students predicted these meanings and discussed with the teacher. From teacher-student discussion and guidance, students created pictures or symbols of the meanings of unknown words and recorded them in their notebooks to discuss, prior to rereading each day. The teacher used the research-based strategies found in Jennings (2008) research. Together, daily, the student and the teacher reread the missed vocabulary words, defined them and then used them in context in sentences. The teacher read the sentence aloud within the week's passage, to the student, that used the mispronounced vocabulary word and the student redefined what the word meant within the context of the passage. Much one on one dialogue took place daily with the teacher and the student.

**Methods**

**Teacher-based.** It should be noted at the beginning of the school year that the four students with reading comprehension scores in the bottom quartile all struggled in the area of fluency. With the Houghton Miffling Leveled Reading Passage Assessment, all four students scored below a three (with a 1-4 rubric system) in the area of reading fluency. Consequently, the teacher opted to arrange reading fluency instruction in addition to their regular reading program. The Power Reading program was chosen due to its ease of usage, the explicit instruction focused on reading fluency and the vast array of grade level materials. In addition, the elementary school these four individuals attended, had already purchased and housed the complete Power Reading Program in their school's reading resource room for educators. Appendix one shows the daily lessons the teacher used with the four students. The students are each given a fifteen minute, daily, one on one time block for the teacher-based research. The teacher in this research trained a hired Title I paraprofessional to assist her with instructing the students with their one on one time.
**Research-based.** Even with mastery on reading fluency, by the second semester of the school year, the researcher noted that comprehension did improve, however, various meanings of words that students struggled with, they were challenged deciphering the words meanings. With this struggle, the researcher chose to combine the students’ current fluency reading program with isolate vocabulary instruction. Appendix one shows the daily lessons the teacher used with the four students. The students are each given approximately fifteen minutes, daily on one time block for the research based strategy. Day one usually took longer, due to the time necessary for decoding, recording and first time learning of vocabulary. For this research, these students keyed in on reading fluency with vocabulary instruction and its effects on reading comprehension and word meanings. To help the students in this research with their speech memory, a journal was used to record the missed words in the reading, along with a picture/symbol to represent the word and the words' meanings and an alternate sentence the word can be used correctly. The teacher in this research trained a hired Title I paraprofessional to assist her with instructing the students with their one on one time.

It cannot go without mentioning that the four students in this study also qualified for the school’s Reading Lab Program, a reading support classroom, four times a week, for thirty minutes. During this time the students are being instructed a vast array of skills in this program, such as comprehension and organizational skills, note taking skills and they are given minimal fluency and decoding skills. Students are given the opportunities to read aloud and complete Reading Counts Quizes on the computer, as well as use the Read Naturally Program. All four students were accommodated during state testing. Their accomodations included being able to read the passage aloud in an isolated setting.

**Analysis of Data**

The students were monitored for one week on the teacher-based strategy and the research-based strategy, to keep the study consistent. Students’ results of their cold (first) read were compared to their hot (last) read. Day 1 was on a Monday and day six was on a Monday. The time the students read the passage both times was compared as well as the difference in the two times. The number of vocabulary mistakes in their reading before and after fluency with vocabulary instruction was noted. Students' comprehension was assessed, using the comprehension check following each passage. Comparisons were made with hot and cold readings from the first day the program began (October, 2008) to the second week of April, 2009. The difference of the time between the cold and hot reads from week 1 (October) to week 2 (April) was compared, along with the grade level of the passage. The amount of mispronounced words in the passage for week 2 was compared in the cold versus the hot reads. The addition of the vocabulary instruction with the articles from Power Reading began in January of 2009. The researcher also included each students’ Houghton Mifflin Leveled Reading Passage from September to January and then again from January to April; as well as NWEA percentiles compared from September to April. Finally, Kansas State Reading Assessment Scores were recorded. Data was evaluated below each figure.

**Figure 1a: Grade levels of passages students read**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Fluency Instruction Only (October, 2008)</th>
<th>Fluency WITH Vocabulary Instruction (April, 2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2nd Grade</td>
<td>Middle 4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2nd Grade</td>
<td>Early 4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2nd Grade</td>
<td>Middle 4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Early 1st</td>
<td>Early 3rd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1a shows the student's name (capital letter used for confidentiality) and the grade level each student was reading in October, 2008 and the grade level each student was reading in April, 2009. The passages chosen for this research matched these grade levels respectively. All four passages used in October were narrative texts. All four passages chosen in April were expository texts, to keep studies as consistent as possible. This chart shows the progress made with these students using fluency only until mid-December and fluency WITH vocabulary instruction from January through April.

**Figure 1b: Differences in time of passage read with fluency instruction only compared to fluency and vocabulary instruction combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Cold Read (min:sec)</th>
<th>Hot Read (min:sec)</th>
<th>Difference (min:sec)</th>
<th>Cold Read (min:sec)</th>
<th>Hot Read (min:sec)</th>
<th>Difference (min:sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2:47</td>
<td>1:27</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>5:52</td>
<td>3:58</td>
<td>1:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3:25</td>
<td>1:35</td>
<td>1:40</td>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>4:50</td>
<td>2:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1:48</td>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>:33</td>
<td>5:05</td>
<td>3:24</td>
<td>1:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4:46</td>
<td>2:38</td>
<td>2:08</td>
<td>5:26</td>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>1:26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1b corresponds with figure 1a as it shows the time taken to read the cold read (first read), the hot read (second read) and the difference of time between the two. The figure also shows the same for the passages read by students in April. The most vital information to note in this figure is the "Difference" in the cold reads and hot reads of both months, keeping in mind that students were reading at a higher grade level (as shown in figure 1a) in April, 2009 - fluency instruction WITH vocabulary instruction. Combining vocabulary with fluency shows a significant increase in the difference of time the passage was read for students A, B, and C. Student D, although did not increase the difference in fluency between her cold and hot read; did significantly increase the grade level of the passage read. According to the NWEA and the Houghton Mifflin Reading Assessment, student D was reading at an early first grade level when entering third grade. Thus, by the end of April, student D increased the level of reading approximately two grade levels.

**Figure 2: Comprehension Results of passages read with fluency instruction only compared to fluency and vocabulary instruction combined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Fluency Only Instruction (October, 2008)</th>
<th>Fluency With Vocabulary Instruction (April, 2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 shows incredible difference in comprehension scores for all four students. Reading at their own levels both times, research shows a significant difference in comprehension scores when the researcher combined fluency WITH vocabulary instruction.
Figure 3: Mispronounced Vocabulary in reading passages combining fluency with vocabulary instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Mispronounced Words in Cold Read (April, '09)</th>
<th>Mispronounced Words in Hot Read (April '09)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 shows the mispronounced words for the cold read in April and the hot read in April. Students showed a significant increase in the words pronounced correctly following days of continuous practice pronouncing the missed vocabulary words, learning the meanings of the words and following the final, hot read. It was during the recording of the vocabulary words, students chose how to learn the words. For example, student D demonstrated the words "sighing" and "kneeling" along with writing definitions of other words down; while student C chose to draw illustrations to help learn vocabulary words. Students A and B both chose to have the teacher use the vocabulary words in different sentences, applied context clues and decoded the meaning of the missed words. It was with this differentiation students were able to learn words using the strategies that helped them learn best.

Figure 4: Local, State and National Reading Scores/ Percentiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student (Birthday)</th>
<th>NWEA – Sept. '08</th>
<th>NWEA – May '09</th>
<th>HMLRP – Aug. '08</th>
<th>HMLRP – Jan. '09</th>
<th>HMLRP – May '09</th>
<th>Kansas State Assessments Mar. '09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (June, 1999)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>J = early second grade</td>
<td>KL = late second grade</td>
<td>TUV= fifth grade</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Mar., 2000)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>J = early second grade</td>
<td>KL = late second grade</td>
<td>OP = late third grade</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (Apr., 2000)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>HJ = early second grade</td>
<td>KL = late second grade</td>
<td>TUV= fifth grade</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (Dec., 2000)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>CD = early first grade</td>
<td>CD = early first grade</td>
<td>KL = late second grade</td>
<td>93% (KAMM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NWEA = Northwest Evaluation Association  
HMLRP = Houghton Mifflin Leveled Reading Passages

Figure 4 shows assessment scores or percentiles for the 2008-09 school year for students A, B, C and D, along with each child's birth month and year. The most gains were made after the teacher added individual, vocabulary instruction WITH fluency practice. All four students rose above the bottom quartile in May with the NWEA. Student A rose to the third (50-75th%) quartile. All four students increased their leveled reading comprehension level by 1.5 to 3.0 grade levels. All four students scored within the top twelfth percentile on the Kansas State Assessments. The fact that Power Reading Program consists of comprehension questions that match exactly the Kansas state standards may have something to do with the students' success on the Kansas State Assessments.
Summary

The goal of every classroom teacher should be to progress each student beyond where he/she enters the classroom and take him/her as far as possible. This requires much organized preparation on the part of the educator. This requires finding precisely where each child is in each area of learning through a variety of preassessments. Within reading many categories exist. As the educator preassesses students the educator can determine the area(s) of deficiency and hopefully create a road map that enables each child to find their reading potential. In this research, fluency and vocabulary were two earmarks with the four students identified that entered third grade and assessed below grade level, within the bottom 20th percentile of national standards. Creating a learning map for each student individually, using a combined fluency with individualized vocabulary instruction significantly improved each of the four students' reading levels and reading comprehension. The Power Reading Program correlates with the Kansas State Assessments. These four students were naturally practicing every week and preparing for the state assessment through their individualized practices. The comprehension questions with the Power Reading Program include Kansas State Standards. This is a program that educators should look at closely for all students in the classroom while preparing them to become thinkers as they read, using the reading standards for the state of Kansas. Obviously, many factors contribute to the success of these students in addition to the individualized lesson plans developed by the regular classroom teacher. The addition of reading lab support the school provided was vital. Connecting with each student on a personal level and developing relationships was essential. Together these approaches, along with finding the missing pieces of student learning can provide success for each, individual student. The question remains, how does a classroom teacher go about doing this for every student in the classroom with multiple subjects?
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Appendices

Appendix 1

Teacher-based Plans

Day 1: Students will be given a Power Reading passage according to their grade level ability. Students will read the passage out loud. While reading, the teacher will be marking words on a separate copy of the same passage. The teacher will mark words mispronounced, words added and words deleted. The teacher will also mark incorrect prosody the student may use in his/her reading. While the student is reading the teacher will time the first read, known as a “cold” read. This time will be labeled on a bar graph and filled in with a blue marker, by the student. The teacher may choose to simply record the time as well. The bar graph makes for a nice visual for students to see their progress.

Day 2: Students will reread the passage to the teacher.

Day 3-5: Repeat Day 2.

Day 6: The teacher will time the reader today. Following the reading of the passage, the student will graph in red marker his/her time of the oral reading of the passage, using a red marker. The student will complete a comprehension quiz.

Research-based Plans

Day 1: Students will be given a Power Reading reading passage according to their grade level ability. Students will read the passage out loud. While reading, the teacher will be marking words on a separate copy of the same passage. The teacher will mark words mispronounced, words added and words deleted. The teacher will also mark incorrect prosody the student may use in his/her reading. While the student is reading, the teacher will time this first read, known as a “cold” read. This time will be labeled on a graph and filled in with a blue marker, by the student. The teacher may choose to simply record the time as well. The bar graph makes for a nice visual for students to see their progress. Following the passage, the student will note words he/she did not know the meanings into his/her journal. Students will create a "prediction" chart and write what they predict the word means. Students will repeat each of these words orally to the teacher before and after the reading of the passage. The teacher will give the student a sentence, using the word in context to help the student decipher the meaning of the word. The student will listen to the word again in the passage and create the meaning of the word in their journal with a picture/symbol. Students will repeat each of these words orally to the teacher before and after the reading of the passage.

Day 2: The teacher will have created vocabulary cards of mispronounced words from yesterday’s reading. (All four students will have a different set of vocabulary cards). Before reading the teacher will show students the vocabulary card. Discussion will take place on the meaning of the mispronounced word. Students will create a "prediction" chart and write what they predict the word means. Students will repeat each of these words orally to the teacher before and after the reading of the passage. The teacher will give the student a sentence, using the word in context to help the student decipher the meaning of the word. The student will listen to the word again in the passage and create the meaning of the word in their journal with a picture/symbol. Students will repeat each of these words orally to the teacher before and after the reading of the passage.

Day 3: Same as Day 2. Students create sentences for the vocabulary words on the cards, attempting to use the word in context. Students read the vocabulary mispronounced or misunderstood orally. Students receive individual instruction on any missed end marks. Students reread the passage out loud..
Day 4: Same as Day 3.

Day 5: Same as Day 4.

Day 6: The teacher will review vocabulary words with student. The teacher will go over the meaning of the vocabulary words. Today the teacher will time the student as he/she reads the passage out loud. Student will mark the “hot” read on the bar graph with a red marker. A comprehension quiz will be given following the reading. If students are noted with accomodations for state assessments, the researcher used accomodations for this research. All four students were accomodated by having the questions and answers read aloud to them. It must be noted that if a student does not feel comfortable with the reading passage, or the teacher has observed nonfluent reading so far, more time may be given to allow the student time to attain a more automatic approach to reading the passage. When both the student and the teacher are comfortable with the child's practice performance, the student may read for their final, "hot" read, as well as complete the comprehension portion and the vocabulary quiz. For the purpose of consistency, the researcher had all four students participating perform their hot read and their comprehension quizzes on day six of this study.