

Reading Case Study Assignment

1. Using the Internet, thoroughly research your assigned field experience school. Include information from the DOE concerning the school's accountability report; from the parish, include information about the school's location, administration, teachers, student demographics, mission statement, mascot, uniforms, parental involvement, etc. The Louisiana Department of Education, Teach Louisiana, MapQuest, and the Rapides Parish School Board all have excellent websites.
2. Write a letter of introduction to your cooperating teacher.
3. Meet with your cooperating teacher and receive the name of your case study student.
4. Write a letter to the student's parents or guardian. Give a brief overview of the reading project and ask for permission to view the student's records. (Seek approval of your letter from the university professor, the school principal, and the cooperating teacher.)
5. Meet with your case study student, develop a rapport, and administer the child-friendly (Garfield) Elementary Reading Attitude Survey. Analyze and summarize the results.
6. Administer The Elementary Interest Survey (Cheek & Cheek). Analyze and summarize your findings. Also include the individual student learning profile -- VARK Learning Styles, Visual, Aural, Reading, and Kinesthetic Learning—that you administered during this clinical semester as part of EDCI 4200, Reading in the Content.
7. With the school guidance counselor and your instructor in attendance, thoroughly review the student's cumulative folder. Make notes concerning standardized test results, report cards, dyslexia screenings, DIBELS data, and attendance. Summarize your findings. This information is part of the student's background information.
8. Using technology of your choosing, administer the Dolch Word List to your elementary student, then analyze and summarize the results.
9. Administer the appropriate spelling test—Primary Spelling Inventory or Elementary Spelling Inventory—to your student. Administer the GRAY Oral Reading Test and the Slosson Oral Reading Test (word recognition). Analyze and summarize the results.
10. Construct a multi-item affix test using the Common Core States Standards as a guide. Administer the test to your student, analyze, and summarize the results.
11. Administer the Analytical Reading Inventory, analysis and summarize the results.
12. Using the inventories, surveys, assessments, state standardized test results, cooperating teacher input, and your observations, create a comprehensive prescription plan to meet the needs of your student. "Candidates select and create learning experiences that are appropriate for curriculum goals, meaningful to elementary students, and based upon the principles of effective teaching." Reference the appropriate Common Core State Standards. Have your plan approved by your university professor. Share the plan with your cooperating teacher.
13. Implement the approved plan, tutor your student, make adjustments, process monitor, and remember to use purposeful and motivating activities.
14. Compare and summarize pre-test and post-test results.
15. Summarize in both quantitative and qualitative terms, student's progress as a result of your tutoring instruction.
16. Summarize in the reflections section of your report the strengths, weaknesses, and overall value of this educational experience for you as a future teacher. Address the role of assessment in instruction and its impact on student learning.
17. Remember your final report should follow a logical sequence, use standard written English, and be error free.
18. Final report should include a title page, table of contents, sectional headings, tables and charts. Include in the appendix all assessments, surveys, inventories, letters, and research.
19. Share your finding with the cooperating teacher and parent (if requested by the cooperating teacher), university instructor, and fellow teacher candidates.

EDCI 4100 Case Study

Attribute	Unacceptable (1) 0-1.4	Needs Improvement (2) 1.5-2.4	Acceptable (3) 2.5-3.4	Excellent (4) 3.5-4.0	Score
1) School and student background information (Examples: State School Accountability Reports, student's IOWA, iLEAP, ELDA, and LEAP results, report cards, writing samples, Elementary Interest Inventory; Reading Attitude Survey)	Candidate provided incomplete or no description of school's instructional and demographic information. There was little or incomplete background information on the case study student. There was no rationale for assessment.	Candidate included evidence of limited background information on student and school. There was a very weak rationale for assessment.	Candidate summarized background information of student and school as well as rationale for assessment.	Candidate provided thorough (historical and contemporary) background information on the school. Candidate provided an educationally insightful and concise presentation of student's academic and familial and background. Sound rationale for assessing this student was included.	
2) Assessments and informal inventories (Examples: Slosson Oral Reading Test –Revised Primary Spelling Inventory, Elementary Spelling Inventory, Dolch High Frequency Word List; Affix Test.)	Assessments and informal reading inventories were not accurately scored and/or summarized. All required submissions were not present.	Information from the assessments and inventories were not accurately scored and/or summarized. Most required submissions were present.	Information from the assessments and inventories were accurately scored and summarized. All required submissions were present.	Information from all required assessments and inventories were accurately scored and comprehensively summarized.	

3) Reading pre-test with analysis (Examples: Gray Oral Reading Test-4 and/or Analytical Reading Inventory)	Gave pre-test(s) with major errors in implementation, scoring, and analysis.	Gave pre-test(s) with minor errors in implementation, scoring, and analysis. Pre-test administered to independent and instructional levels, and failed to test beyond instructional level.	Pre-test(s) administered, scored, and brief analyzed. Independent, instructional, frustrational levels reported.	Pre-test(s) administered, accurately scored, and thoroughly analyzed. Narrative was comprehensive and chart(s) were included.	
4) Comprehensive prescriptive plan	Did not address the needs of the student based on: (1) the results of the surveys and assessments, (2) input from the classroom teacher, (3) records of documented past performance, and (4) LSUA teacher candidate's observation of the student, but suggested activities deemed necessary to the student's grade level.	Addressed one or two of the current needs of the student based on (1) the results of the surveys and assessments, (2) input from the classroom teacher, (3) records of documented past performance, and (4) LSUA teacher candidate's observation of the student. Suggested activities were mentioned.	Addressed the needs of the student and understood that it is an ongoing process that requires periodic progress monitoring and adjustment to the initial plan in order to meet the needs of the student. (The initial plan was based on results of the surveys and assessments, elementary student's past performance, teacher's input, and LSUA teacher candidate's observation of elementary student.) Tutoring activities given.	Prioritized and addressed the needs (sequence of learning) of the student and understands that it is an ongoing process that requires periodic progress monitoring and adjustments to the initial plan in order to meet the changing needs of the elementary student. Tutoring activities were tailored to the precise needs of the student. Louisiana English Language Arts Content Standards and the GLEs were used. Common Core State Standards are now being used as of Summer 2013.)	

5) Reading post-test with analysis (Examples: Gray Oral Reading Test-4 and/or Analytical Reading Inventory)	Administered post-test but errors in scoring and analysis.	Administered post-test with accuracy in scoring and analysis. (In the ARV, post-test administered to instructional level, and failed to test beyond instructional level.)	Post-test administered and accurately scored. Summarized post-test findings. Wrote summary comparing pre-and post-test results.	Post-test administered, accurately scored, and analyzed. Wrote a <i>detailed</i> summary on the effectiveness of tutoring that was evident from comparing pre- and post-test results.	
6) Results	Teacher candidate listed or <i>charted</i> quantitative data with no narrative summary of results.	Teacher candidate summarizes the student's gains as a result of the tutoring, in quantitative terms only.	Teacher candidate cursorily summarizes student's gains, as a result of tutoring, in quantitative and qualitative terms.	Teacher candidate comprehensively summarizes student's gains, as a result of tutoring, in quantitative and qualitative terms.	
7) Format	Assessment information and final report lacked overall cohesiveness, logic, and structure.	Assessment information and final report followed a logical sequence, with some inconsistencies in cohesiveness and structure. Some assessments and inventories are included in the appendix.	Assessment information and final report followed a logical sequence, with minor inconsistencies in structure and cohesiveness. All required submissions were present. The report included a table of contents. All assessments and inventories were included in the appendix in an organized manner.	Assessment information and final report followed a logical plan, was cohesive in presentation, and included table of contents, sectional headings, tables, charts, and appendix.	
8) Writing	Report included multiple	Report followed standard	Report followed	Report followed standard	

	errors in grammar, spelling, punctuation, and/or mechanics. TCs bias was evident in report.	written English with some errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation. Some findings were presented in a biased manner.	standard written English with few errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation. Most findings were presented in an unbiased manner.	written English-- free of errors. Results were presented in a professional unbiased manner.	
9) Reflections	TC reflected cursorily on changes in student's academic behavior. TC's reflections were vague on the value of the educational experience for her/him as a future teacher.	TC reflected on the changes in the student's academic behavior. TC gave a few precise reflections on value of this educational experience for her/him as a future teacher.	TC reflected, using concrete examples, on the changes in the student's academic behavior. TC included reflections on strengths and weaknesses of this educational experience as it pertained to her/him as a future teacher.	TC reflected, using concrete examples, on the changes in the student's academic behavior. TC included reflections on the strengths and weaknesses of this educational experience for self as a future teacher. TC used concrete examples to illustrate the strengths and weaknesses.	

Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education, Grades 1-5

Ineffective (0-1.4)	Effective: Emerging (1.5-2.4)	Effective: Proficient (2.5-3.4)	Highly Effective (3.5-4.0)	
Reading Case Study (Data from All Rubric Rows)				
Criteria (Rubric Row)	FA10/SP11 Average Score N=5	FA11/SP12 Average Score N=14	FA12/SP13 Average Score N=16	FA10-SP13 <u>Overall</u> Average Score N=35
School and Student Background Information	3.42	3.58	3.69	3.56
Assessments and Informal Inventories (Reading, Spelling, High Frequency Words)	3.14	3.42	3.49	3.35
Reading Pre-test with Analysis (Gray Oral Reading Test-4 or Analytical Reading Inventory)	3.02	3.17	3.46	3.22
Comprehensive Prescriptive Plan	3.00	3.15	3.36	3.17
Post-test Gray Oral Reading Test-4 or Analytical Reading Inventory)	3.30	3.29	3.43	3.34
Results	3.22	3.39	3.43	3.35
Format	3.10	3.47	3.54	3.37
Writing	3.11	3.69	3.53	3.44
Reflections	3.26	3.34	3.37	3.32