# Final Project Part III: 

Data Analysis and Interpretation
I decided to analyze Bel Pre's Quarter One: Comprehension for Montgomery County Public School's Second Grade standard in my mentor teacher's class. There were five indicators that make up Quarter One, including: determining the author's purpose; retelling stories and relating them to prior experiences; identifying the elements of plot, setting, character, problem, and solution; stating a purpose for reading and identifying who would use the text; and finally, explaining connections between illustrations and text to support comprehension. Of these five indicators, my teacher chose to grade an average of three assignments per indicator to measure the children's growth and assess each indicator so that children have a chance to grasp it over the course of time. Each assignment was either given an NP for Not Proficient, an AP for Approaching Proficient, or a P for Proficient. The ultimate goal is to have each child be at the Proficient level on the third assignment measuring each indicator.

I decided to color-code the grades so that each NP, AP, or P is apparent. I also chose the color red for the NPs so that they stand out, making it easier to point out the trouble spots. First and foremost, because the NPs are so noticeable, I decided to count the number of NPs each child received. If a child received 4 or more NPs on the given assignments, I decided to classify them in the group that the teacher needs to focus most of her attention on. These students include: Trevor with 4 NPs, Zobel with 6, Kenny and DeShawna with 7, and Eric with 8 NPs. Perhaps these five students need to be placed in
their own reading group for extra help. Although these students received the most NPs out of the total indicators, it appears that for the majority of the time the students were either at the AP or P level during the final assignment demonstrating almost-mastery, or mastery.

After noticing the children with the most NPs total, I thought maybe it might be more necessary to look at each indicator and notice the individuals that received NP or AP during the final assignment. Perhaps this might be the best approach to helping the students being that our goal is for every child to be at the Proficient level during the final assessment of each indicator.

For indicator 1.2.5.7 of determining the author's purpose, four children were approaching proficiency, while the rest were proficient. Once again, these students were Zobel, Kenny, Eric, and DeShawna-all children mentioned above. Maybe if these students were in their own reading group the teacher could give them individualized attention working on determining the author's purpose. With a smaller group it is often much easier for the children to discuss their thoughts and grasp concepts. If meeting with the classroom teacher in a small group is not effective, coupled with homework or follow-up assignments, it is possible that these children could be pulled out of the classroom for individualized meetings with reading specialist and academic support system personnel.

At the end of the 2.2.2.1a retelling stories and relating them to prior experiences indicator, again four children were still at the Approaching Proficient level. These children were Yesenia, Kenny, Eric, and DeShawna-three of the four children previously mentioned. However, it seems that all of these children began the first
assignment at the Not Proficient level, and showed improvement by the end. One can infer from this improvement that perhaps these children still need a few more practice assignments and discussion to master the indicator. The teacher should not end at APthe teacher should continue to teach and give assignments on this indicator until the children truly understand and reach the Proficient level.

The next indicator, 2.2.2.2 identifying the elements of plot, setting, character, problem, and solution entails a great deal of teaching. This teacher only chose two assess the children twice on this indicator, unlike all the others which she gave them three opportunities. There were still three NPs and three APs at the end of teaching this indicator. This is a sign that the teacher should also continue teaching this particular topic-even more so because of the great detail it includes. Zobel, Kenny, and DeShawna all received NPs on both given assignments-showing no improvement. Yesenia, Eric, and Zachary received APs both times. This is not a continuous trend for Zachary—who received all Proficients by the end of each of the other indicators in Quart 1. This is also an indication that the teacher needs to spend a little bit more time teaching this concept, or possibly needs to incorporate these concepts into everyday Read Alouds to still discuss as a group. Perhaps it may be helpful for these children to pair up with a child who received a P , and have them buddy work on a similar assignment so that the buddy can point out things the teacher may have missed on an individual basis.

The next indicator, 1.2.5.1 stating a purpose for reading and identifying who would use the text was difficult for every child on the first assignment, given that all children received an NP. The teacher knew beforehand that this concept was going to be challenging because of her previous teaching experience, and chose to give this
assignment as a small-group discussion task. For example, she asked each child while in reading group why someone might read a particular book and who that person might be. Every child did not give a proficient response, resulting in NPs for the entire class. After some discussion, she gave the children a second opportunity in guided reading groups to reach the Proficient level. Eight children succeeded at getting Ps, while eight received APs, and one child (Eric) was still struggling at the NP level. For the final assessment, she once again used the reading group strategy, and succeeded to have eleven P , and six AP. It was great to see that all children had improved at least from the NP level, but these six children still need to grasp the concept. These children include: Zobel, Sybill, Yesenia, Kenny, Eric, and DeShawna. Perhaps when she reorganizes her reading groups, she can include Zobel, Yesenia, Kenny, Eric, and DeShawna (Sybill has received Ps at the end of every other indicator). This will allow for further attention to be given, and also allows for her to meet with this group more frequently than the rest of them.

For the final indicator to be assessed, 2.2.2.5 explaining connections between illustrations and text to support comprehension, all children were at the Proficient level except for two children (Eric and DeShawna) who were still at the Approaching Proficient level.

Overall, the same seems to hold true for each indicator-about the same four children, give or take a few, were still struggling by the end of each assessment for each indicator. As mentioned previously, the teacher really needs to provide these children with extra opportunities to master these skills. Each time they were approaching proficient, they were never proficient. I believe that each child needs to be proficient and master a skill before they can move on the next concept. Or perhaps, these concepts can
be integrated along with other concepts and can be continually discussed. For example, when the teacher is introducing the story elements, she could also ask them questions that relate to their prior experience, such as "has what happened to the character in the story ever happened to you in your life?" Perhaps it would help if she met with this struggling group of children more frequently and for a longer period of time each time. I understand that time is always so short and valuable, and there is never enough of it, so perhaps these children could even be pulled out of the classroom to work with paraprofessionals such as the academic support team, the reading specialists, or the literacy aids.

Overall, if the teacher spends just a little bit more time working on these concepts, I believe that all of the children will be at the Proficient level by the end of each Quarter.

