

# Part 7: Student Literacy Assessment Plan

---

## Step 1: Lesson Summary Assessment Table — Weeks 2–6

---

### Week 2 — Lesson: CVC Word Blending & Decodable Text Fluency (Kindergarten)

**Lesson Objective:** Students will blend individual phonemes to read CVC words with 80% accuracy and read simple decodable sentences while developing fluency, demonstrating knowledge of letter-sound correspondences, which is a state standard, as cited from Michigan Department of Education (n.d.) on page 16 from the portion titled Demonstrate understanding of spoken words, syllables, and sounds.

Category	Details
Formative Assessment	Oral blending check: The teacher says individual sounds (e.g., "/c/ /a/ /t/") and students blend orally to say the whole word, with a target of 7/10 words correct. The teacher observes and records student accuracy on a checklist during partner reading. Running records are conducted during small group time to document whether students use beginning sounds, blend sounds together, and self-correct.
Summative Assessment	Exit ticket: Each student reads 5 CVC words independently to the teacher, such as dog, sun, pig, hop, fun, and draws a picture of one word to demonstrate comprehension; mastery goal is 4/5 (80%) correct.
Modification – Gifted Learner	Advanced readers partner with developing readers as reading buddies. Fast finishers receive a second decodable book with more complex sentences. Students who demonstrate mastery generate a word family list and write a sentence using 2–3 CVC words independently.
Modification – English Learner (EL)	Picture cards accompany every CVC word to connect spoken words to meaning. Pre-teaching of story vocabulary with picture cards occurs before partner reading. Sentence frames support oral responses.

<b>Modification – ASD</b>	Clear routine and posted lesson agenda reduce unpredictability. The predictable structure of the decodable text and the concrete nature of the exit ticket provide support. Partner work with a preferred peer reduces social anxiety.
<b>Modification – Dyslexia</b>	Elkonin sound boxes are provided so students push a counter for each phoneme before blending. Tactile letters provide a multisensory approach. Highlighted CVC words in text reduce visual tracking demands.
<b>Modification – ADHD</b>	The lesson is structured in short segments with varied modalities. Listening, partner work, hands-on manipulation, and independent response. A digital timer supports pacing. Fidget tools are available during partner reading.

---

### **Week 3 — Lesson: Sound Detectives – CVC Word Spelling Through Phoneme Segmentation (Kindergarten)**

**Lesson Objective:** Students will orally segment and blend the three phonemes in CVC words with 90% accuracy and spell at least 3 CVC words using magnetic letters, demonstrating that spoken sounds can be represented by written letters, which is a state standard, as suggested by the Michigan Department of Education (n.d.) on page 15 from the titled section Demonstrate understanding of spoken words, syllables, and sound.

<b>Category</b>	<b>Details</b>
<b>Formative Assessment</b>	Teacher observational checklist used during partner practice records each student's ability to segment sounds orally, match sounds to corresponding letters, and spell 3–5 CVC words using magnetic letters. Exit ticket at closure: each student orally segments and spells one self-selected CVC word before lining up.
<b>Summative Assessment</b>	Students independently spell 5 CVC words from picture cards using magnetic letters and draw a picture for each word, producing a completed word-picture recording sheet collected and evaluated against the lesson objective.
<b>Modification – Gifted Learner</b>	Gifted students compose and illustrate a simple sentence using 2–3 of their spelled words. Students may also act as group leaders, guiding peers through oral sound games and taking on the teacher role during partner practice.

<b>Modification – English Learner (EL)</b>	Students are encouraged to say the target word in their home language first, then in English, noting which sounds are similar. Picture cards provide visual-semantic support. The exit ticket may be completed orally with teacher support.
<b>Modification – ASD</b>	A visual step-by-step task card structures the activity. Step one is pick a picture card. Step two is to say the word. Step three is to stretch the sounds and step four is to build with letters. The exit ticket is administered one-on-one in a quiet setting rather than in the group context.
<b>Modification – Dyslexia</b>	Elkonin boxes allow students to physically push a chip into each box as they say each phoneme before placing magnetic letters, making the phoneme-grapheme connection concrete and multisensory.
<b>Modification – ADHD</b>	The activity is chunked into clearly labeled short steps with a visual checklist on the student's desk. A personal 2–3 minute timer per word supports self-monitoring. The hands-on magnetic letters provide tactile engagement to support focus.

## **Week 4 — Lesson: Word Recognition, Fluency & Vocabulary with Community Helpers Text (Grade 3)**

**Lesson Objective:** Students will decode multisyllabic words with 90% accuracy and read connected text at 60+ words per minute with appropriate expression. Students will correctly use at least 3 Tier 2 vocabulary words, protect, assist, emergency, community, in their story map to demonstrate understanding of text meaning, as Tompkins et al. (2021) note that these Tier 2 words are high-frequency and have a powerful impact on learning on page 185.

<b>Category</b>	<b>Details</b>
<b>Formative Assessment</b>	Teacher observation during partner reading with a fluency checklist documenting accuracy rates and expression. Think-Pair-Share monitoring of vocabulary usage during discussion checks whether students can use target words in context.
<b>Summative Assessment</b>	Completed story map incorporating at least 3 target vocabulary words with correct contextual usage, scored with a rubric. The exit ticket would be the requirement that students write one sentence about community helpers using a vocabulary word from the lesson.

<b>Modification – Gifted Learner</b>	Gifted students create an original community helper story using all four target vocabulary words. Students may serve as peer tutors during partner reading sessions, guiding partners through word recognition strategies.
<b>Modification – English Learner (EL)</b>	Visual vocabulary cards with pictures and student-friendly definitions are provided. Sentence frames support story map completion (e.g., "The _____ helps to protect our community by _____."). Pre-teaching of story vocabulary before reading builds access.
<b>Modification – ASD</b>	Predictable partner reading protocol with a visual step card reduces ambiguity. The story map graphic organizer provides concrete structure for comprehension. One-on-one vocabulary check-in replaces group Think-Pair-Share if preferred.
<b>Modification – Dyslexia</b>	Leveled text below grade level with the same vocabulary targets is provided. Extended time for story map completion addresses processing needs. Text-to-speech access for the Community Helpers reader supports independent engagement.
<b>Modification – ADHD</b>	The story map is broken into chunked sections completed one at a time. A digital timer structures partner reading rotations. Flexible seating during independent work reduces restlessness.

---

## **Week 5 — Lesson: /ar/ Controlled Vowel, Fluency & Comprehension Using *Car Race* (Grade 1)**

**Lesson Objective:** Students will decode and read words containing the r-controlled vowel /ar/ sound with 80% accuracy and read *Car Race* orally with accuracy, appropriate rate, and expression on successive readings through shared and echo reading, supporting comprehension through fluent reading, which is a state standard, as suggested by the Michigan Department of Education (n.d.) on page 16 from the portions titled Know and apply grade-level phonics and word analysis skills in decoding words and Read with sufficient accuracy and fluency to support comprehension.

<b>Category</b>	<b>Details</b>
<b>Formative Assessment</b>	The teacher conducts observations during echo reading and choral reading of repeated phrases and records participation and accuracy. Students sequence picture cards from the story in correct order and use vocabulary words, race, lead, pass, bump, wins, to retell story events to a partner.

<b>Summative Assessment</b>	Exit ticket with sentence frames: Students complete sentences about Carla's number, Mark's number, and who wins the race, demonstrating both word recognition of /ar/ words and story comprehension. Students self-assess comfort level with /ar/ words using thumbs up/middle/down.
<b>Modification – Gifted Learner</b>	Students create their own racing story using /ar/ words with at least 4–5 sentences and a complete story arc. Students generate extended /ar/ word lists beyond the text and write a different story ending.
<b>Modification – English Learner (EL)</b>	Picture-heavy text and sequencing cards provide visual support for meaning-making. Partner work creates natural language practice opportunities. Pre-teaching of racing vocabulary with picture cards precedes the first read.
<b>Modification – ASD</b>	The predictable, repetitive structure of the text and clearly posted lesson agenda support routine. The concrete sequencing card activity provides a tangible comprehension task. Explicit discussion of sportsmanship and character emotions is scaffolded with visual emotion cards.
<b>Modification – Dyslexia</b>	Explicit, multisensory /ar/ phonics instruction uses visual word cards, auditory repetition, and kinesthetic letter card manipulation. Echo reading structure allows multiple supported repetitions building automaticity.
<b>Modification – ADHD</b>	Short, varied activity segments incorporate movement through partner work and physical sequencing of cards. A digital timer structures reading rotations. The high-interest racing theme and competitive narrative maintain engagement.

---

## Week 6 — Lesson: Personal Narrative Writing with Story Grammar Charts (Grade 1)

**Lesson Objective:** Students will use a story grammar chart to plan a personal narrative with characters, setting, beginning, middle, and end; write 3+ sequenced sentences using transition words with sentence frame support; and orally share their narrative plan with a peer using complete sentences, which follows state standards, as suggested by the Michigan Department of Education (n.d.) on pages 15–16.

### Category

### Details

<b>Formative Assessment</b>	Story grammar chart observation with anecdotal notes during guided practice: teacher circulates and records whether students can identify and record the WHO, WHERE/WHEN, beginning, middle, and end for their own story. Think-Pair-Share monitoring during oral rehearsal captures sequencing ability and sentence-level language.
<b>Summative Assessment</b>	Students complete an independent personal narrative draft using their completed story grammar chart and sentence frames, producing a 3+ sentence sequenced narrative with transition words. An exit ticket and self-assessment checklist with visual icons and colored stickers, green, beginning, yellow, middle, red, end, capture student reflection on their own work.
<b>Modification – Gifted Learner</b>	Extension cards challenge students to add dialogue, figurative language, sensory details, or varied sentence structures. Choice boards offer options to create a multi-page book, audio recording, comic strip format, or sequel story.
<b>Modification – English Learner (EL)</b>	Bilingual word banks, English/Spanish, English/Arabic, support planning. Students are explicitly encouraged to plan in their home language first. Fluent peer pairing provides natural language models during Think-Pair-Share.
<b>Modification – ASD</b>	Visual schedule cards show each lesson phase with estimated times, reducing unpredictability. The traffic light color system (green/yellow/red) provides a concrete organizational metaphor. Students may choose to write about a routine or preferred activity to leverage familiar content. Noise-canceling headphones and a quiet corner are available during independent writing.
<b>Modification – Dyslexia</b>	Color-coded graphic organizers create non-linguistic memory cues for story sequences. Word prediction software and speech-to-text reduce spelling burden during drafting. Larger-font writing paper supports visual processing.
<b>Modification – ADHD</b>	Tasks are chunked with a visual timer on the SmartBoard showing time remaining for each phase. Movement opportunities are embedded between phases. Fidget tools and flexible seating options are available during independent writing. The story grammar chart reduces the cognitive load of holding ideas in working memory.

## Step 2: In-Depth Lesson Analysis

## **Selected Lesson: Week 4 — Word Recognition, Fluency & Vocabulary with Community Helpers Text (Grade 3)**

### **Assessment Context**

The purpose of this lesson is to integrate four literacy components, word recognition, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension, by using a grade-level Community Helpers text so that students develop the ability to both decode academic language and construct meaning from it. As Tompkins et al. (2021) suggest on page 185, Tier 2 vocabulary words such as protect, assist, emergency, and community are high-frequency words that appear in a variety of texts across content areas and have a powerful impact on students' learning. The two assessments together measure whether students can access the text through fluent, accurate reading, formative, and whether they can use the vocabulary meaningfully to demonstrate comprehension of text content, summative. The Michigan Department of Education (n.d.) standards require third-grade students to read with sufficient accuracy and fluency to support comprehension and to "know and apply grade-level phonics and word analysis skills in decoding words" (p. 17). Thus, both assessments are designed to generate evidence of these skills within a single, connected task.

### **How the Formative Assessment Monitors Understanding**

The fluency observation checklist used during partner reading functions as a real-time monitoring tool. By circulating among pairs with a checklist that records accuracy rates, expression, and pacing, the teacher can identify which students are decoding multisyllabic vocabulary words automatically and which are laboring over them, which is a distinction that directly predicts comprehension outcomes. As Tompkins et al. (2021) suggest on page 136, word recognition automaticity is essential because it allows students to read texts fluently. This frees cognitive resources for meaning-making. The Think-Pair-Share vocabulary check is a second formative layer. When students discuss vocabulary words in pairs before completing the independent story map, the teacher can hear whether students are using target words accurately in context or conflating their meanings. This data allows the teacher to adjust whole-group review, pull intervention groups, or scaffold the summative task before students attempt it independently.

### **How the Summative Assessment Evaluates Mastery**

The completed story map evaluated with a rubric serves as a post-instruction product demonstrating integrated mastery of the lesson's dual objectives. Correctly mapping characters, setting, problem, and solution requires fluent enough reading to extract literal information from the text. Incorporating at least 3 Tier 2 vocabulary words with correct usage requires both semantic understanding and the ability to connect word meaning to textual evidence. The exit ticket, a single sentence about community helpers using a target vocabulary word, provides a second, lower-stakes summative data point that captures the same vocabulary objective in a more concise form. Together, these two products allow the teacher to distinguish between students who can comprehend at the sentence level, exit ticket, and those who can organize

and express comprehension at the text level (story map), enabling more precise differentiation in subsequent lessons.

---

## Step 3: Rubric Design

---

### Rubric 1: Formative Assessment Rubric

**Tool: Fluency Observation Checklist + Think-Pair-Share Vocabulary Monitoring Lesson: Word Recognition, Fluency & Vocabulary with Community Helpers Text (Grade 3)**

Criteria	Exceeds (4)	Meets (3)	Approaching (2)	Below (1)
<b>Word Recognition Accuracy</b> – Student decodes multisyllabic words in the Community Helpers text during partner reading.	Student independently and accurately decodes all multisyllabic target words (community, protect, emergency, assistant) and other grade-level words with no hesitation, self-correcting immediately when errors occur.	Student accurately decodes most multisyllabic words; occasional hesitations are brief and student self-corrects without teacher prompting. Accuracy is at or above 90%.	Student decodes some multisyllabic words correctly but struggles with 2–3 target vocabulary words; requires partner or teacher support to decode unknown words; accuracy falls between 70–89%.	Student has difficulty decoding multisyllabic words; frequently misreads or skips target vocabulary; requires significant teacher support; accuracy is below 70%.



<b>Reading Fluency &amp; Expression</b> – Student reads connected text at appropriate rate with expression during partner reading.	Student reads at 60+ words per minute with consistent, appropriate phrasing and expressive prosody that reflects text meaning; pauses at punctuation and uses intonation effectively.	Student reads near 60 words per minute with generally appropriate phrasing; expression is present but may be inconsistent; phrasing reflects basic sentence structure.	Student reads below 60 words per minute; phrasing is choppy or word-by-word in places; expression is minimal; reading does not consistently reflect meaning of the text.	Student reads very slowly or haltingly; phrasing is almost entirely word-by-word; no expressive reading present; pace significantly interferes with comprehension.
<b>Vocabulary Usage in Think-Pair-Share</b> – Student uses target Tier 2 words (protect, assist, emergency, community) accurately in discussion.	Student uses 3–4 target vocabulary words accurately and spontaneously in discussion with a partner, providing context-appropriate sentences that demonstrate understanding of word meaning.	Student uses at least 2–3 target vocabulary words accurately in discussion; sentences are mostly context-appropriate with minor errors that do not affect meaning.	Student uses 1–2 vocabulary words but usage is inconsistent or partially accurate; may define words in isolation but struggle to use them in context-appropriate sentences.	Student does not use target vocabulary words in discussion or uses them inaccurately; cannot demonstrate understanding of word meanings in context without direct teacher support.
<b>Engagement &amp; Self-Monitoring</b> – Student actively tracks text, engages with partner, and uses reading strategies when encountering difficulty.	Student tracks text consistently, uses context clues and picture supports independently to resolve confusion, and actively provides and receives feedback with partner.	Student tracks text and engages productively with partner; uses at least one self-monitoring strategy when encountering difficulty with teacher prompting.	Student tracks text inconsistently; partner interaction is limited or passive; relies heavily on partner to resolve reading difficulties rather than applying independent strategies.	Student does not track text or engage meaningfully with partner; makes no attempt to apply reading strategies; requires teacher redirection to stay on task.

---

## Rubric 2: Summative Assessment Rubric

**Tool: Completed Story Map + Exit Ticket Lesson: Word Recognition, Fluency & Vocabulary with Community Helpers Text (Grade 3)**

Criteria	Exceeds (4)	Meets (3)	Approaching (2)	Below (1)
<b>Story Map Completeness</b> – Student completes all required sections: characters, setting, problem, and solution.	All four sections are fully and accurately completed with specific details drawn directly from the Community Helpers text; responses are written in complete sentences.	All four sections are completed with relevant information from the text; minor omissions or imprecise details do not significantly affect accuracy.	2–3 sections are completed; one or more sections are left blank or contain responses that do not accurately reflect the text.	Fewer than 2 sections are completed; responses are absent, inaccurate, or unrelated to the text.
<b>Vocabulary Integration</b> – Student correctly incorporates at least 3 Tier 2 vocabulary words (protect, assist, emergency, community) in the story map.	Student incorporates all 4 target vocabulary words accurately within the story map, using them in sentences that demonstrate clear contextual understanding of each word's meaning.	Student incorporates at least 3 target vocabulary words accurately and in context-appropriate ways within the story map responses.	Student attempts to use vocabulary words but uses 1–2 accurately; remaining vocabulary words are absent, misused, or placed without contextual meaning.	Student uses 0–1 vocabulary words in the story map; vocabulary is absent or consistently misused in ways that indicate lack of understanding.

**Comprehension of Text Meaning**

– Story map responses reflect accurate understanding of text events, character roles, problem, and solution.

Story map responses reflect deep, accurate comprehension including inferential understanding of character motivation and the purpose of community helpers in the text.

Story map responses reflect accurate literal comprehension of character roles, the problem presented in the text, and how community helpers provided a solution.

Story map responses reflect partial comprehension; the problem or solution section may be inaccurate or confused; character roles may be partially correct.

Story map responses reflect little to no comprehension of the text; responses are inaccurate, generic, or unrelated to the Community Helpers reading.

**Exit Ticket – Vocabulary Sentence –**

Student writes one complete, accurate sentence about community helpers using a target vocabulary word.

Student writes a complete, correctly punctuated sentence that uses a target vocabulary word accurately and demonstrates understanding of both the word and its connection to community helpers (e.g., "Police officers protect our community by keeping people safe.").

Student writes a complete sentence using a target vocabulary word accurately; sentence conveys a relevant idea about community helpers with minor mechanical errors.

Student writes an incomplete or partially accurate sentence; vocabulary word may be present but misused or the connection to community helpers is unclear.

Student does not complete the exit ticket or writes a sentence that does not contain a vocabulary word or demonstrate relevant comprehension.

<b>Writing Conventions –</b> Story map and exit ticket responses demonstrate grade-appropriate capitalization, punctuation, and spelling.	All responses demonstrate consistent grade-appropriate conventions including capitalization of proper nouns, end punctuation, and mostly correct spelling of grade-level words.	Most responses use correct conventions; 2–4 minor errors (e.g., missing end punctuation, capitalization errors) that do not interfere with meaning.	Responses contain multiple convention errors that occasionally interfere with readability; capitalization and punctuation are inconsistent.	Responses contain pervasive convention errors that significantly interfere with readability; capitalization, punctuation, and spelling are not yet at grade level.
--	---	---	---	--

### Scoring Guide:

- **18–20 points = Exceeds Expectations** – Student demonstrates mastery beyond grade-level expectation
- **14–17 points = Meets Expectations** – Student has met the lesson objectives at grade level
- **9–13 points = Approaching Expectations** – Student is developing toward mastery; re-teaching and targeted vocabulary support recommended
- **0–8 points = Below Expectations** – Student has not met the objectives; Tier II/III intervention in word recognition, vocabulary, and/or fluency is needed

## Step 4: Reflective Questions

### 1. How did creating both formative and summative assessments for each lesson deepen your understanding of assessment alignment with instructional goals?

Designing both a formative and a summative assessment for each lesson from Weeks 2 through 6 forced me to examine what student learning actually looks like during instruction versus after it. In the Week 4 Community Helpers lesson, for example, the formative fluency checklist captures whether students can decode academic vocabulary automatically enough to read fluently; the summative story map captures whether that decoding produced genuine comprehension. These are related but distinct indicators of the same instructional goal. Tompkins et al. (2021) on page 136 explain that word recognition automaticity is essential because it allows students to read texts fluently. This supports meaning-making, and my two assessments trace exactly that progression. Across all five weeks, I found that when I could not easily distinguish what the formative assessment was measuring from what the summative was measuring, it was a signal that my lesson objective was not specific enough. This process

sharpened my ability to write objectives that are genuinely measurable at both points in a lesson's arc, which will make my future planning more intentional.

## **2. Which student modification challenged you the most to design, and how did you ensure the assessment remained equitable and meaningful for that learner?**

The modification for students with dyslexia was the most consistently challenging to design across all five weeks, because dyslexia specifically affects the phonological processing and orthographic mapping skills that underlie virtually every lesson in an early literacy sequence. The core tension was that if I modified the assessment task itself by reducing the number of words, removing writing demands, or substituting oral for written responses, I risked changing what was being measured and producing data that did not reflect the same learning objective as the unmodified task. To resolve this tension, I focused consistently on modifying the pathway to the task rather than the task itself. For example, in Week 3, the student with dyslexia still spells five CVC words and still produces a word-picture recording sheet, but Elkonin boxes and tactile letters scaffold the phoneme-grapheme mapping process in a way that makes the task accessible without lowering the standard. As Tompkins et al. (2021) describe on page 109, developing phonological awareness is considered essential and foundational to developing an understanding that letters represent sounds in language, and students with dyslexia need not be exempted from this learning. They need more explicit, multisensory pathways to reach it. Keeping that distinction between access modification and standard modification was the design principle that kept my assessments equitable.

## **3. In what ways can assessment planning like this improve your future instructional decision-making and support all learners in a diverse classroom?**

Planning assessments at this level of specificity, with formative and summative tools aligned to each lesson objective, and with documented modifications for five distinct learner profiles, transforms how I think about instructional timing and data use. When I know in advance what formative evidence I am looking for during a lesson, I can make grouping decisions in real time rather than waiting for a post-lesson score to tell me who struggled. In the Week 6 narrative writing lesson, for example, monitoring story grammar chart completion during guided practice allows me to pull a Tier 2 intervention group before students attempt the independent writing draft, which is a decision that can prevent a gap from becoming a failure. Michigan Department of Education (n.d.) standards build upon each other from kindergarten through third grade, requiring students to move from phoneme awareness to decoding to fluency to vocabulary to comprehension in a developmental progression. By designing assessments that are explicit about which component of that progression each lesson addresses, I can track not just whether a student met an objective but where in the literacy development sequence their understanding is breaking down. For a diverse classroom, this kind of data is the difference between reacting to gaps and preventing them.

---

## References

- Haas, R. (2024, November 27). *20 differentiated instruction strategies and examples*. Prodigy. <https://www.prodigygame.com/main-en/blog/differentiated-instruction-strategies-examples-download>
- J & E Learn to Read. (2026). *Step 3: Open (CV) and closed (CVC) syllables, Y at the end of words*. <https://www.jandelearntoread.com/phonics-steps-1-10/step-3-open-closed-syllables/>
- Lane, H. (2021). *Using Elkonin boxes*. University of Florida Literacy Institute. <https://ufli.education.ufl.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/Using-Elkonin-Boxes-Handout.pdf>
- Michigan Department of Education. (n.d.). *Michigan K-12 standards English language arts*. [https://www.michigan.gov/-/media/Project/Websites/mde/Literacy/Content-Standards/ELA\\_Standards.pdf?rev=0f76588bc2bd48f89165484fa35d2b31](https://www.michigan.gov/-/media/Project/Websites/mde/Literacy/Content-Standards/ELA_Standards.pdf?rev=0f76588bc2bd48f89165484fa35d2b31)
- Tompkins, G. E., Campbell, R., Green, D., & Smith, C. (2021). *Literacy for the 21st century: A balanced approach* (3rd Canadian ed.). Pearson.