Comparison of DRA 4-8 and Bridge Set, Rigby PM Benchmark, and QRI III for International Schools

	DRA	Rigby PM Benchmark	QRI III
Advantages of Assessment Content/ <i>Materials</i>	 Choice between two different narrative and two different expository texts at each level for student choice. Also, two copies of each text provided for assessing multiple students at one time. Texts are extensive enough in length to hold storyline and to evaluate reading stamina. Levels of texts match USA proficiency guidelines and aligns to a Developmental Continuum Assesses all parts of reading process including attitude, monitoring of variety of genres, accuracy, fluency, and comprehension. Comprehension portion is strong because of length of text, written summary, short constructed responses, metaocgnition self evaluation. Comprehensive rubric for all parts of assessment including examples of student responses for every level of proficiency for every portion of assessment; very useful for staff development in teacher collaboration. Strong follow up with "Focus for Instruction" sheet of proposed instructional strategies Teacher administration is minimal. Colorful illustrations, photos, diagrams, etc. 	 Discrete levels of texts within grade levels. Teachers record a self correction rate as well as an accuracy rate. 	 Combination of narrative and expository texts at all levels. Includes both explicit and implicit questions, although some teachers have questioned whether or not all the implicit questions are very high level. Comprehension is evaluated critically as independent, instructional, or frustration.
Disadvantages of Assessment Content/ <i>Materials</i>	 (Not a disadvantage but a suggestion: Teachers who are already trained in deep analysis of cueing systems and self-correction rate may want to adapt the analysis form to analyze the student's Record of Oral Reading, especially when working with students in the Bridging kit.) Student assessment books are paper but single texts can be replaced with no/minimal cost 	 is needed to hold a storyline and to evaluate reading stamina and do not match proficiency guidelines of NCEE and USA. Some of the texts lose continuity because of their short length. This definitely would affect comprehension especially in intermediate grades. Levels 24 and above do not correlate with F & P in level of difficulty and are not at 3rd – 5th grade level. Assesses only accuracy, some reading strategies, and some comprehension – no fluency or reading preferences. Comprehension assessment is weak focusing on lower level comprehension except for one question per text. No rubric is included to evaluate comprehension. Follow up for instruction is not suggested; 	 Texts are not extensive enough at Levels 3 and above to evaluate reading stamina and do not match proficiency guidelines of NCEE and USA. In Colorado, an informal research study was conducted and found that a student needed to be one level above the QRI grade level to be proficient on the state assessment. Assesses only accuracy, some prediction, and some comprehension – no fluency, reading strategies, or reading preferences. Follow up for instruction is explained in a very detailed, lengthy text that is not very user friendly. Teachers are not required to analyze the cueing systems nor the self correction rate. Illustrations when included are line drawings and not very engaging. Carrie Ekey, March 2005