Comparison of DRA K-3, Rigby PM Benchmark, and QRI III for International Schools

Assessment Content/ Materials Dis Le gu Assessment Action Assessment Content/ Assessment Te sto Le gu Assessment Content/ I re qu	rong combination of narrative and expository text pove Level 16. exts are extensive enough in length to hold oryline and to evaluate reading stamina. screte levels of texts within grade levels. evels of texts match NCEE and USA proficiency uidelines. ssesses all parts of reading process. comprehension portion is strong because of ngth of text, retell with accompanying optional	•	Texts at levels below 14 are extensive enough in length to hold storyline and to evaluate reading stamina. 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 at a very high level. Comprehension level is evaluated critically as
pro stu	puestions including higher levels. Comprehension is evaluated with a rubric. Collow up is strong with "What's Next" sheet of coposed instructional strategies for various udent needs. Colorful illustrations, photos, diagrams, etc.	•	Bright, colorful illustrations through level 20 Student assessment books are very sturdy in a slick lightweight cardboard.		independent, instructional, or frustration.
Disadvantages of Assessment Content/ Materials (Not a trained correct analyz	ength of administration for Levels 12 – 16 is stensive. disadvantage but a suggestion: Teachers who are do in deep analysis of cueing systems and selfction rate may want to adapt the analysis form to be the students Record of Oral Reading.)	•	Expository text does not begin until level 22 which is a DRA level 28 or a F & P level M. Texts above level 14 are much shorter than what 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. Levels 1 and 2 have discrepancy with Fountas and Pinnell because they are administered with the student reading with no support in the beginning of the predictable text. Some other levels do not correlate well with F & P. 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; depends on teacher expertise.	•	Texts are not extensive enough at Levels 3 and above to evaluate reading stamina and do not match proficiency guidelines of NCEE and USA. No discrete levels within grade levels. In Colorado a formal research study was conducted and found that the reliability of the assessment for indicating specific reading level was not accurate for students below the end of 2nd grade. 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 just line drawings and not very engaging.