

**RIGBY
READS
Reading Evaluation and Diagnostic System**

Alignment Study

Beck Evaluation & Testing Associates, Inc.

November, 2006

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	3
II.	Methodology	5
III.	Results	13
IV.	Conclusions	28
V.	Recommendations	30
VI.	Caveats	30
	Bibliography	32
	Appendix A: Test Analysis Summaries	33

I. Introduction

Beck Evaluation and Testing Associates (BETA, Inc.) was contracted by Harcourt Achieve to conduct an alignment study between the content of the *Rigby READS* tests and that of five statewide assessment instruments. A distinguished panel of elementary reading content specialists with assessment expertise and familiarity with alignment processes was convened by BETA to participate in the project, which included the analysis and comparison of READS tests, at Grades 3, 4, and 5, to the corresponding grade-level assessments of Colorado, Connecticut, Michigan, North Carolina, and Washington. These five states were selected because their current curriculum and assessment efforts have received national recognition and because they are geographically diverse. For the purposes of this study, the reviewers used a modified version of Dr. Norman Webb’s alignment process and the *Web Alignment Tool*. The goal of this project was to ensure that elementary teachers across the country can be confident that READS tests are effective measures; that they are aligned to the knowledge and skills assessed on representative state assessments; and that they inform and support classroom instruction.

The concept of “alignment” is not new. For decades, test and textbook publishers have produced correlation studies of varying quality, from superficial to in-depth, to demonstrate the extent to which their materials match state and local curriculum objectives. Educators have long been encouraged to scrutinize their classroom assessments to ensure content validity; that is, the content of tests and tasks represent a balanced and adequate sampling of the target knowledge and skills as they are taught in the classroom. The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) mandates evidence of alignment

and the use of formalized models and procedures to determine “the degree to which expectations and assessments are in agreement and serve in conjunction with one another to guide the system toward students learning what they are expected to know and do” (Webb, 2005, p. 2) Due to the increased emphasis on alignment, test developers and K–12 educators must continually examine how their instructional materials and assessment instruments match the standards that define successful performance tied to Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

The intent of the alignment study was to illustrate the degree of alignment of READS tests to state tests, and reviewers were charged with the task of comparing assessment components, features, and test items. From the beginning of the project, it was evident to the reviewers that *Rigby READS* and large-scale state assessments are designed for different purposes.

The *Rigby Reading Evaluation and Diagnostic System (Rigby READS)* is designed to measure several core elements of an effective reading program, including phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. In compliance with NCLB mandates, READS provides diagnostic feedback about individual student mastery of specific skills and strategies in reading, targeting those students who need early intervention with high-quality instruction in those critical elements. In addition, comprehension passages covering multiple reading levels yield information about students’ instructional and independent reading levels. Basically, *Rigby READS* is a classroom-based assessment that helps teachers *dig deeper* in order to ascertain exactly how individual students are making progress toward achievement of the learning targets. Teachers in Grades 1 through 8 are encouraged to use *Rigby READS* as

beginning- and end-of-year benchmark tests in order to monitor students' ongoing progress and to inform and support their instructional decisions.

State assessments are benchmark tests of a sort as well, in that they monitor progress from year to year. In compliance with NCLB and other mandates, they are now used annually to measure student achievement of curriculum standards for reporting and accountability purposes; to enable data comparisons across schools and districts, and to evaluate program effectiveness. These tests are often called "high stakes," because scores are made very public, and schools and districts are subject to sanctions and embarrassment if they do not make annual AYP goals (Popham, 2004). While state assessments offer general feedback about students' achievement of content standards, they are not designed to provide the specific, immediate, and ongoing information about performance that are necessary to guide teachers' critical decisions about instruction.

To adequately measure a student's progress in reading or evaluate the success of a literacy program, multiple and different assessments are needed. While one might expect potential misalignment issues due to differences in intent, format, and uses of diagnostic tests and mandated large-scale assessments, the reviewers found the tests to be complementary. Student performance on *Rigby READS* may be predictive of the degree of success on high-stakes assessments, and scores on state assessments may be explained by digging deeper with Rigby READS.

II. Methodology

In preparation for conducting the READS Alignment Study, BETA President Michael Beck invited three reading/language arts content specialists to serve on the review panel. These highly admired individuals were selected because of their varied

experiences in K–12 teaching at the local level, teacher education programs at the university level, coordination of English language arts curriculum and assessment projects at the state level, and work in research and development at the national level. All three panelists were respected for their extensive knowledge about elementary reading/language arts and their experiences with the Webb alignment process.

The READS Alignment Study began with a detailed analysis of Form A of the *Rigby READS Reading Evaluation and Diagnostic System* (Farr, Beck, & Munroe, 2005) for Grades 3, 4, and 5. The purpose of the analysis was to carefully examine the questions in each test booklet, categorize the reading content, and assign Depth of Knowledge (DOK) levels, as outlined in Dr. Webb’s *Web Alignment Tool* (Wisconsin Center of Education Research [WCER], 2005). Once READS was analyzed for content concurrence and DOK levels, reading test items from five state assessment programs were reviewed. Analysis of the state reading assessments included *released* test sections and items for Grades 3, 4, and 5 obtained from the five state department-of-education Web sites. Tests under study were the *Colorado Student Assessment Program* (CSAP; Colorado Department of Education, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2002, 2003); the *Connecticut Mastery Test* (CMT), *Fourth Generation* (Connecticut State Department of Education, n.d.); the *Michigan Educational Assessment Program* (MEAP; Michigan Department of Education, 2001); the *North Carolina End-of-Grade (EOG) Test of Reading Comprehension* (Public Schools of North Carolina, n.d.); and the *Washington Assessment of Student Learning* (WASL; Office of Superintendent of Public Education, 2005).

The three reviewers independently rated each of the state assessment items in reference to reading content and DOK. The analysis was conducted grade level by grade

level and, using a consensus process, the reviewers determined DOK levels and content categories for each item.

State assessment items were then compared to READS items to identify the number and degree of item *matches*. Charts depicting content categorical concurrence and reading DOK levels were constructed and used in a comparative analysis (see Appendix A).

Depth of Knowledge

Depth-of-Knowledge levels were based on the *Web Alignment Tool* developed by Norman Webb (Webb, 2005). Webb identifies four levels upon which to identify the complexity of reading assessment tasks.

A reading DOK Level 1 assessment task requires test takers to demonstrate a basic understanding of the text by responding primarily with verbatim recall, slight paraphrasing of specific details from the text, and/or identification of the meaning of a single word or phrase. The following is an example of a reading Level 1 question found in READS Grade 3.

Penguins live where it is—

— *dry*.

— *cold*.

— *warm*.

Before answering the question, students read a short informational text titled ***What Are Penguins?*** The last paragraph begins, “Penguins live in cold places.” This question is an example of a DOK Level 1 because students need only to recall or look back in the text for the literal response.

A Reading DOK Level 2 assessment task requires closer understanding of the text. Test takers might be asked to use context cues to identify the meaning of an unfamiliar word or phrase, make a lower level inference based on an intersentence analysis of text, predict a logical outcome clearly implied in the text, and/or identify and summarize major events. For example, the following question appears in READS Grade 4. After reading a short narrative titled *Chipmunk and Bear*, students are asked to make a lower level inference about the feelings of one of the characters. Although the answer to the question is not explicitly stated, it is clearly implied.

*How does Bear **most likely** feel when the sun comes up in the morning?*

- A. *angry*
- B. *concerned*
- C. *excited*
- D. *pleased*

Reading DOK Level 3 assessment tasks require a deeper understanding of the text. Test takers are asked to explain, generalize, and/or connect ideas. Tasks often require test takers to apply prior knowledge and make inferences or draw conclusions that go beyond the text. Tasks may involve identification of abstract themes and require test takers to make inferences across an entire passage. An example of a DOK Level 3 question is found in the CMT Grade 5. Students are asked to read a piece of functional text titled *Lawala*. The text consists of directions for a game that asks students to throw balls through a hula hoop as it is rolled by them. The question asks students to make a comparison between *Lawala* and basketball. In order to answer correctly, students need to apply prior knowledge about basketball to find differences between the two games.

In what way is Lawala different from basketball?

- A. *Each side has an equal number of players.*
- B. *The hoop doesn't stay still during the game.*
- C. *The ball is thrown through a round target.*
- D. *Points are given when a ball goes through the hoop.*

Reading DOK Level 4 assessment tasks are often extended, constructed-response tasks that require the test taker to use higher order thinking skills to apply an understanding of text in the completion of a new task. Test takers are sometimes asked to develop hypotheses and/or to perform complex analyses across multiple texts. An example is found in the MEAP Grade 3 test. After reading two texts, a short story titled *Eric's Lizard* and a poem titled *Porcupine*, students are asked to complete a constructed response. The question is:

Do you think Eric would want a porcupine as a pet? Explain your answer using specific details and examples from both "Eric's Lizard" and "Porcupine." Be sure to show how the two selections are alike or connected.

In this assessment task, students must think across texts in order to make a prediction. The tasks require that students use knowledge from both texts to make a judgment about how well the features of an animal described in one task will be valued by a character in another story.

The aforementioned descriptions were used by reviewers to achieve consistency in evaluating the reading DOK levels of assessment items. Using the *Web Alignment Tool*, each of the panelists completed a training exercise designed for reviewers. Reviewers scored the items separately; if there was disagreement on the initial rating of an item, a discussion was conducted, and consensus was reached by comparing the features of the assessment item to the criteria provided in the *Web Alignment Tool*.

Categorical Concurrence

Each assessment item was examined and categorized for content. The reviewers, experienced in the development of assessment items for reading tests, independently reviewed the READS items as well as released items on the CSAP, CMT, MEAP, EOG, and WASL. The purpose of the analysis was to determine the English language arts (ELA) content and skills addressed in each of the assessment items. This information is reported in charts and discussed in the *Results* section of this report.

The following ELA content categories represent the types of categories that were identified: **Detail, Vocabulary and Word Structure, Story Elements and Text Structures, Main Idea and Themes, Author’s Craft, Critical Comprehension, Genre and Text Features, Reference Skills, and Reading Response**. The categories and examples of questions are discussed next.

One frequently occurring category was labeled **Detail**. This category included items that asked test takers to identify details from the text that answered questions related to “who,” “what,” “when,” “where,” and “how” responses. For example “Bees help flowers by—” was categorized as a detail question asking “how” (READS Grade 3).

“Who earns the money for Willa’s family?” was classified as a detail question asking “who” (READS Grade 4). “On Iwo Jima, we know Joe was carrying a—” was identified as a detail question asking for a “what” response (READS Grade 5).

A second frequently occurring category included **Story Elements and Informational Text Structure**, such as setting, events, sequence, problem, solution, characters, characteristics and feelings, and character motive. Examples include “How did Russell feel when he first saw the birds?” (READS Grade 3); “The problem in 1974 and 1975 was that the pandas—” (READS Grade 5); and “The skunk invited the squirrel home to—” (READS Grade 4).

Another category captured items related to **Vocabulary and Word Structure**. The majority of vocabulary items asked readers to define how a word was used in the context of the reading passage. An example of a vocabulary item is “In this story, the word *odd* means—” (READS Grade 4). An example of a word-structure item is “Which of these words from ‘Snow Day’ is a compound word?” (CSAP Grade 3).

Main Idea and Themes was another category that occurred frequently in the item analysis. Examples of the main-idea category include items such as “The best title for this article would be—” (READS Grade 5), and “This story is mostly about how bees—” (READS Grade 3).

The **Author’s Craft** category includes items that ask test takers to respond to questions about an author’s purpose, use of figurative language, and attention to audience. For example, in READS Grade 5, an item categorized as figurative language asks, “The monkey acted as Hippy’s—.” The expected answer is “toothpick,” illustrating the use of a metaphor. Audience is addressed in a READS Grade 3 item when test takers

are asked to identify the intended audience for a poster: “This poster is mostly for—.” The expected response is “students.”

One of the largest categories is labeled **Critical Comprehension**; it includes a variety of comprehension skills including determining importance, predicting, identifying causes and effects, summarizing, inferring, interpreting, and comparing. An example of a questions asking for a comparison is “How are penguins like fish?” (READS Grade 3). “Why couldn’t Bill have done it?” (READS Grade 4) is an example of a question in which test takers must identify a cause. “Which of the following best expresses Demarest’s attitude toward snakes as shown in the beginning of the selection?” (North Carolina EOG Test, Grade 5) is an example of a question that asks test takers to interpret information from the text.

Genre and Text Features was a category that appeared less frequently than most of the other categories. “What makes *Porcupine* a poem?” (MEAP Grade 3) is a typical example of a genre question, and “In this section, the best use of the map is to find—” (MEAP Grade 4) is a typical example of a text-feature question. In general, most of the questions in this category asked test takers to identify text features associated with a specific genre or to identify the primary use of a particular text feature, such as graphs and maps.

A rarely used category was **Reference Skills**. A typical question found on the MEAP Grade 4 released test asks, “Which would be the best place to find out more about black bears?” Students must use their knowledge of research tools and materials to identify the correct response.

The final category was **Reading Response**, and a representative question found in the CMT Grade 5 was “Write a brief paragraph telling why you would or would not enjoy playing Lawala. Use information from the passage to support your response.” This question followed a functional reading passage, which listed the directions for playing an African game.

III. Results

Although the READS and the five state literacy assessments analyzed shared several characteristics, they also differed in several ways. A brief description of each assessment is provided next.

Rigby Reading Evaluation and Diagnostic System (READS)

READS has two assessment batteries: the READS Evaluation Test, which measures growth in reading comprehension, and the READS Diagnostic Test, which not only measures growth in reading comprehension but also provides feedback on mastery of specific reading skills and objectives. For the purpose of this analysis, the READS Diagnostic Test battery was analyzed. Although READS Diagnostic Tests are available for Grades 1 through 8, only Grades 3 through 5 were the focus of this alignment study per BETA’s agreement with Harcourt Achieve. Grades 3, 4, and 5 of READS correspond with the grade levels of the state reading assessments selected for comparison. An additional section of the READS Diagnostic Test battery that measures fluency was not included in this review because it is an optional component.

The format of the READS Diagnostic Test is entirely multiple choice. The test begins with phonics assessments addressing letter-sound and vocabulary knowledge and ends with comprehension items. The comprehension items are based on short narrative, informational, and functional reading passages. Multiple-choice questions probe student comprehension of the overall passage, comprehension of specific details, and reasoning skills. The number of items at each of the grade levels studied is described in Table 1.

Table 1. Rigby READS Diagnostic Test

Test Components	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
	<i>N</i> = 154	<i>N</i> = 160	<i>N</i> = 156
Consonant letter sound knowledge	27 items 17%	24 items 15%	24 items 15%
Vowel letter sound knowledge	36 items 23%	42 items 26%	42 items 30%
Vocabulary in context	22 items 13%	22 items 14%	24 items 15%
Vocabulary word part clues	24 items 15%	24 items 15%	18 items 11%
Comprehension	45 items 29%	48 items 30%	48 items 31%

Colorado Student Assessment Program (CSAP)

Analysis of CSAP Reading was conducted on the basis of a sample of released items at Grades 3, 4, and 5. The assessments provide a measure of how well Colorado students demonstrate knowledge of Colorado state reading standards and benchmarks through measurement of performance on items based on specific reading assessment objectives for each grade level. These objectives are rotated on a cyclical basis, so some test items are repeated in adjacent grade levels.

The format of the sample CSAP items examined for this study includes narrative, informational, and poetic passages followed by a combination of multiple-choice and constructed-response questions. The nature of the constructed-response items vary, but include asking for brief explanations, lists, retellings, and completion of charts and diagrams. The characteristics of the items analyzed are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. CSAP

	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
	<i>N</i> = 22	<i>N</i> = 47	<i>N</i> = 7
# of passages	6	8	3
# of multiple-choice items	13 items 59%	35 items 74%	6 items 86%
# constructed response	9 items 40%	12 items 25%	1 items 14%

Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT), Fourth Generation

The reading comprehension portion of the CMT measures student performance objectives that include forming a general understanding of text, developing an interpretation and making reader–text connections, and examining the content and structure of texts. Passages selected for the CMT are authentic works of literature that represent three contexts: (a) reading for literary experience; (b) reading for information; and (c) reading to perform a task.

The format of the CMT includes both narrative and informational passages. The items include both multiple-choice and constructed-response questions. The open-ended items vary in complexity by grade level, but generally the items call for a brief description or short paragraph. Characteristics of the released samples analyzed in this report are described in Table 3.

Table 3. CMT

	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
	$N = 12$	$N = 11$	$N = 9$
# of passages	1	1	1
# of multiple-choice items	8 items 67%	8 items 73%	7 items 78%
# constructed response	4 items 33%	3 items 27%	2 items 22%

Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP)

The Reading section of MEAP English language arts is based on the Michigan English Language Arts standards, benchmarks, and grade-level expectations. The released assessments include informational, narrative, and poetic passages that are linked in content in a manner that allows cross-text items to be developed.

The reading portion of the MEAP is divided into two parts. The first task in Part 1 requires students to read the first of a pair of passages and answer a series of text-specific multiple-choice questions. Then, students read the second passage of the pair and answer multiple-choice questions specific to that text. There is third set of cross-text multiple-choice questions in Part 1, requiring students to make connections between the paired texts. The final task in Part 1 asks students to compose an extended constructed response in which they use information from the paired readings to take a stance on a position and support their point. In Part 2 students are asked to read a third passage, unrelated to the passage pair, and answer a series of multiple-choice questions. Characteristics of the released reading portions of the MEAP analyzed in this report are described in Table 4.

Table 4. MEAP

	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
	<i>N</i> = 31	<i>N</i> = 31	<i>N</i> = 31
# of passages	3	3	3
# of multiple-choice items	30 items 97%	30 items 97%	30 items 97%
# constructed response	1 item 3%	1 item 3%	1 item 3%

North Carolina End-of-Grade (EOG) Test of Reading Comprehension

The EOG Test is aligned to the *North Carolina Department of Public Instruction's 1999 English Language Arts Standard Course of Study*. At Grades 3, 4, and 5, the EOG Test consists of eight reading passages including six literary passages (two fiction, two nonfiction, one drama, and one poem) and three informational passages (two

content and one consumer). The variety of passages is designed to assess student understanding of text purposes, such as reading for literary experience, reading to gain information, and reading to perform a task. Items on the EOG Test are designed to assess student cognition, interpretation, ability to take a critical stance, and ability to make connections. The format of the assessment is multiple choice.

Characteristics of the released items for the EOG Test analyzed in this report are described in Table 5. For purposes of this review, only a portion of the released passages and accompanying questions were analyzed. The sample of passages selected for analysis reflected the number and variety of passages included on each form of the test.

Table 5. North Carolina EOG Test of Reading Comprehension

	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5
	$N = 46$	$N = 53$	$N = 52$
# of passages	8	8	8
# of multiple-choice items	46 items 100%	53 items 100%	52 items 100%

Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL)

The WASL Reading is designed to measure student proficiency of *Washington's Essential Academic Learning Requirements and Grade Level Expectations* in reading.

The test includes a variety of narrative (e.g., stories, poems, novel excerpts, biographies) and informational (e.g., magazine/newspaper articles, textbook excerpts, historical

documents) passages. At Grades 3 through 5 the major reading-skill areas measured are literary and informational text comprehension, analysis, and critical thinking. Test items include multiple-choice questions, short-answer questions, and constructed-response prompts.

Released items were available for only Grades 3 and 5. Characteristics of the released items WASL items analyzed in this report are described in Table 6.

Table 6. WASL

	Grade 3	Grade 5
	$N = 28$	$N = 31$
# of passages	6	6
# of multiple-choice items	20 items 71%	22 items 71%
# short answer	7 items 25%	8 items 26%
# constructed response	1 item 3%	1 item 3%

Table 7 provides a summary of the format and features of the reviewed state reading/language arts tests. The comprehension passage types are similar in nature across the five states. All of the state tests include authentic texts representing a variety of informational, narrative/poetic, and functional genre. READS passages tend to be less authentic and generally shorter in length. The greatest difference is manifested in the types of items. All of the tests have multiple-choice questions, yet only North Carolina and READS tests contain *exclusively* multiple-choice items. The CSAP, CMT, and WASL have short constructed-response items in addition to multiple-choice questions;

the MEAP and WASL contain extended-response items. In general, those tests with constructed-response and extended-response prompts have a higher percentage of DOK Reading Levels 3 and 4.

Table 7. Comparison of Test Formats

	CSAP	CMT	MEAP	EOG	WASL	^a READS
Grades	3, 4, 5	3, 4, 5	3, 4, 5	3, 4, 5	3, 5	3, 4, 5
total # of items	7–47	9–12	31	46–53	28–31	45–48
# of passages	6	1	3	8	6	9
# of multiple-choice items	13	7–8	30	46–53	20–22	45–48
# short constructed-response	9	0	0	0	7–8	0
# extended constructed response		2–4	1	0	1	0

^aThis column reflects only the Reading Comprehension section of READS.

Tables 8 through 10 describe the reading DOK levels of READS as compared to the CSAP, CMT, MEAP, North Carolina EOG Test, and WASL. The READS assessment has the highest percentage of DOK Level 1 items and the lowest percentage of DOK Level 3 items at all three grade levels. Only two assessments, the CMT and the MEAP, have items identified as DOK level 4, and this is a reflection of the nature and complexity of their constructed-response questions.

READS Grade 3 has a higher percentage of Level 2 questions than four of the five state tests analyzed. At Grade 4, READS has a higher percentage of Level 2 questions than two of the four state tests (WASL Grade 4 items were not available). And at Grade 5, READS has a higher percentage of Level 2 questions than three of the five state tests. READS has the lowest percentage of Level 3 questions at all grade levels.

READS has the highest percentage of combined reading DOK Levels 1 and 2 and the lowest percentage of DOK Levels 3 and 4 at all grade levels. The percentage of DOK Level 1 questions decreases at each grade level in READS: 51%, 42%, and 31% at Grades 3, 4, and 5, respectively. At the same time, the percentage of DOK Levels 2 and 3 increase at each grade level. The READS questions increase in developmental complexity in much the same manner as a taxonomy of thinking skills (Anderson et al., 2001). The reading DOK Level 1 questions reflect recall of information, while the Levels 2 and 3 require increasingly higher levels of comprehension, such as interpreting, inferring comparing, explaining, and differentiating. This pattern of increasing developmental complexity is not evident in the state tests.

Table 8. Grade 3 Comparison of Depth-of-Knowledge (DOK) Levels

Assessments	DOK 1	DOK 2	DOK 3	DOK 4
READS	51%	42%	7%	0%
CSAP	18%	68%	14%	0%
CMT	2%	25%	33%	25%
MEAP	23%	30%	43%	3%
EOG	20%	39%	41%	0%
WASL	14%	39%	46%	0%

Table 9. Grade 4 Comparison of Depth-of-Knowledge (DOK) Levels

Assessments	% DOK 1	% DOK 2	% DOK 3	% DOK 4
READS	42%	46%	12%	0%
CSAP	27%	43%	30%	
CMT	9%	55%	27%	9%
MEAP	7%	17%	73%	3%
EOG	18%	66%	16%	0%
WASL	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note. NA = not applicable.

Table 10. Grade 5 Comparison of Depth-of-Knowledge (DOK) Levels

Assessments	% DOK 1	% DOK 2	% DOK 3	% DOK 4
READS	31%	52%	17%	0%
CSAP	14%	57%	28%	0%
CMT	22%	22%	33%	22%
EOG	20%	40%	37%	3%
NCRCT	13%	60%	27%	0%
WASL	16%	45%	39%	0%

An analysis of ELA content categories reveals several patterns, which are demonstrated in Tables 11 through 13. In general, the READS tests have the largest percentages of items categorized as Detail questions, but there are two exceptions. First, 27% of the MEAP Grade 3 test items are categorized as Detail questions, while only 26% of READS Grade 3 test items are Detail questions. Second, 14% of both the READS and CSAP Grade 5 test items are categorized as Detail questions. The questions classified as Detail questions are fairly literal or require a low-level inference and ask respondents to simply identify who-, what-, when-, and where-types of information. Detail questions fell primarily into DOK Level 1.

All of the tests ask questions requiring respondents to identify the meaning of Vocabulary in context. The percentage of items related to Vocabulary in the READS tests are 10%, 15%, and 17% in Grades 3, 4, and 5, respectively. The percentage of Vocabulary items on the state tests range from 7% to 11%, 8% to 9%, and 3% to 15% in Grades 3, 4, and 5, respectively. At Grade 3, two state tests have higher percentages of Vocabulary items, and three of the states have lower percentages of Vocabulary items than does the READS test. At Grades 4 and 5, none of the state tests have more Vocabulary items than the READS tests. All of the Vocabulary items require test takers to identify the meaning of a word using the context of the reading passage, except for one item. That item asks students to select a compound word out of a group of word types.

Questions related to Story Elements and Text Structures are asked in all of the tests. The percentage of items related to story elements and text structure varies from 32% in Grade 3 to 19% in Grade 5. None of the state tests have higher percentages of

items categorized as Story Elements and Text Structure in Grades 3 and 4 than does READS, but two of the states have higher percentages in Grade 5. The percentage of items identified as Story Elements and Text Structure in the state tests range from 4% to 23%, 7% to 18%, and 3% to 26% in Grades 3, 4, and 5, respectively. The majority of items categorized as Story Elements and Text Structure ask test takers to answer questions about story settings, characters, problems, and events, as well as informational-text sequence.

Main Idea and Theme questions are emphasized in all of the tests. The percentages of Main Idea/Theme questions in the READS tests are 6%, 8%, and 12% in Grades 3, 4, and 5, respectively. The percentage of items categorized as Main Idea/Theme in the state tests range from 7% to 10%, 4% to 27%, and 0% to 28% in Grades 3, 4, and 5, respectively. In Grade 3, all of the state tests have higher percentages of Main Idea/Theme items than does READS. In Grade 4, three of the state tests (data are not available for the WASL at Grade 4) have higher percentages of Main Idea/Theme items than does READS, and one state test has a lower percentage. At Grade 5, only one of the states has a higher percentage of Main Idea/Theme items than does READS. The items in the Main Idea/Theme category ask participants to identify best titles, what a text is mostly about, and the author's theme. Some short and extended constructed-response items ask students to identify main ideas or themes shared by two or more texts.

Critical comprehension is another major category. The percentages of Critical Comprehension questions in the READS tests are 19%, 30%, and 27% in Grades 3, 4, and 5, respectively. The percentage of items categorized as critical comprehension items in the state tests range from 41% to 50%, 30% to 36%, and 14% to 44% in Grades 3, 4,

and 5, respectively. In Grade 3, all of the state tests have higher percentages of Critical Comprehension items than READS. In Grade 4, three of the state tests (data are not available for the WASL at Grade 4) have higher percentages of Critical Comprehension items than does READS. At Grade 5, all of the states except one have higher percentages of Critical Comprehension items than does READS. For the most part, items categorized as Critical Comprehension ask test takers to interpret, summarize, compare, infer meaning, and analyze text.

Author's Craft questions are included on most of the tests. These items ask test takers to identify audience, the author's purpose, and use of figurative language. The percentages of Author's Craft questions in the READS tests are 6%, 2%, and 10% in Grades 3, 4, and 5, respectively. The percentage of items categorized as Author's Craft items in the state tests range from 0% to 20%, 9% to 17%, and 11% to 37% in Grades 3, 4, and 5, respectively. In Grade 3, three of the state tests have higher percentages of Author's Craft items than does READS, and two state reading tests do not include Author's Craft questions. In Grade 4, four of the state tests (data are not available for the WASL at Grade 4) have higher percentages of Author's Craft items than does READS. At Grade 5, all of the states except one have higher percentages of Author's Craft items than does READS.

The last three categories are Genre/Text Features, Reading Response and Reference Skills. In general, there are very few items in these categories. Genre/Text Feature items require test takers to classify reading passage genre and to identify purposes of text features. The READS tests include Genre/Text Feature items only in the

Grade 4 test, accounting for 2% of the test items. The MEAP is the only other test to include Genre/Text Feature items (13% at Grade 4 and 6% at Grade 5).

Only one state test addresses Reading Response items. Eleven percent of the CMT items at Grade 5 are labeled as Reading Response items; that is, items that ask test takers to give their personal opinion on a topic. The final category is Reference Skills. This category asks test takers to select possible resources for finding additional information about a topic. Two state tests includes items categorized as Reference Skills. Three percent of the items in Grades 3 and 4 of the MEAP, and 11% of the CSAP at Grade 4 are identified as Reference Skills. None of the READS tests include Reference Skill items.

Table 11. Grade 3 Content Categorical Concurrence

Grade 3	% of Items in Content Categories					
	CSAP	CMT	MEAP	EOG	WASL	READS
Detail	9%	8%	27%	15%	0%	26%
Vocabulary in Content	9%	8%	7%	11%	11%	10%
Story Elements/Text Structures	23%	17%	7%	4%	21%	32%
Main Idea/Theme	9%	8%	10%	9%	7%	6%
Author's Craft	0%	0%	7%	20%	18%	6%
Critical Comprehension	50%	50%	30%	41%	43%	19%
Genre/Text Features	0%	0%	10%	0%	0%	0%
Reference Skills	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%
Reading Response	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Table 12. Grade 4 Content Categorical Concurrence

Grade 4	% of Items in Content Categories					
	CSAP	CMT	MEAP	EOG	WASL ^a	READS
Detail	15%	0%	7%	11%	—	21%
Vocabulary in Content	8%	9%	3%	9%	—	15%
Story Elements/Text Structures	13%	18%	7%	13%	—	25%
Main Idea/Theme	4%	27%	13%	9%	—	8%
Author's Craft	13%	9%	17%	15%	—	2%
Critical Comprehension	36%	36%	30%	41%	—	27%
Genre/Text Features	0%	0%	20%	0%	—	2%
Reference Skills	11%	0%	3%	0%	—	0%
Reading Response	0%	0%	3%	0%	—	0%

^aReleased test items were not available for review in the Grade 4 WASL.

Table 13. Grade 5 Content Categorical Concurrence

Grade 5	% of Items in Content Categories					
	CSAP	CMT	MEAP	EOG	WASL	READS
Detail	14%	0%	2%	11%	10%	14%
Vocabulary in Content	0%	11%	3%	15%	10%	17%
Story Elements/Text Structures	0%	22%	3%	4%	26%	19%
Main Idea	28%	0%	7%	8%	6%	12%
Author's Craft	28%	11%	37%	25%	16%	10%
Critical Comprehension	14%	44%	37%	36%	32%	27%
Genre/Text Features	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%
Reference Skills	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Reading Response	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%

IV. Conclusions

The analysis of the READS test in comparison to five state tests results in evidence that the READS tests are complementary to the state tests. Results from the READS Diagnostic Tests provide data that allow educators to identify students who may have difficulty succeeding on state tests and to identify areas of study that need instructional emphasis in order to improve performance on state tests. The READS Diagnostic Tests include assessments of phonological awareness and fluency that can help explain low performances on state tests by identifying students who do not have sufficient word-level reading skills to independently read and comprehend test passages written for the grade level in which the test is administered.

Analysis of the READS tests in relation to Depth of Knowledge indicates a developmental sequence in the measurement of comprehension from DOK Level 1 to DOK Level 3. The READS Grade 3 test is composed of short passages followed by mostly literal and inferential questions that are focused on basic understanding, while the READS Grade 5 test features longer passages followed by fewer literal questions and more complex inferential questions that require critical comprehension. Although READS tests do not address the thinking skills at the highest levels in a cognitive taxonomy such as evaluation and creation, they provide lenses through which educators are able to analyze more closely test takers' abilities to use cognitive skills related to remembering, understanding, and analyzing.

Analysis of the format of the READS Diagnostic Tests indicates that the READS tests include short, graded reading passages written specifically for the purpose of testing as opposed to longer, authentic passages included in the state tests. The READS tests use

a multiple-choice format exclusively to assess the reader's ability to identify literal information explicitly stated in reading passages as well as to make inferences about text structure, word meaning, text meaning, and author's craft. All except one of the state tests use a variety of question formats for assessing reading comprehension. The CSAP, CMT, MEAP, and WASL use short constructed-response items and/or extended constructed-response items in addition to multiple-choice items to assess reading comprehension and achievement of their states' respective English language arts curriculum standards. Although the READS tests do not provide data about how well students perform the writing tasks required on constructed-response items, they do provide data about the cognitive skills that are prerequisite skills for success on constructed-response items.

There is high categorical concurrence between READS and the five assessments examined in this alignment study. The areas in which READS correlates most strongly with the state tests are questions addressing Details, Story Elements/Text Structures, Main Idea/Themes, and Critical Comprehension. The content knowledge addressed in these categories of test items will inform teachers about areas of student strengths, areas that need additional instructional support or intervention, and areas where students are showing improvement.

Although there is strong content categorical concurrence in important comprehension skills, there are English language arts areas that are not adequately addressed by READS. These areas include Genre Features, Author's Craft, Reference Skills, and Reading Response. There are a minimal number of items in READS that address content related to Genre and Author's Craft and no items related to Reference Skills and Reading Response. There is insufficient opportunity for teachers to gather

feedback from READS to inform and guide their instruction in these significant curricular areas.

V. Recommendations

The recommendation of the reviewers is that, because there is significant content categorical concurrence between READS and five state reading tests, and because READS tests provide feedback that can be used to identify learning goals for students and inform instructional decisions, READS will serve as a useful companion to state tests. The data gathered through READS will support teachers as they develop individual learning plans for students who have not performed well on state tests. In addition READS will provide evidence of yearly growth for students whose growth may not be apparent on state assessments or during years in which state tests are not administered.

READS disaggregates word-level knowledge and comprehension skills and provides feedback in a manner that can be used by teachers to design focused instruction for individual students. The reviewers recommend that *Rigby READS* Diagnostic Tests be used to supplement state assessments because there is content categorical concurrence between READS and state instruments, a developmental sequencing of Depth of Knowledge, and a format that provides guidance in making instructional decisions.

VI. Caveats

It should be noted that in some instances there were a limited number of released state assessment items available. This situation had an impact on the percentages reported in this document. The number of items for each state assessment is reported in Table 7.

In addition, this review focused on the READS test items in the Reading Comprehension section of the tests, because state tests examined in this study contained no items related to word-level knowledge or fluency. A strength of the READS Diagnostic Tests is the inclusion of enabling skills, such as recognition of vowel and consonant letter sounds, vocabulary, word-part clues, and fluency, which are closely aligned with growth in comprehension.

Bibliography

- Anderson, L. W., Krathwohl, D. R., Airasian, P. W., Cruikshank, K. A., Mayer, R. E., Pintrich, et al. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: Longman.
- Colorado Department of Education. (1997). *Colorado Student Assessment Program: 1997 released passages, items, and prompts*. Denver: Author.
- Colorado Department of Education. (1999). *Colorado Student Assessment Program: 1999 released passages, items, and prompts*. Denver: Author.
- Colorado Department of Education. (2001). *Colorado Student Assessment Program: 2001 released passages, items, and prompts*. Denver: Author.
- Colorado Department of Education. (2002). *Colorado Student Assessment Program: 2002 released passages, items, and prompts*. Denver: Author.
- Colorado Department of Education. (2003). *Colorado Student Assessment Program: 2003 released passages, items, and prompts*. Denver: Author.
- Connecticut Department of Education. (n.d.). *Connecticut Mastery Test*. Retrieved December 5, 2006, from http://www.csde.state.ct.us/public/cedar/assessment/cmt/1_a_handbook.htm
- Farr, R., Beck, M. D., & Munroe, K. (2005). *Rigby READS: Reading evaluation and diagnostic system*. Austin, TX: Harcourt Achieve.
- Michigan Department of Education. (2001). *Michigan Education Assessment Program*. Retrieved December 5, 2006, from http://www.mi.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140-22709_31168_31355-95471--,00.html
- Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (2005). *Washington of Student Learning*. Retrieved December 5, 2006, from <http://www.k12.wa.us/assessment/WASL/readingpubdocs/WAgr3Rsmpltst.pdf>
- Popham, W. J. (2004). Tawdry tests and AYP. *Educational Leadership*, 62(2), 85–86.
- Public Schools of North Carolina. (n.d.). *North Carolina End-of-Grade Reading Comprehension Tests, Grades 3–8*. Retrieved December 5, 2006, from <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/testing/eog/reading/>
- Webb, N. L. (2005). *Web alignment tool training manual*. Madison: Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Draft 10/19/07

Wisconsin Center of Education Research. (2005). *Web alignment tool*. Retrieved December 5, 2006, from <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/wat/index.aspx>

Appendix A: Test Analysis Summaries

Table A1. CSAP Grade 3 Summary

Content Categories	DOK 1	DOK 2	DOK 3	DOK 4	Total Items	% of Items
Detail					2	9%
Detail/what		2			2	
Vocabulary in Context	1	1			2	9%
Story Elements/Text Structure					5	23%
Sequence		2			2	
Feeling/characteristic	1	2			3	
Main Idea		2			2	9%
Author's Craft					0	
Critical Comprehension					11	50%
Interpretation		1	2		3	
Cause and effect	2	2	1		5	
Comparison		2			2	
Prediction		1			1	
Genre/Text Features					0	0%
Reference Skills					0	0%
Reading Response					0	0%
Total items	4	15	3	0	22	
% of items	18%	68%	14%	0%		

Note. DOK = Depth of Knowledge.

Table A2. CSAP Grade 4 Summary

Content Categories	DOK 1	DOK 2	DOK 3	DOK 4	Total Items	% of Items
Detail					7	15%
Detail/what	2	2			4	
Detail/how	1	1			2	
Detail/function	1				1	
Vocabulary/Word Structure					4	8%
Vocabulary in context		3			3	
Vocabulary/antonym		1			1	
Story Elements/Text Structure					6	13%
Sequence	2	1			3	
Feeling/characteristic			2		2	
Event	1				1	
Main Idea		1	1		2	4%
Author's Craft					6	13%
Purpose	1		3		4	
Figurative language	1		1		2	
Critical Comprehension					17	36%
Interpretation			2		2	
Summary		1	1		2	
Cause and effect	2	3	1		6	
Comparison	1	2	1		4	
Prediction		2			2	
Distinguishing fact and opinion			1		1	
Reference Skills	1	3	1		5	11%
Reader Response					0	0%
Total items	13	20	14		47	
% of items	27%	43%	30%			

Table A3. CSAP Grade 5 Summary

Content Categories	DOK 1	DOK 2	DOK 3	DOK 4	Total Items	% of Items
Detail	1				1	14%
Story Elements/Text Structure					1	14%
Feeling/characteristic			1		1	
Main Idea		1	1		2	28%
Author's Craft					2	28%
Figurative language		1			1	
Purpose		1			1	
Critical Comprehension					1	14%
Prediction		1			1	
Genre/Text Features						
Reference Skills						
Reading Response						
Total items	1	4	2	0	7	
% of items	14%	57%	28%	0%		

Note. DOK = Depth of Knowledge.

Table A4. CMT Grade 3 Summary

Content Categories	DOK 1	DOK 2	DOK 3	DOK 4	Total Items	% of Items
Detail					1	8%
Detail/function	1				1	
Vocabulary in Context		1			1	8%
Word Structure					0	
Story Elements/Text Structure					2	17%
Sequence		1			1	
Setting	1				1	
Main Idea			1		1	8%
Author's Craft					0	
Critical Comprehension					6	50%
Interpretation			1	1	2	
Comparison				1	1	
Summary		1			1	
Prediction			1		1	
Determining importance			1		1	
Genre/Text Features						0%
Reference Skills						0%
Reading Response				1	1	8%
Total items	2	3	4	3	12	
% of items	17%	25%	33%	25%		

Note. DOK = Depth of Knowledge.

Table A5. CMT Grade 4 Summary

Content Categories	DOK 1	DOK 2	DOK 3	DOK 4	Total Items	% of Items
Detail					0	0%
Vocabulary in Context		1			1	9%
Story Elements/Text Structure					2	18%
Sequence		1			1	
Feelings/characteristics		1			1	
Main Idea/Theme		1	2		3	27%
Author's Craft/Text Feature		1			1	9%
Critical Comprehension					4	36%
Summary		1			1	
Prediction			1		1	
Cause and effect	1				1	
Perspective				1	1	
Genre/Text Features					0	0%
Reference Skills					0	0%
Reading Response					0	0%
Total items	1	6	3	1	11	
% of items	9%	55%	27%	9%		

Note. DOK = Depth of Knowledge.

Table A6. CMT Grade 5 Summary

Content Categories	DOK 1	DOK 2	DOK 3	DOK 4	Total Items	% of Items
Detail					0	0%
Vocabulary in Context		1			1	11%
Story Elements/Text Structure					2	22%
Sequence	2				2	
Main Idea/Theme					0	0%
Author's Craft					1	11%
Purpose			1		1	
Critical Comprehension					4	44%
Interpretation		1			1	
Inference			1		1	
Comparison			1	1	2	
Genre/Text Features					0	0%
Reference Skills					0	0%
Reading Response				1	1	11%
Total items	2	2	3	2	9	
% of items	22%	22%	33%	22%		

Note. DOK = Depth of Knowledge.

Table A7. MEAP Grade 3 Summary

Content Categories	DOK 1	DOK 2	DOK 3	DOK 4	Total Items	% of Items
Detail					8	27%
Detail/how	2				2	
Detail/event		1			1	
Detail/classification	1				1	
Detail/what	1				1	
Detail/how many	2				2	
Detail/where	1				1	
Vocabulary in Context		2			2	7%
Story Elements/Text Structure					2	7%
Setting		1			1	
Feelings/characteristics			1		1	
Main Idea			3		3	10%
Author's Craft					2	7%
Purpose		1	1		2	
Critical Comprehension					9	30%
Inference			1		1	
Summary			1		1	
Cause/effect		2			2	
Comparison		1	3		4	
Prediction				1	1	
Genre/Text Features		1	2		3	10%
Reference Skills			1		1	3%
Reading Response					0	0%
Total items	7	9	13	1	30	
% of items	23%	30%	43%	3%		

Note. DOK = Depth of Knowledge.

Table A8. MEAP Grade 4 Summary

Content Categories	DOK 1	DOK 2	DOK 3	DOK 4	Total Items	% of Items
Detail					2	7%
Detail/how					0	
Detail/event					0	
Detail/classification					0	
Detail/what		2			2	
Detail/how many					0	
Detail/where					0	
Vocabulary in Context		1			1	3%
Story Elements/Text Structure					2	7%
Setting					0	
Sequence	1				1	
Feelings/characteristics			1		1	
Main Idea/Theme			4		4	13%
Author's Craft					5	17%
Purpose			3		3	
Figurative language	1				1	
Rhetorical choice			1		1	
Critical Comprehension					9	30%
Inference			2		2	
Interpretation			1		1	
Summary					0	
Cause/effect		1	1		2	
Comparison			1		1	
Prediction					0	
Determining importance			1		1	
Close reading			1		1	
Supporting a position				1	1	
Genre/Text Features		1	5		6	20%
Reference Skills			1		1	3%
Reading Response					0	0%
Total items	2	5	22	1	30	
% of items	7%	17%	73%	3%		

Note. DOK = Depth of Knowledge.

Table A9. MEAP Grade 5 Summary

Content Categories	DOK 1	DOK 2	DOK 3	DOK 4	Total Items	% of Items
Detail					2	7%
Detail/how	1				1	
Detail/event					0	
Detail/classification					0	
Detail/what	1				1	
Detail/how many					0	
Detail/where					0	
Vocabulary in Context		1			1	3%
Story Elements/Text Structure					1	3%
Setting					0	
Sequence					0	
Feelings/characteristics			1		1	
Main Idea/Theme			2		2	7%
Author's Craft					11	37%
Purpose	1	3	4		8	
Figurative language					0	
Rhetorical choice					0	
Poetic device		2	1		3	
Critical Comprehension					11	37%
Inference		1			1	
Interpretation		1			1	
Summary					0	
Cause/effect	2	1	1		4	
Comparison	1	1	2		4	
Prediction					0	
Determining importance					0	
Close reading					0	
Taking and supporting a stance				1	1	
Genre/Text Features		2			2	6%
Reference Skills					0	0%
Reading Response					0	0%
Total items	6	12	11	1		
% of items	20%	40%	37%	3%	30	

Table A10. North Carolina EOG Test Grade 3 Summary

Content Categories	DOK 1	DOK 2	DOK 3	DOK 4	Total Items	% of Items
Detail					7	15%
Detail/how	2				2	
Detail/who	2				2	
Detail/what	1				1	
Detail/function	1	1			2	
Vocabulary in Context		5			5	11%
Story Elements/Text Structure					2	4%
Feelings/characteristic	1	1			2	
Main Idea		2	2		4	9%
Author's Craft					9	20%
Purpose		1	7		8	
Figurative language		1			1	
Critical Comprehension					19	41%
Interpretation		2	7		9	
Cause and effect	2	5	2		9	
Comparison			1		1	
Genre/Text Features					0	0%
Reference Skills					0	0%
Reading Response					0	0%
Total items	9	18	19		46	
% of items	20%	39%	41%			

Note. DOK = Depth of Knowledge.

Table A11. North Carolina EOG Test Grade 4 Summary

Content Categories	DOK 1	DOK 2	DOK 3	DOK 4	Total Items	% of Items
Detail					6	11%
Detail/what	2				2	
Detail/how	2				2	
Detail/function		2			2	
Vocabulary in Context		5			5	9%
Story Elements/Text Structure					7	13%
Setting	1	1			2	
Feelings/characteristics		3			3	
Event	2				2	
Main Idea/Theme		3	2		5	9%
Author's Craft					8	15%
Purpose		4			4	
Figurative language		1			1	
Literacy device		1	2		3	
Critical Comprehension					22	41%
Interpretation		3	1		4	
Cause and effect	2	5			7	
Comparison		4	1		5	
Prediction		2			2	
Motive			1		1	
Determining importance		1	1		2	
Critical thinking			1		1	
Genre/Text Features					0	0%
Reference Skills					0	0%
Reading Response					0	0%
Total items	9	35	9		53	
% of items	17%	66%	17%			

Note. DOK = Depth of Knowledge.

Table A12. North Carolina EOG Test Grade 5 Summary

Content Categories	DOK 1	DOK 2	DOK 3	DOK 4	Total Items	% of Items
Detail					6	11%
Detail/what	2	2			4	
Detail/where	2				2	
Vocabulary in Context		8			8	15%
Story Elements/Text Structure					2	4%
Setting		1			1	
Sequence	1				1	
Main Idea		2	2		4	8%
Author's Craft					13	25%
Figurative language		2			2	
Purpose	1	6	4		11	
Critical Comprehension					19	36%
Interpretation		3	2		5	
Inference			1		1	
Cause and effect	1	4	1		6	
Comparison		2			2	
Prediction		1			1	
Determining importance			2		2	
Determining support			1		1	
Application			1		1	
Genre/Text Features					0	0%
Reference Skills					0	0%
Reading Response					0	0%
Total items	7	31	14	0	52	
% of items	13%	60%	27%	0%		

Note. DOK = Depth of Knowledge.

Table A13. WASL Grade 3 Summary

Content Categories	DOK 1	DOK 2	DOK 3	DOK 4	Total Items	% of Items
Detail					0	0%
Vocabulary in Context		3			3	11%
Story Elements/Text Structure					6	21%
Setting	1				1	
Sequence	2	1			3	
Feeling/characteristic		1			1	
Problem			1		1	
Main Idea			2		2	7%
Author's Craft					5	18%
Author's purpose			4		4	
Audience			1		1	
Critical Comprehension					12	43%
Cause and effect	1	2			3	
Comparison		3	1		4	
Prediction		1	3		4	
Summary			1		1	
Genre/Text Features					0	0%
Reference Skills					0	0%
Reading Response					0	0%
Total items	4	11	13		28	
% of items	14%	39%	46%			

Note. DOK = Depth of Knowledge.

Table A14. WASL Grade 5 Summary

Content Categories	DOK 1	DOK 2	DOK 3	DOK 4	Total Items	% of Items
Detail					3	10%
Detail/what	2					
Detail/where	1					
Vocabulary in Context		3			3	10%
Story Elements/Text Structure					8	26%
Feelings/characteristics		2			2	
Sequence	2	3			5	
Problem			1		1	
Main Idea			2		2	6%
Author's Craft					5	16%
Audience		2			2	
Purpose			3		3	
Critical Comprehension					10	32%
Cause and effect		1	2		3	
Comparison		3	1		4	
Prediction			1		1	
Summary			1		1	
Fact and opinion			1		1	
Genre/Text Features					0	0%
Reference Skills					0	0%
Reading Response					0	0%
Total items	5	14	12	0		
% of items	16%	45%	39%	0%		

Note. DOK = Depth of Knowledge.

Table A15. Rigby READS Grade 3 Summary

Content Categories	DOK 1	DOK 2	DOK 3	DOK 4	Total Items	% of Items
Detail					8	26%
Detail/how	1				1	
Detail/event	1				1	
Detail function	3				3	
Detail/what	3				3	
Vocabulary in Context		3			3	10%
Story Elements/Text Structure					10	32%
Setting	1				1	
Feelings/characteristics	2	4			6	
Sequence	3				3	
Main Idea	1		1		2	6%
Author's Craft					2	6%
Figurative language	1				1	
Audience		1			1	
Critical Comprehension					6	19%
Inference		2			2	
Cause/effect	1	2			3	
Comparison		1			1	
Genre/Text Features					0	0%
Reference Skills					0	0%
Reading Response					0	0%
Total items	17	13	1		31	
% of items	55%	42%	3%	0%		

Note. DOK = Depth of Knowledge.

Table A16. Rigby READS Grade 4 Summary

Content Categories	DOK 1	DOK 2	DOK 3	DOK 4	Total Items	% of Items
Detail					10	21%
Detail/who	1	1			2	
Detail/what	3				3	
Detail/when	0				0	
Detail/where	1				1	
Detail/how	3				3	
Detail/function		1			1	
Vocabulary in Context		7			7	15%
Story Elements/Text Structure					12	25%
Setting	1				1	
Feelings/characteristics	1	2			3	
Sequence	1				1	
Problem	1				1	
Solution		2			2	
Event	3	1			4	
Main Idea			4		4	8%
Author's Craft					1	2%
Figurative language	1				1	
Critical Comprehension					13	27%
Determining fact and opinion			1		1	
Comparison		1			1	
Cause and effect	3	5			8	
Prediction	1				1	
Motive		2			2	
Genre/Text Features			1		1	2%
Genre					1	
Reference Skills					0	0%
Reading Response					0	0%
Total items	20	22	6	0	48	
% of items	42%	46%	13%	0%		

Note. DOK = Depth of Knowledge.

Table A17. Rigby READS Grade 5 Summary

Content Category	DOK 1	DOK 2	DOK 3	DOK 4	Total Items	% of Items
Detail					7	14%
Detail/what	5	1			6	
Detail/where		1			1	
Vocabulary in Context		8			8	17%
Story Elements/Text Structure					9	19%
Feelings/characteristics		1			1	
Sequence	5				5	
Problem	1	1			2	
Event	1				1	
Main Idea/Theme	1	1	4		6	12%
Author's Craft					5	10%
Purpose		1	1		2	
Figurative language	1		1		2	
Audience			1		1	
Critical Comprehension					13	27%
Inference		2			2	
Cause and effect	1	9	1		11	
Genre/Text Features					0	0%
Reference Skills					0	0%
Reader Response					0	0%
Total items	15	25	8		48	
% of items	31%	52%	17%			

Note. DOK = Depth of Knowledge.