



TECHNICAL REPORT #35:

Teacher Use Study: Surveys from Rural Districts

*Christine Espin, Stan Deno, Kristen McMaster, Rebecca Pierce,
Seungsoo Yeo, Amy Mahlke, and Beth Zukowski*

RIPM Year 5: 2007 – 2008

Dates of Study: October 2007 – May 2008

September 2009

The College of Education
& Human Development

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA



Produced by the Research Institute on Progress Monitoring (RIPM) (Grant # H324H30003) awarded to the Institute on Community Integration (UCEDD) in collaboration with the Department of Educational Psychology, College of Education and Human Development, at the University of Minnesota, by the Office of Special Education Programs. See progressmonitoring.net.

Purpose of Primary Study

Teacher Use Study (2007-2008): CBM with and without Diagnostic Feedback

(Taken from Tech Report #32)

The purpose of this study was to examine factors that affect teachers' use of progress monitoring data for designing instructional programs. Specifically, we compared the use of progress monitoring data alone to progress monitoring data combined with diagnostic feedback. The hypothesis was that progress monitoring data coupled with diagnostic feedback would increase teachers' use of data in designing student instruction, broaden the type of interventions teachers use with students, and effect greater student achievement gains. The study was guided by the following question: "Does the use of a diagnostic feedback system coupled with progress monitoring affect teachers' use of CBM data?"

Purpose of Survey Component

As part of the above Teacher Use Study study, teachers were asked to fill out two different survey forms: a survey for each individual student and an overall survey. The purpose of both surveys was to examine the effects progress monitoring measures with and without diagnostic feedback had on teacher instruction. Initially, instructional plans and a form on which teachers documented instructional changes were to be used to measure these effects. However, as the study progressed and it became clear that the instructional plans would not yield sufficient information, the researchers decided to generate the surveys as an additional collection method.

Method

Setting and Participants

The participants in this study were from 8 schools within a rural cooperative (see Tech Report #32 for detailed description of the setting). The 21 teacher participants taught students

who experienced academic difficulties in reading. During the primary study, each teacher monitored the reading progress of two, four, or six students using CBM. In addition, each teacher received diagnostic feedback (detailed error analysis of the CBM readings) for half of their student participants (one, two, or three students who had been matched on reading level with another participating student from their classroom and assigned randomly to the diagnostic feedback condition). In total, teachers completed individual surveys on 45 students for whom they received CBM data alone, and 45 students for whom teachers received diagnostic feedback along with the CBM data. All 90 students received supplemental reading instruction in individual or small group settings. For detailed demographic information about teacher and student participants see Tech Report #32.

Independent Variable

The independent variable in this study was the information teachers received from progress monitoring. Teachers received CBM data (reading aloud) for half (one, two, or three) of their student participants. For the other half, they received CBM data *and* detailed error analysis information. The software used for error analysis was called Subskill Analysis of Reading Fluency (SARF; 2006).

Surveys

Two surveys were generated by the researchers to examine how CBM data with and without additional diagnostic data influenced teachers' instructional decisions. Each survey was created in a three-step process. First, the researchers and a representative from the school district identified specific topics to be surveyed. Next, two research assistants drafted a prototype. Third, the research team met two additional times to revise the prototype. Both surveys were administered at the end of the study.

Student survey. The student survey contained five items (see Appendix A). The first four items required teachers to rate the influence of progress monitoring and diagnostic feedback on student performance, instructional planning, and their judgment of student performance. The teachers were asked to rate the influence from 1 (not at all) to 4 (a lot). The last item asked teachers to make recommendations for the future programming of the students. Teachers filled out one survey for each student participant whose progress was monitored with or without diagnostic feedback.

General survey. In addition to filling out a survey on each student participant, teachers also completed a survey that asked 12 questions about progress monitoring (with and without diagnostic feedback) in general. The first four questions focused on the technology required for recording CBM data and for using the error analysis software. The next three questions queried the process of sharing CBM data with a partner in an online forum. Five questions centered on how beneficial the teachers considered CBM data with and without diagnostic feedback for instructional purposes. One question asked teachers to rank the student participants by the amount of growth they made during the primary study. See Appendix B for the complete survey.

Design and Data Analysis

A within-teacher design was used, in which each teacher's participating students were matched on reading level and assigned randomly to progress monitoring with or without diagnostic feedback (SARF or non-SARF). **Describe data analysis.**

Results

In this study, we used surveys to collect evidence of the effects CBM data with and without diagnostic feedback have on teacher instruction. First, we present the differential effects as evidenced in the student surveys, and then, as evidenced in the general survey. Data from the

student surveys were analyzed using *t*-tests to compare teacher responses for students monitored with and without diagnostic feedback (SARF and non-SARF). The tables below present item-by-item means and *SD*s for the whole group and by condition, as well as the corresponding *t*-value.

Student Surveys

<i>Item 1.</i> To what extent has weekly progress monitoring helped you learn about _____'s reading growth in the following areas?	<i>Condition</i> SARF =45 Non SARF=45	<i>Overall Mean</i>	<i>Overall SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t-value</i>
General Reading Skills	SARF	3.11	.66	3.07	.720	-.64
	Non-SARF			3.16	.601	
Phonemic Awareness: sounds in spoken words	SARF	2.65	.97	2.49	.920	-1.62
	Non-SARF			2.82	.995	
Phonics: Letter/Sound relationships & decoding	SARF	2.79	.91	2.67	.879	-1.28
	Non-SARF			2.91	.925	
Fluency: Reading quickly, correctly & w/expression	SARF	3.35	.64	3.36	.609	.05
	Non-SARF			3.35	.686	
Vocabulary: Word meaning	SARF	2.17	.84	2.09	.821	-.88
	Non-SARF			2.24	.857	
Comprehension: Understanding of text	SARF	2.48	.89	2.40	.863	-.83
	Non-SARF			2.56	.918	

Note. The scale used for these items ranged from 1(Not at all) to 4 (A lot).

Based on the results regarding item 1, there was no significant difference between the two groups.

<i>Item2.</i> To what extent did _____'s progress monitoring data in reading influence changes in the following?	<i>Condition</i> <i>SARF =45</i> <i>Non=44</i>	<i>Overall</i> <i>Mean</i>	<i>Overall</i> <i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t-value</i>
Total reading time	SARF	2.32	.965	2.18	.860	-1.40
	Non-SARF			2.47	1.054	
Type of instructional activities	SARF	2.96	.722	2.76	.712	-2.73
	Non-SARF			3.16	.680	
Distribution of time allocated to instructional activities	SARF	2.71	.882	2.53	.842	-1.92
	Non-SARF			2.89	.895	
Materials used	SARF	2.81	.877	2.62	.912	-2.07
	Non-SARF			3.00	.807	
Student grouping	SARF	2.40	.989	2.34	1.010	-.54
	Non-SARF			2.45	.975	
Motivation strategies	SARF	2.46	.799	2.42	.783	-.46
	Non-SARF			2.50	.821	
IEP goals/objectives	SARF	2.65	1.070	2.62	1.103	.23
	Non-SARF			2.68	1.047	

Note. The scale used for these items ranged from 1(Not at all) to 4 (A lot).

Based on the results regarding item 2, there was no significant difference between the two groups.

3. <i>Item 3. After reflecting on _____'s progress monitoring data, if you were given the necessary resources and freedom (i.e., no time constraints, no specific ratio of teacher to students), to what extent would you make changes in the elements of _____'s instructional program listed below .</i>	<i>Condition</i> SARF=44 Non=44	<i>Overall Mean</i>	<i>Overall SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t-value</i>
Total reading time	SARF	2.81	.920	2.86	.905	.577
	Non-SARF			2.75	.943	
Type of instructional activities	SARF	2.92	.805	2.93	.728	.132
	Non-SARF			2.91	.884	
Distribution of time allocated to instructional activities	SARF	3.03	.850	3.05	.834	.125
	Non-SARF			3.02	.876	
Materials used	SARF	2.72	.742	2.73	.817	.133
	Non-SARF			2.70	.668	
Student grouping	SARF	2.55	.909	2.61	.868	.366
	Non-SARF			2.48	.952	
Motivation strategies	SARF	2.61	.932	2.51	.985	.237
	Non-SARF			2.70	.878	
IEP goals/objectives	SARF	2.43	.901	2.33	.859	.358
	Non-SARF			2.54	.942	
Federal setting	SARF	1.93	.938	1.93	.959	.434
	Non-SARF			1.92	.929	

Note. The scale used for these items ranged from 1(Not at all) to 4 (A lot).

Based on the results regarding item 3, there was no significant difference between the two groups.

<i>Item 4.</i> To what extent did the following influence your judgments about _____'s improvement in reading?	<i>Condition</i> SARF = 44 Non =44	<i>Overall</i> <i>Mean</i>	<i>Overall</i> <i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t-value</i>
Comparing this week's score to last week's score	SARF	2.65	.95	2.64	.917	-.11
	Non-SARF			2.66	.987	
Comparing performance level to goal	SARF	3.17	.82	3.14	.824	-.39
	Non-SARF			3.20	.823	
Examining growth (slope of the data) across weeks	SARF	3.24	.80	3.16	.805	-.93
	SARF			3.32	.800	
Listening as student reads aloud	Non-SARF	3.28	.79	3.30	.851	.13
	SARF			3.27	.727	
Watching as student reads silently	Non-SARF	2.18	.93	2.16	.924	.21
	SARF			2.20	.954	
Noting the number and type of errors made	SARF	3.10	.73	2.95	.722	-1.92
	Non-SARF			3.25	.719	

Note. The scale used for these items ranged from 1(Not at all) to 4 (A lot).

Based on the results regarding item 4, there was no significant difference between the two groups.

General Survey

<i>Item1.</i> How easy/difficult was it to use the read aloud measure for progress monitoring? Rate each of the components below:	<i>Mean</i> (<i>n =20</i>)	<i>SD</i>
Administering read aloud measures	1.05	.224
Scoring read aloud measures	1.60	1.05
Graphing read aloud data	1.45	.759

Note. The scale used for these items ranged from 1(Easy) to 4 (Difficult).

It appears that the most teachers feel that it is easy to administer CBM measures.

<i>Item2</i> Thinking of SARF, once the final version was loaded, how easy/difficult was it to use the SARF along with your progress monitoring?	<i>Mean</i> (<i>n =20</i>)	<i>SD</i>
Determining SARF error codes	2.40	.821
Entering data into the SARF program	2.60	1.05
Accessing the SARF reports	1.95	.999

Note. The scale used for these items ranged from 1(Easy) to 4 (Difficult).

Compared to CBM measures, it seems that the teacher have difficulties in using SARF.

<i>Item3.</i> In what way did the following influence your use of the AIMSweb technology.	<i>Mean</i> (<i>n =20</i>)	<i>SD</i>
Computer access	1.20	.523
Your computer skills	1.55	.759
User-friendliness of OCR site	1.40	.598
Time constraints	2.40	.940

Note. The scale used for these items ranged from 1(Made easy) to 4 (Made difficult).

Based on the results for item 3, time is one of the key factors affecting the use of CBM.

<i>Item4.</i> In what way did the following influence your use of the SARF program?	<i>Mean</i> (<i>n =20</i>)	<i>SD</i>
Computer access	1.35	.671
Your computer skills	1.85	.813
User-friendliness of OCR site	1.74	.872
Time constraints	2.80	.951

Note. The scale used for these items ranged from 1(Made easy) to 4 (Made difficult).

Like the CBM measures, time is an important element affecting the use of SARF.

<i>Item5.</i> How much impact did the following have on your use of Moodle?	<i>Mean</i> (<i>n =20</i>)	<i>SD</i>
Computer access	1.45	.826
Your computer skills	1.80	.696
User-friendliness of OCR site	1.95	.621
Time constraints	2.95	.705

Note. The scale used for these items ranged from 1(Made easy) to 4 (Made difficult).

Compared to other skills, time is viewed as a key factor affecting use of Moodle (the online tool teachers used to post and discuss date; see Tech Report #32).

	<i>Mean</i> (<i>n =20</i>)	<i>SD</i>
<i>Item6.</i> Do you think partner feedback through Moodle is a valuable resource for problem solving?	2.11	.676

Note. The scale used for these items ranged from 1(Not at all) to 4 (A lot).

Interestingly, most of the teachers did not think that their partner feedback from Moodle was valuable.

<i>Item7</i> Based on your experience, to what extent are progress monitoring data from read aloud measures without SARF data beneficial for planning instruction for members of the following groups?	<i>Mean</i> (<i>n</i> =20)	<i>SD</i>
Students in Grades 1-3	3.20	.862
Students in Grades 4-6	2.65	.606
Students in Grade 7 & above	2.55	.522
Students with limited reading skills	3.00	.918
Students with higher reading skills	2.56	.784
English Language Learners	2.93	.884
Native English speakers	2.94	.873

Note. The scale used for these items ranged from 1(Not at all) to 4 (A lot).

<i>Item8.</i> To what extent are progress monitoring data from read aloud measures with SARF data beneficial for planning instruction for members of the following group?	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Students in Grades 1-3	3.67	.617
Students in Grades 4-6	3.29	.772
Students in Grade 7 & above	3.36	.674
Students with limited reading skills	3.20	.951
Students with higher reading skills	2.83	.707
English Language Learners	3.25	.931
Native English speakers	3.35	.702

Note. The scale used for these items ranged from 1(Not at all) to 4 (A lot).

Overall, the teachers think that progress monitoring data from read aloud measures with SARF data are beneficial for planning instruction.

<i>Item9.</i> In general, how frequently did you do the following?	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Collect progress-monitoring data	1.00	.000
Enter data to OCR graphs	1.00	.000
Examine OCR graphs	1.35	.587
Post on Moodle	1.35	.745

Note. The scale used for these items is 1(Once per week), 2 (Once per month), 3 (Once per rotation) and 4 (Once during this study).

On average, the teachers collected progress monitoring data, entered data to OCR graphs examined OCR graphs, and posted Moodle once per week.

<i>Item10.</i> In the future how likely are you to use the following progress monitoring measures:	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Reading aloud	3.75	.716
Reading aloud +SARF	3.15	.813

Note. The scale used for these items ranged from 1(Not likely) to 4 (Very likely).

It appears that teacher prefer to use of reading aloud measures alone slightly more than with SARF (we did not ask if they would prefer to use SARF alone; this might have been a useful question).

Reading Aloud Strengths

- Easy to administer and score
- Materials all there, computer keeps track. Good info for IEP's, PLP's & objectives.
- Nice data collection. Fairly user friendly w/regard to convenience--all probes are there & leveled.
- The AIMSweb charts show us if the current reading program is working or if something needs to be changed or added. It is also a place to keep data and interventions
- easy to admin, score, review results
- Excellent opportunity to analyze kids' reading habits--errors, predicting across a line, interaction w/text, awareness of audience
- Good way to monitor students.
- Doing what is normally done.
- Quick-simple to administer. Easy to use online recording of graphs.
- Can see student growth. Response to Intervention data. Can see a need for beginning additional interventions.
- Provides individual information on reading fluency progress. Provides information on effectiveness of instruction as it relates to reading fluency and ultimately comprehension.
- More oral practice on a consistent basis.
- Great to track improvement - I like the visual of the chart- easy to see if a new intervention needs to happen - kids like to see their progress- by the end of the year they actually looked forward to the weekly fluencies and charting.
- can't cheat - must do the reading; allows you to analyze student's reading
- quick and easy; kids don't "sweat it"; an easy way to track progress
- precise teacher awareness/prefer alternate fluency/maze data collection; used Aimsweb charts and data for IEP pleps; para able to track basic info

Reading Aloud Weaknesses

- doesn't give information other than errors
- doesn't teach a skill to help actually read
- Some probes are more difficult than others (even though they should all be that particular grade level). This makes it difficult for speech students. Some names used in probes are way too difficult. Should use common names.
- For students with difficulty with comprehension, the one-minute timed readings don't tell a lot about progress.
- No comprehension component
- can't see error patterns as easily
- Does not give you any information other than it was an error.
- Shouldn't over-emphasize building fluency to the detriment of comprehension
- Need of quiet area for other students not involved.
- Weekly rather than every other week.
- Time constraints with many students to progress monitor.

- Some of the passages are more difficult than others - this affects their fluency on some weeks.
- The passages did not seem to progress in difficulty so the student's progress was so variable.
- Not real helpful in deciding how to improve individual student success - takes time to analyze errors on your own.
- time involved; students can get tired of doing it and lose interest.
- time consuming because I do it weekly - I try to do on a set date, but time gets away from me!
- Had to learn 3 new computer processes! Wow! And through short, quick teaching moments; use of time- better after para learned processes
- Lacks a true comprehension component

SARF Strengths

- Great for looking more in depth into errors
- like knowing the categories the word
- Will help determine which categories they struggle in and which they show improvement in. Good data to share with parents & PLP for IEPs.
- Great data & parent report. Nice that it shows longitudinal growth for a student. Would be great for RTI decisions making.
- It breaks down problem areas and creates word lists.
- the reports and prescriptive pieces are useful. I didn't use them because I had Sarf + nonSarf together in class.
- Great tool for looking more in depth into errors students are making--helps you plan better. Great if student made just a few errors.
- Error analysis; word lists for instruction
- Break Down of errors. I listen more carefully for errors.
- Has nice readouts of practice words.
- It identifies many specific area which need remediation
- Specific information regarding errors.
- Great resource provided through the word lists & analysis of errors.
- Great tool for identifying error patterns.
- I love how SARF analyzes errors- specifically shows problems with CVC, sight words, etc. so you easily know what to remediate
- error analysis helpful to show error patterns; Good word list can be developed to help child; Good early growth; May be more beneficial for younger grades.
- None
- Great idea! The SARF program has promise to be a helpful teaching tool. More positives than negatives, like word list analysis; Interest to see SARF program available
- identifies types of errors, creates lists of problematic words

SAFR Weaknesses

- Hard to click on buttons at bottom fast enough
- time, glitches
- Word lists that are generated are not appropriate for younger grades. It would be nice to have a

feature when you could say you'd like the words generated for a certain grade level. If you only use Sopris-West Lang. the multi-syl, prefix, suffix, are never addressed--Rewards does.

- Word lists are too hard for the younger kids.
- All the kinds -> hard to get all errors entered in one minute.
- Time consuming - not user friendly
- Having to do it with paper pencil and enter later. I don't think I could do it without paper pencil.
- Didn't work all the time--very effective tool when it is working. Hard to click on buttons at bottom fast enough if student was making a lot of errors.
- Putsy, multi-stepped & time consuming, somewhat unreliable.
- Time for 1 to 1 reading.
- Not enough training/snafus in program.
- Cumbersome - time consuming
- More time constraints. I would only use with a specific group of at risk students.
- Difficult to enter all of student's errors in one min. too difficult too administer and enter on computer at the same time, while starting and stopping timer.
- Some computer glitches that made the program cumbersome.
- glitches in program - once in a while the passage I had given wasn't a choice on SARF - I never did get efficient enough to enter data on computer as student was reading- did paper errors and then transferred over
- bugs in the system; hard to enter data without recording readings; Not as easy to implement in larger groups.
- paper copies didn't line up with computer screen copy, 2. I was not confident in my ability to code errors especially with 1 min. to go from paper to screen! 3. My #'s correct did not match up with what was on the screen. 4. I did not know we could get at reports 'til very late in the study so never learned their potential for use. 5. My students chosen to be "SARFed" have fluency issues, but read at a high level of accuracy so error reports contained little info.
- Want scoring to be optional - timed or untimed; 1 min. scoring requires more eye/hand coordination than I have. It was hard to network with research team to review process; would have liked specific group networks to update problems.

References

- Scullin, S., Werde, S., Christ, T. J., (2006). *Subskill analysis of reading fluency (SARF) 3.4: A review of miscue analysis and informal reading inventories* (Tech. Rep. No. 1).
Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Appendix A

Student-Specific Survey

Student:

This year you have monitored the progress of students with reading aloud measures for all the students and SARF for some of your students. We are interested in your impressions about using Reading Aloud and SARF. In completing the following survey, please try to focus on _____ and the type of progress monitoring procedures used with that student, (read aloud w/wo SARF)

1. To what extent has weekly **progress monitoring** helped you learn about _____'s reading growth in the following areas?

	NOT AT ALL			A LOT
General Reading Skills	1	2	3	4
Phonemic Awareness: sounds in spoken words	1	2	3	4
Phonics: Letter/Sound relationships & decoding	1	2	3	4
Fluency: Reading quickly, correctly & w/expression	1	2	3	4
Vocabulary: Word meaning	1	2	3	4
Comprehension: Understanding of text	1	2	3	4
Other (please state):	1	2	3	4

1. To what extent did _____'s **progress monitoring data** in reading influence changes in the following?

	NOT AT ALL			A LOT
Total reading time	1	2	3	4
Type of instructional activities	1	2	3	4
Distribution of time allocated to instructional activities	1	2	3	4
Materials used	1	2	3	4
Student grouping	1	2	3	4
Motivation strategies	1	2	3	4
IEP goals /objectives	1	2	3	4
Other (please elaborate): _____	1	2	3	4

2. **After reflecting on _____'s progress monitoring data**, if you were given the necessary resources and freedom (i.e., no time constraints, no specific ratio of teacher to students), to what extent would you make changes in the elements of _____'s instructional program listed below .

	NOT AT ALL			A LOT
Total reading time	1	2	3	4
Type of instructional activities	1	2	3	4
Distribution of time allocated to instructional activities	1	2	3	4
Materials used	1	2	3	4
Student grouping	1	2	3	4
Motivation strategies	1	2	3	4
IEP goals/objectives	1	2	3	4
Federal setting	1	2	3	4
Other (please elaborate): _____	1	2	3	4

3. To what extent did the following influence your judgments about _____'s improvement in reading?

	NEVER			A LOT
Comparing this week's score to last week's score	1	2	3	4
Comparing performance level to goal	1	2	3	4
Examining the growth (trend data) across weeks	1	2	3	4
Listening as student reads aloud	1	2	3	4
Watching as student reads silently	1	2	3	4
Noting the number and type of errors made	1	2	3	4

4. Suppose you were to provide recommendations for _____'s next special education teacher. **Based on the progress-monitoring data** you accumulated throughout this year, what instructional recommendations would you make for improving _____'s reading? Please suggest three or more instructional recommendations.

Recommendation 1:

Recommendation 2:

Recommendation 3:

Recommendation 4:

Recommendation 5:

Appendix B

Overall survey of Progress Monitoring, SARF and Moodle

Please rate the following items as they relate to your experience, in general, when using Progress Monitoring measures:

1. How easy/difficulty was it to use the read aloud measure for progress monitoring. Rate each of the components below.

	EASY			DIFFICULT
Administration of reading aloud measures	1	2	3	4
Scoring reading aloud measures	1	2	3	4
Graphing the reading aloud data	1	2	3	4

2. Thinking of SARF, once the final version was loaded, how easy/difficult was it to use the SARF along with your progress monitoring?

	EASY			DIFFICULT
Determining SARF error codes	1	2	3	4
Entering data into the SARF program	1	2	3	4
Accessing the SARF reports	1	2	3	4

3. In what way did the following influence your use of the AIMSweb technology. Make SARF question the same

	MADE EASY			MADE DIFFICULT
Computer access	1	2	3	4
Your computer skills	1	2	3	4
User-friendliness of AIMSweb site	1	2	3	4
Time constraints	1	2	3	4

4. In what way did the following influence your use of the SARF program?

	MADE EASY			MADE DIFFICULT
Computer access	1	2	3	4
Your computer skills	1	2	3	4
User-friendliness of AIMSweb site	1	2	3	4
Time constraints	1	2	3	4

5. How much impact did the following have on your use of Moodle?

	MADE EASY			MADE DIFFICULT
Computer access	1	2	3	4
Your computer skills	1	2	3	4
User-friendliness of Moodle site	1	2	3	4
Time constraints	1	2	3	4

6. Do you think partner feedback through Moodle is a valuable resource for problem solving?

	NOT AT ALL	1	2	3	A LOT
		1	2	3	4

Please make comments that will help us improve potential future use of Moodle for data-sharing between teachers

Comment 1:

Comment 2:

Comment 3:

7. Based on your experience, to what extent are progress monitoring data from read aloud measures without SARF data beneficial for planning instruction for members of the following groups?

	NOT AT ALL	1	2	3	A LOT
Students in Grades 1-3	1	2	3	4	
Students in Grades 4-6	1	2	3	4	
Students in Grade 7 & above	1	2	3	4	
Student with limited reading skills	1	2	3	4	
Student with higher reading skills	1	2	3	4	
English Language Learners	1	2	3	4	
Native English speakers	1	2	3	4	

8. To what extent are progress monitoring data from read aloud measures with SARF data beneficial for planning instruction for members of the following group?

	NOT AT ALL	1	2	3	A LOT
Students in Grades 1-3	1	2	3	4	
Students in Grades 4-6	1	2	3	4	
Students in Grade 7 & above	1	2	3	4	
Student with limited reading skills	1	2	3	4	
Student with higher reading skills	1	2	3	4	
English Language Learners	1	2	3	4	
Native English speakers	1	2	3	4	

9. In general, how frequently did you do the following?

	ONCE PER WEEK	ONCE PER MONTH	ONCE PER 6 WEEK ROTATION	ONCE DURING THE STUDY
Collect progress monitoring data	1	2	3	4
Entered data into AIMSweb	1	2	3	4
Examine the AIMSweb graphs	1	2	3	4
Entered data into SARF	1	2	3	4
Examine SARF reports	1	2	3	4
Post on Moodle	1	2	3	4

10. In the future, how likely are you to use the following progress monitoring tools:

	Not likely			Very likely
Reading Aloud	1	2	3	4
Read Aloud + SARF (if it works well)	1	2	3	4

11. We want you to give us your estimate of the amount of growth made this year by students you progressed monitored **in the study** this year. Please list the students you progress monitored in order from those who made the most growth to those who made the least growth.

Most growth: _____

Least growth: _____

12. Please tell us what you think are the strengths and weaknesses of the Reading Aloud and SARF tools.

Reading Aloud

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

SARF

Strengths:

Weaknesses: