

CHAPTER 6

Quality Assurance Program for PIRLS 2021

Ieva Johansone
Susan Flicop

Overview

Standardized assessment materials and survey operations procedures were developed and adapted from previous cycles so that the PIRLS 2021 data collection met the highest standards. The TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, working with IEA Amsterdam, developed an International Quality Assurance Program to document data collection activities and verify that the standardized procedures were followed. IEA Amsterdam appointed International Quality Control Monitors (IQCMs) to implement the program by visiting a sample of schools in each country to observe the PIRLS 2021 administration. This chapter provides an overview of the PIRLS 2021 International Quality Assurance Program and reports the data collected through the program, noting any issues related to the COVID-19 pandemic that coincided with data collection. School access issues related to the pandemic were addressed on a country-by-country basis.

An important aspect of the PIRLS International Quality Assurance Program is the independence of the IQCMs from the national centers. In most participating countries and benchmarking entities, IEA Amsterdam recruited IQCMs who had served in the same role in previous IEA assessments. For the remaining countries, National Research Coordinators assisted IEA Amsterdam in nominating an IQCM. The nominated person could not be a member of the national center, or a family member or personal friend of the National Research Coordinator. Often, this person was a school inspector, ministry official, or retired school teacher. The IQCM was required to be fluent in both English and the language(s) spoken in the country.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, training for IQCMs was provided electronically. A series of ten pre-recorded presentations and accompanying PDF versions were sent to each IQCM prior to beginning their assignments. In the videos, IQCMs were introduced to the *PIRLS 2021 Survey Operations Procedures* ([Chapter 4](#)) as well as the PIRLS 2021 achievement booklets, context questionnaires, and National Adaptation Forms (NAFs). IQCMs were also supplied with a manual detailing their role and responsibilities as well as the necessary materials for completing the quality control tasks. Three “Question & Answer” sessions were held via Zoom to answer any questions

the IQCMs had after reviewing the presentations and documents. Additional support was provided as needed from the TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center.

The major task of the IQCMs was to conduct site visits during the data collection process. In each country, the IQCM visited a sample of 15 participating schools during the assessment administration. When one or more benchmarking entities participated from the same country and a single centrally organized national center was responsible for all aspects of data collection, the IQCM visited five additional schools in each benchmarking region in addition to the schools visited for the country as a whole. In countries transitioning to digitalPIRLS during the 2021 assessment cycle, three additional schools were visited to observe the paper bridge booklet administration.

In each school that they visited, IQCMs observed the PIRLS testing sessions and recorded their observations, noting any deviations from the standardized administration script, timing, and procedures. They also interviewed the School Coordinators about their experiences coordinating the assessment. IQCMs checked the context questionnaires to verify that the suggestions made by the international translation and layout verifiers ([Chapter 5](#)) had been integrated into the final instruments, as documented in the National Adaptations Forms. In countries administering PIRLS 2021 on paper, IQCMs reviewed these suggestions for the national achievement booklets as well. Since the digitalPIRLS translation and verification process was conducted in RM's Assessment Master (www.rm.com), all changes were tracked by the software and no additional checking by the IQCMs was necessary.

IQCMs showed great flexibility and perseverance in making this program successful in the middle of a worldwide pandemic. The COVID-19 pandemic created challenges for IQCM classroom visits because access to schools could change or be limited on short notice. As a precaution, IQCMs were encouraged to increase their list of replacement schools in case a selected school was closed. If schools did not allow the IQCMs to visit in person, the IQCMs inquired about observing the test administration virtually. In all but two countries, IQCMs were able to observe the sessions either in person or electronically. In one country, the IQCM was limited to interviews with the School Coordinators, and in another, the IQCM was not able to visit the schools or conduct interviews. Almost all IQCMs, either working on their own or with assistants, were able to complete all required observations. When necessary, the IQCMs were permitted to recruit assistants to effectively cover the territory and testing timetable.

For PIRLS 2021, a total of 63 IQCMs were trained across the 57 countries and 8 benchmarking participants. In addition, the IQCMs trained more than 200 assistant monitors to help with school visits in large countries or when the administration period was short. Altogether, International Quality Control Monitors observed 565 paperPIRLS testing sessions and 397 digitalPIRLS testing sessions. The results of the PIRLS 2021 IQCM observations are reported in the following sections of this chapter.

Quality Control Observations of the PIRLS 2021 Data Collection

IQCMs conducted site visits during the assessment administration to a sample of schools in each country. For each school visit, the IQCMs completed the Classroom Observation Record. The records were completed via IEA's Online SurveySystem.

The observation records were organized into the following sections:

- Section A—Documentation of the PIRLS Testing Session
- Section B—Summary Observations of the PIRLS Testing Session
- Section C—Student Questionnaire Administration and Distribution of the Early Learning Survey
- Section D—Interview with the School Coordinator

Documentation and Summary Observations of the PIRLS 2021 Testing Sessions

Sections A and B of the Classroom Observation Record addressed activities that took place during the testing sessions. The assessments were administered in two parts with a break of up to 30 minutes between each part. During test administration, IQCMs were asked to observe the activities of the Test Administrator, such as distributing, collecting, and securing the testing materials, following the assessment administration script, and timing the testing sessions.

The percentages of IQCM responses on these activities are reported in Exhibit 6.1 for paperPIRLS testing sessions and in Exhibit 6.2 for digitalPIRLS testing sessions. IQCMs reported that the assessments were conducted in accordance with the international procedures.

Exhibit 6.1: Observations of paperPIRLS 2021 Assessment Administration Sessions – 565 Sessions (Percentage of IQCM Responses)

Question	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
Did the Test Administrator distribute test booklets according to the booklet assignment on the Student Tracking Form and booklet labels?	98	1	1
Was the total testing time for Part 1 of the testing session equal to the time allowed?	91	8	1
Did the Test Administrator announce, “You have 5 minutes left” prior to the end of Part 1 of the testing session?	91	8	1
Were there any other “time remaining” announcements made during Part 1 of the testing session?	20	78	2
Was the total time for the break between Part 1 and Part 2 of the testing session equal to or less than 30 minutes?	95	4	2
Were the booklets left unattended or unsecured during the break?	5	94	2
Was the total testing time for Part 2 of the testing session equal to the time allowed?	88	11	1
Did the Test Administrator announce “you have 5 minutes left” prior to the end of Part 2 of the testing session?	90	9	1
Were there any other “time remaining” announcements made during Part 2 of the testing session?	19	80	1
Did any students finish either Part 1 or Part 2 of the assessment early (before the time allowed was up)?	84	15	1
Did the Test Administrator have a timer (watch with a seconds hand, a stopwatch, a timer, or a phone with timer) for accurately timing the testing session?	98	2	1

Because of rounding some results may appear inconsistent.

Exhibit 6.2: Observations of digitalPIRLS 2021 Assessment Administration Sessions – 397 Sessions (Percentage of IQCM Responses)

Question	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
Did the Test Administrator make sure that students were seated at their assigned computers (logged into the digitalPIRLS Player with his/her Student ID and password) according to the Student Tracking Form?	96	1	4
Was the total time for the break between Part 1 and Part 2 of the testing session equal to or less than 30 minutes?	84	10	7
Were the computers and, if applicable, USBs kept secure during the break (e.g., the Test Administrator or a teacher remained in the classroom)?	90	5	6
After the break, did the Test Administrator make sure that students returned to their assigned computers (logged into the digitalPIRLS Player with his/her Student ID and password) according to the Student Tracking Form?	91	4	6
Did any students finish either Part 1 or Part 2 of the assessment early (logged out before the time was up)?	92	4	4

Because of rounding some results may appear inconsistent.

In accordance with the procedures, almost all paperPIRLS Test Administrators ensured that the paper achievement tests were distributed according to the Student Tracking Forms and instrument labels, and almost all digitalPIRLS Test Administrators ensured that the students were seated at the computer assigned to them.

For the paper assessment, some Test Administrators added extra “time remaining” announcements at the 20-, 10-, or 2-minute points for each part of the test. For digitalPIRLS, the assessment Player software showed how much time was remaining on the screen and stopped when time ran out, so there was no need for the Test Administrator to make time announcements. In sessions where the total testing time for a part of the assessment was not equal to the time allowed, it was usually because students completed their work a few minutes before the allotted time had elapsed.

For both paperPIRLS and digitalPIRLS, there were a few instances where the students did not have breaks between the two parts of the testing session or where the breaks exceeded 30 minutes. This often occurred when schools decided to follow their regular break schedule, or when schools required a specific COVID-19 protocol to be followed, such as handwashing

before re-entering a classroom. For some digitalPIRLS classes, the students needed to leave the computer lab to have a snack. These extended breaks were usually reported to be 35 to 45 minutes in duration.

Test Administrators generally ensured that the materials, both paper achievement booklets as well as computers and USBs, were kept secure between the parts of the testing session as well as at the end of the session. IQCMs who reported that Test Administrators did not adhere to the security guidelines also observed that everyone left the classroom for a break and that no interference with the materials were observed.

Exhibits 6.3 and 6.4 report on the use of the Test Administrator script during the assessment sessions for paperPIRLS and digitalPIRLS, respectively. To standardize test administration, all Test Administrators were instructed to read the script in the Test Administrator Manual to the students. IQCMs reported that in more than three-quarters of the paperPIRLS observations and in more than half of the digitalPIRLS observations, the Test Administrators followed the script exactly. When the Test Administrator deviated from the script, most modifications were reported to be “minor.” The larger number of changes for digitalPIRLS might reflect varying levels of comfort students had with the technology across countries. For example, IQCMs commented that in quite a few classes students needed more explanation and support using the scrolling function.

Exhibit 6.3: Test Administrators Following the paperPIRLS Test Administration Script – 565 paperPIRLS Sessions (Percentage of IQCM Responses)

Question	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
In your opinion, had the test administrator familiarized himself or herself with the test administration script prior to the testing?	93	4	1 (<i>I cannot answer</i>) 1 (<i>Not answered</i>)
Did the test administrator follow the test administration script in the PIRLS 2021 Test Administrator Manual?	78	18 (<i>Minor changes</i>) 3 (<i>Major changes</i>)	1
<i>If the Test Administrator made changes to the script, how would you describe them?</i>			
<i>Additions</i>	16	8	37 (<i>Not answered</i>) 39 (<i>Not applicable</i>)
<i>Revisions</i>	9	12	38 (<i>Not answered</i>) 41 (<i>Not applicable</i>)
<i>Deletions</i>	7	14	39 (<i>Not answered</i>) 40 (<i>Not applicable</i>)
Did the test administrator address students' questions appropriately?	96	3	1

Because of rounding some results may appear inconsistent.

Exhibit 6.4: Test Administrators Following the digitalPIRLS Test Administration Script – 397 digitalPIRLS Sessions (Percentage of IQCM Responses)

Question	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
In your opinion, had the test administrator familiarized himself or herself with the test administration script prior to the testing?	92	2	2 (<i>I cannot answer</i>) 4 (<i>Not answered</i>)
Did the test administrator follow the test administration script in the PIRLS 2021 Test Administrator Manual?	57	32 (<i>Minor changes</i>) 6 (<i>Major changes</i>)	5
<i>If the Test Administrator made changes to the script, how would you describe them?</i>			
<i>Additions</i>	28	10	30 (<i>Not answered</i>) 32 (<i>Not applicable</i>)
<i>Revisions</i>	19	17	31 (<i>Not answered</i>) 34 (<i>Not applicable</i>)
<i>Deletions</i>	18	18	31 (<i>Not answered</i>) 33 (<i>Not applicable</i>)
In your opinion, did the test administrator address student questions appropriately?	94	2	5

Because of rounding some results may appear inconsistent.

Exhibit 6.5 summarizes observations on student compliance with instructions and overall cooperation during assessment administration for both paperPIRLS and digitalPIRLS. The first two questions apply only to the paper assessment because the timing and access to the digital test was controlled by the Player. According to the IQCMs’ observations, students complied “very well” or “fairly well” with the instruction to stop work at the end of both Part 1 and Part 2 in almost all of the paperPIRLS sessions. IQCMs described the students as “extremely” or “moderately” orderly and cooperative during most of the testing sessions. Some IQCMs for digitalPIRLS classrooms noted that there were technical issues that delayed test administration and caused disruption for students. In addition, digitalPIRLS students who finished early did not always have activities provided for them and were reportedly bored.

Exhibit 6.5: Student Cooperation During Assessment Administration – 565 paperPIRLS Sessions and 397 digitalPIRLS Sessions (Percentage of IQCM Responses)

Question	Very Well (%)	Fairly Well (%)	Not Well At All (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
When the Test Administrator ended Part 1 of the testing session, how well did the students comply with the instruction to stop work (close their booklets and put their pens down)? (paperPIRLS, n = 565)	89	9	1	1
When the Test Administrator ended Part 2 of the testing session, how well did the students comply with the instruction to stop work (close their booklets and put their pens down)? (paperPIRLS, n = 565)	90	9	0	1

Question	Extremely (%)	Moderately (%)	Somewhat (%)	Hardly (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
To what extent would you describe the students as orderly and cooperative during the paperPIRLS testing sessions? (n = 565)	77	20	2	0	1
To what extent would you describe the students as orderly and cooperative during the digitalPIRLS testing sessions? (n = 397)	67	25	3	0	5

Because of rounding some results may appear inconsistent.

Summary Observations of the PIRLS 2021 Testing Sessions

Exhibits 6.6 and 6.7 report on the IQCMs’ general observations of the paperPIRLS and digitalPIRLS assessment administrations, respectively. Overall, IQCMs reported that the quality of testing sessions was “good,” “very good,” or “excellent.” Only 2-4 percent of IQCMS reported that students refused to take the test and, according to the IQCM comments, those students started it but then stopped at some point and left the sessions. In addition, more than 90 percent of all of the observed testing sessions took place under favorable room conditions that were suitable for students to work without distraction. Most of the students, 93 percent for both paperPIRLS and digitalPIRLS, followed the direction to store away everything, including electronic devices, for the duration of the test administration. The IQCMs also reported that in 95 percent of observed testing sessions for paperPIRLS and in 90 percent of digitalPIRLS testing sessions, students were seated in an arrangement that provided adequate space to work and not be distracted by one another.

Exhibit 6.6: General Observations of the paperPIRLS 2021 Testing Sessions – 565 Sessions (Percentage of IQCM Responses)

Question	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
Did the student identification information on the paperPIRLS booklets correspond with the Student Tracking Form?	97	2	1
Were any defective test booklets detected and replaced?	2 (BEFORE testing began) 0 (AFTER testing began)	97 (BEFORE testing began) 99 (AFTER testing began)	1 (BEFORE testing began) 1 (AFTER testing began)
<i>If any defective test booklets were replaced, did the Test Administrator replace them appropriately?</i>	2	2	22 (Not answered) 75 (Not applicable)
Did any students refuse to take the test?	2	97	1
<i>If a student refused, did the Test Administrator accurately follow the instructions for excusing the student (collect the test booklet, and if readmitted, return the test booklet)?</i>	2	1	23 (Not answered) 75 (Not applicable)
Were any late students admitted to the testing room?	4 (BEFORE testing began) 2 (AFTER testing began)	93 (There were no late students) 1 (Late students were not admitted)	1
Did any students leave the room for an “emergency” during the testing?	19	81	1
<i>If a student left the room for an “emergency”, did the Test Administrator address the situation appropriately (collect the test booklet, and if re-admitted, return the test booklet)?</i>	12	7	22 (Not answered) 59 (Not applicable)
Were there any students requiring special accommodations (e.g., students with visual or hearing impairment, Dyslexia)?	9	90	1
Did students store away everything (school books/papers and all electronic devices), having only a pen or a pencil and the test booklet for the duration of the test administration?	93	6	1
During the testing session did the Test Administrator walk around the room to be sure students were working on the correct section of the test and/or behaving properly?	95	5	1

Exhibit 6.6: General Observations of the paperPIRLS 2021 Testing Sessions – 565 Sessions (Percentage of IQCM Responses) (Continued)

Question	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
In your opinion, were the conditions in the testing room suitable (lighting, temperature, noise, etc.) for the students to work without distractions?	95	5	1
Did the seating arrangement provide adequate space for students to work and not be distracted by each other?	98	2	1
Did you see any evidence of students attempting to cheat on the tests (e.g., by copying from a neighbor)?	4	95	1

Question	Excellent (%)	Very Good (%)	Good (%)	Fair (%)	Poor (%)	Not Answered (%)
In general, how would you describe the overall quality of the testing session?	63	24	9	3	0	1

Because of rounding some results may appear inconsistent.

Exhibit 6.7: General Observations of the digitalPIRLS 2021 Testing Sessions – 397 Sessions (Percentage of IQCM Responses)

Question	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
Were any defective USB sticks detected and replaced?	6 (BEFORE testing began) 1 (AFTER testing began)	47 (BEFORE testing began) 47 (AFTER testing began)	48 (BEFORE testing began) 52 (AFTER testing began)
Did any students refuse to take the test?	4	92	4
<i>If a student refused, did the Test Administrator record the incident on the Student Tracking Form?</i>	3	1	28 (Not answered) 69 (Not applicable)
Were any late students admitted to the testing room?	4 (BEFORE testing began) 2 (AFTER testing began)	90 (There were no late students) 0 (Late students were not admitted)	4
Did any students leave the room for an “emergency” during the testing?	17	79	4
Were there any students requiring special accommodations (e.g., students with visual or hearing impairment, Dyslexia)?	16	81	4

Exhibit 6.7: General Observations of the digitalPIRLS 2021 Testing Sessions – 397 Sessions (Percentage of IQCM Responses) (Continued)

Question	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
Did students store away everything (school books/papers and all electronic devices), having only the computer used for the testing session?	93	3	5
In your opinion, were the conditions in the testing room suitable (lighting, temperature, noise, etc.) for the students to work without distractions?	90	6	5
Did the seating arrangement provide adequate space for students to work and not be distracted by each other?	90	5	5
Were all students in the participating class tested together in one session or in groups (multiple testing sessions due to the number of computers available)?	77 (<i>One session</i>)	19 (<i>Multiple sessions</i>)	4
In addition to the Test Administrator, were there any additional personnel (e.g., School Coordinator, class teacher, an IT specialist) available during the testing session?	80	17	4
Did any technical problems occur during the testing session?	33	63	4
Did the Test Administrator submit the data from each computer/USB students used for the digital PIRLS testing session directly after the testing session? (This only applies to PC/individual USB delivery method.)	33	13	4 (<i>Not answered</i>) 50 (<i>Not applicable</i>)

Question	Excellent (%)	Very Good (%)	Good (%)	Fair (%)	Poor (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
In general, how would you describe the overall quality of the testing session?	50	31	10	3	1	5

Because of rounding some results may appear inconsistent.

In 80 percent of digitalPIRLS classrooms, at least one additional person was available to help the Test Administrator. IQCMs reported that they were primarily classroom teachers, IT specialists, or School Coordinators. The IT specialists were especially helpful, as 33 percent of classrooms experienced technical problems ranging from login issues to computer hardware that needed to

be replaced. These issues were resolved quickly in many classrooms, allowing the students to continue with the full testing session.

When digitalPIRLS was administered using USBs, some Test Administrators uploaded the data directly after the testing session was finished. Other Test Administrators planned to upload the data later the same day or to send the USBs to the national center to do the data upload. Data from the tests administered online were automatically saved and did not require further action by the Test Administrators.

Student Questionnaire Administration

Exhibits 6.8 and 6.9 summarize the IQCMs’ observations of the PIRLS 2021 Student Questionnaire administration for paperPIRLS and digitalPIRLS, respectively. Students who were administered the PIRLS 2021 assessment on paper also completed the student questionnaire on paper. Students who were administered the test on the computer completed the student questionnaire on the computer in the same Player software once the achievement test time ended.

Exhibit 6.8: Student Questionnaire Administration for paperPIRLS – 565 Sessions (Percentage of IQCM Responses)

Question	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
Was there a break between the end of the achievement testing session and the administration of the Student Questionnaires?	90	8	3
Did the Test Administrator distribute the Student Questionnaires according to the Student Tracking Form and questionnaire labels?	96	2	3
Did the Test Administrator follow the questionnaire administration script in the PIRLS 2021 Test Administrator Manual?	83	12 (<i>Minor changes</i>) 2 (<i>Major changes</i>)	3
<i>If the Test Administrator made changes to the script, how would you describe them?</i>			
<i>Additions</i>	9	8	37 (<i>Not answered</i>) 46 (<i>Not applicable</i>)
<i>Revisions</i>	7	9	38 (<i>Not answered</i>) 46 (<i>Not applicable</i>)
<i>Deletions</i>	6	10	38 (<i>Not answered</i>) 46 (<i>Not applicable</i>)

Exhibit 6.8: Student Questionnaire Administration for paperPIRLS – 565 Sessions (Percentage of IQCM Responses) (Continued)

Question	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
Did the Test Administrator read the questions aloud to the students?	42	55 (<i>Students answered the questions independently</i>)	3
After the Student Questionnaire administration, did the Test Administrator distribute the Early Learning Surveys (Home Questionnaires)?	32	65	3
<i>If the Early Learning Surveys were distributed at this time, did the Test Administrator distribute them according to the Student Tracking Form and survey labels?</i>	31	1	13 (<i>Not answered</i>) 55 (<i>Not applicable</i>)

Because of rounding some results may appear inconsistent.

Exhibit 6.9: Student Questionnaire Administration for digitalPIRLS – 397 Sessions (Percentage of IQCM Responses)

Question	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
Was there a break between the end of the achievement testing session and the administration of the Student Questionnaires?	83	12	5
When starting the Questionnaire session, did the Test Administrator make sure that students returned to their assigned computers (logged into the digitalPIRLS Player with his/her Student ID and password) according to the Student Tracking Form?	89	4	7
Did the Test Administrator follow the questionnaire administration script in the PIRLS 2021 Test Administrator Manual?	64	24 (<i>Minor changes</i>) 5 (<i>Major changes</i>)	7
<i>If the Test Administrator made changes to the script, how would you describe them?</i>			
<i>Additions</i>	19	12	33 (<i>Not answered</i>) 37 (<i>Not applicable</i>)
<i>Revisions</i>	17	14	33 (<i>Not answered</i>) 37 (<i>Not applicable</i>)
<i>Deletions</i>	15	15	33 (<i>Not answered</i>) 37 (<i>Not applicable</i>)

Exhibit 6.9: Student Questionnaire Administration for digitalPIRLS – 397 Sessions (Percentage of IQCM Responses) (Continued)

Question	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
Did the Test Administrator read the questions aloud to the students?	9	85 (<i>Students answered the questions independently</i>)	6
After the Student Questionnaire administration, did the Test Administrator distribute the Early Learning Surveys (Home Questionnaires)?	26	69	6
<i>If the Early Learning Surveys were distributed at this time, did the Test Administrator distribute them according to the Student Tracking Form and survey labels?</i>	25	1	21 (<i>Not answered</i>) 53 (<i>Not applicable</i>)

Because of rounding some results may appear inconsistent.

IQCMs reported more breaks between the achievement test and the student questionnaire in the paperPIRLS sessions than in the digitalPIRLS sessions.

In some cases, Test Administrators did not follow the Student Questionnaire Administration script exactly. In the digitalPIRLS sessions, there were more changes than in the paper sessions. IQCMs commented that students had varying levels of comfort with the technology and needed reassurance with the directions. For both paper and digital sessions, modifications were mostly “minor,” as reported by the IQCMs.

In 42 percent of the observed paperPIRLS testing sessions, Test Administrators read the Student Questionnaire questions aloud, compared to only 9 percent of digitalPIRLS sessions. When students worked independently, Test Administrators answered students’ questions as needed.

Interview with the School Coordinator

Section D was the final component of the Classroom Observation Record and involved the IQCM conducting an interview with the School Coordinator. The interview addressed issues such as the following:

- Shipment of assessment materials
- Arrangements for test administration
- Responsiveness of the national center to queries
- Necessity for make-up sessions
- Organization of classes in the school (to validate the within-school sampling procedure)

As shown in Exhibits 6.10 and 6.11, almost all School Coordinators reported that the PIRLS 2021 administration in their school went “very well” or “satisfactory” overall. In addition, the School Coordinators noted that the School Coordinator Manual worked well for them, and most other school staff members had positive attitudes toward PIRLS testing. The issues raised in an open-ended question by the School Coordinators were mostly related to COVID-19, in terms of the necessary physical space and school personnel to support the test administration and the effect of the pandemic on students. For digitalPIRLS, School Coordinators mentioned additional issues related to the computer hardware, assessment USBs, and Wi-Fi or internet connection.

Exhibit 6.10: Interview with School Coordinator for paperPIRLS Administration – 565 Records (Percentage of School Coordinator Responses)

Question	Very Well, No Problems (%)	Satisfactory, Few Problems (%)	Unsatisfactory, Many Problems (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
Overall, how would you say the testing went?	90	10	1	0

Question	Positive (%)	Neutral (%)	Negative (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
Overall, how would you rate the attitude of the other school staff members towards PIRLS?	82	16	2	0

Question	Worked Well (%)	Needs Improvement (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
Overall, do you feel the School Coordinator Manual worked well for you or does it need improvement?	94	5	1

Because of rounding some results may appear inconsistent.

Exhibit 6.11: Interview with School Coordinator for digitalPIRLS Administration – 397 Records (Percentage of School Coordinator Responses)

Question	Very Well, No Problems (%)	Satisfactory, Few Problems (%)	Unsatisfactory, Many Problems (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
Overall, how would you say the testing went?	75	24	1	1

Question	Positive (%)	Neutral (%)	Negative (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
Overall, how would you rate the attitude of the other school staff members towards PIRLS?	75	23	2	0

Question	Worked Well (%)	Needs Improvement (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
Overall, do you feel the School Coordinator Manual worked well for you or does it need improvement?	93	4	3

Because of rounding some results may appear inconsistent.

Exhibits 6.12 and 6.13 show that there were only a small number of cases where components were missing from the shipments of test materials, and that materials were received on time for testing in almost all cases. Ninety-three percent of the paperPIRLS School Coordinators and 96 percent of the digitalPIRLS School Coordinators reported that the national centers were responsive to the school’s questions and concerns.

Exhibit 6.12: Interview with the School Coordinator for paperPIRLS, Details – 565 Records (Percentage of School Coordinator Responses)

Question	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
Prior to the testing day, did you have time to check your shipment of materials from the national center?	81	18	1
Did you receive the correct shipment of the materials as listed in your School Coordinator Manual and according to the tracking forms?	91	8	1
<i>If no, did the national center provide the missing materials in time for the testing?</i>	5	1	30 (Not answered) 63 (Not applicable)
Was the national center responsive to your questions or concerns?	93	5	1

Exhibit 6.12: Interview with the School Coordinator for paperPIRLS, Details – 565 Records (Percentage of School Coordinator Responses) (Continued)

Question	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
Was the Teacher Questionnaire administered online?	37	61 (<i>Administered on paper</i>)	2
<i>If the Teacher Questionnaire was administered online, did the teacher(s) encounter any problems?</i>	2	34	21 (<i>Not answered</i>) 43 (<i>Not applicable</i>)
Was the School Questionnaire administered online?	38	61 (<i>Administered on paper</i>)	1
<i>If the School Questionnaire was administered online, did the person completing it encounter any problems?</i>	1	35	21 (<i>Not answered</i>) 43 (<i>Not applicable</i>)
Was the Early Learning Survey administered online?	10	83 (<i>Administered on paper</i>)	7
<i>If the Early Learning Survey was administered online, did the parents/guardians encounter any problems?</i>	0	12	27 (<i>Not answered</i>) 61 (<i>Not applicable</i>)
Do you anticipate that a makeup session will be required at your school?	14	85	1
<i>If yes, do you intend to conduct one?</i>	11	2	85 (<i>Not answered</i>) 2 (<i>Not applicable</i>)
Did the students receive any special instructions, motivational talk, or incentives to prepare them for the assessment(s)?	63	37	0
Did you provide the list of classes in the tested grade to the national center?	81	16 (<i>Centralized database used</i>)	3
If there was another international assessment, would you be willing to serve as a School Coordinator?	93	7	0

Because of rounding some results may appear inconsistent.

Exhibit 6.13: Interview with the School Coordinator for digitalPIRLS, Details – 397 Records (Percentage of School Coordinator Responses)

Question	Yes (%)	No (%)	Not Answered or Not Applicable (%)
Prior to the testing day, did you have time to check your shipment of materials from the national center?	82	14	4
Did you receive the correct shipment of the materials as listed in your School Coordinator Manual and according to the tracking forms?	88	6	6
<i>If no, did the national center provide the missing materials in time for the testing?</i>	5	1	39 (Not answered) 55 (Not applicable)
Was the national center responsive to your questions or concerns?	96	3	2
Was the Teacher Questionnaire administered online?	77	12 (Administered on paper)	11
<i>If the Teacher Questionnaire was administered online, did the teacher(s) encounter any problems?</i>	1	71	10 (Not answered) 17 (Not applicable)
Was the School Questionnaire administered online?	83	12 (Administered on paper)	5
<i>If the School Questionnaire was administered online, did the person completing it encounter any problems?</i>	1	75	11 (Not answered) 13 (Not applicable)
Was the Early Learning Survey administered online?	37	54 (Administered on paper)	9
<i>If the Early Learning Survey was administered online, did the parents/guardians encounter any problems?</i>	4	35	20 (Not answered) 40 (Not applicable)
Do you anticipate that a makeup session will be required at your school?	14	83	3
<i>If yes, do you intend to conduct one?</i>	10	3	84 (Not answered) 3 (Not applicable)
Did the students receive any special instructions, motivational talk, or incentives to prepare them for the assessment(s)?	68	32	0
Did you provide the list of classes in the tested grade to the national center?	92	8 (Centralized database used)	0
If there was another international assessment, would you be willing to serve as a School Coordinator?	93	7	0

Because of rounding some results may appear inconsistent.

The percentage of PIRLS 2021 Teacher Questionnaires, School Questionnaires, and Early Learning Surveys that were administered online was substantially larger for digitalPIRLS schools than for paperPIRLS schools (77% vs. 37% for the teacher questionnaires, 83% vs. 38% for the school questionnaires, and 37% vs. 10% for the Early Learning Surveys). Respondents had almost no issues when completing these questionnaires.

A small percentage of observed schools were planning to administer a make-up session (10-11%). For both paperPIRLS and digitalPIRLS sessions, over 60 percent of the School Coordinators reported that special instructions, training, motivational talk, or incentives were provided to students prior to testing.

IQCMs also were asked to verify that all classes were included in the PIRLS 2021 sampling process. School Coordinators were asked how many classes of the tested grade were in the school, how many were selected to participate, and whether they provided the list of classes to the national center. Over 80 percent of paperPIRLS School Coordinators and over 90 percent of digitalPIRLS School Coordinators confirmed that they sent a complete list of classes to the national center. In the remaining observed schools, centralized databases were used instead of class lists.

As a reflection of the successful planning and implementation of PIRLS 2021, 93 percent of respondents for both paperPIRLS and digitalPIRLS said that they would be willing to serve as a School Coordinator in future international assessments.