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# DIBELS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ - Letter Naming Fluency ${ }^{1}$ Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ 6th Ed. University of Oregon 

Directions for Administration and Scoring

Target Age Range


Letter Naming Fluency (LNF) is intended for most children from fall of kindergarten through fall of first grade. A benchmark goal is not provided for LNF because it does not correspond to a big idea of early literacy skills (phonological awareness, alphabetic principle, and accuracy and fluency with connected text) and does not appear to be essential to achieve reading outcomes. However, students in the lowest 20 percent of a school district using local norms should be considered at risk for poor reading outcomes, and those between the $20^{\text {th }}$ percentile and $40^{\text {th }}$ percentile should be considered at some risk. For students at risk, the primary instructional goals should be in phonological awareness, alphabetic principle, and accuracy and fluency with connected text.

## Description

DIBELS Letter Naming Fluency (LNF) is a standardized, individually administered test that provides a measure of risk. Students are presented with a page of upper- and lower-case letters arranged in a random order and are asked to name as many letters as they can. LNF is based on research by Marston and Magnusson (1988). Students are told if they do not know a letter they will be told the letter. The student is allowed 1 minute to produce as many letter names as he/she can, and the score is the number of letters named correctly in 1 minute. Students are considered at risk for difficulty achieving early literacy benchmark goals if they perform in the lowest $20 \%$ of students in their district. That is, below the $20^{\text {th }}$ percentile using local district norms. Students are considered at some risk if they perform between the $20^{\text {th }}$ and $40^{\text {th }}$ percentile using local norms. Students are considered at low risk if they perform above the $40^{\text {th }}$ percentile using local norms. The 1-month, alternate-form reliability of LNF is .88 in kindergarten (Good et al., in preparation). The median criterion-related validity of LNF with the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery-Revised Readiness Cluster standard score is 70 in kindergarten (Good et al., in preparation). The predictive validity of kindergarten LNF with first-grade Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery-Revised Reading Cluster standard score is .65, and .71 with first-grade Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM) oral reading fluency (Good et al., in preparation).

[^0]Materials: Student copy of probe, examiner copy of probe, clipboard, stopwatch, and colored scoring pen.

Directions for Administration:

1. Place the student copy of probe in front of the student.
2. Place the examiner probe on clipboard and position so that the student cannot see what you record.
3. Say these specific directions to the student:

Here are some letters (point). Tell me the names of as many letters as you can. When I say "begin", start here (point to first letter), and go across the page (point). Point to each letter and tell me the name of that letter. If you come to a letter you don't know I'll tell it to you. Put your finger on the first letter. Ready, begin.
4. Start your stop watch.
5. Follow along on the examiner probe. Put a slash ( / ) through letters named incorrectly (see scoring procedures)
6. If the student provides the letter sound rather than the letter name, say, "Remember to tell me the letter name, not the sound it makes." This prompt may be provided once during the administration. If the student continues providing letter sounds, mark each letter as incorrect and indicate what the student did at the bottom of the page.
7. At the end of 1 minute, place a bracket ( ] ) after the last letter named and say, "Stop."

## Directions for Scoring:

1. Discontinue Rule. If the student does not get any correct letter names within the first 10 letters (1 row), discontinue the task and record a score of 0 .
2. 3 second rule. If the student hesitates for 3 seconds on a letter, score the letter incorrect, provide the correct letter, point to the next letter, and say "What letter?" This prompt may be repeated. For example, if the letters are "t L s " and the student says, " t " (3 seconds), prompt by saying, "L" (point to s) What letter?"

| Letters |  | Student Says | Prompt | Scoring Procedure |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| t | L | s | U | "t" $(3 \mathrm{sec})$ | "L What letter?" (point to s) |
| i | g | W | r | "i | $\mathrm{g} "(3 \mathrm{sec})$ |

3. Self correct. If a student makes an error and corrects him or herself within 3 seconds, write "SC" above the letter and do not count it as an error.
4. Incorrect letter. A letter is incorrect if the student substitutes a different letter for the stimulus letter (e.g., "B" for "D")

| Letters | Student Says | Scoring Procedure | Correct Letters |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $t \mathrm{D} s \mathrm{U}$ | "t...b...s...u" | $\mathrm{t} \nsupseteq \mathrm{s}$ U | $3 / 4$ |
| $t$ D s U | "t...d...g...o" | $t D / \gamma$ | $2 / 4$ |

5. Omissions. A letter is incorrect if the student omits the letter.

| Letters | Student Says | Scoring Procedure | Correct Letters |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $t$ D s U | "t...s...u" | $\mathrm{t} \ngtr \mathrm{s}$ U | $3 / 4$ |
| $t$ D s U | "t...u" | t $\quad \beta \mathrm{U}$ | $2 / 4$ |

6. Similar shaped font. For some fonts, including times, the upper case letter " i ," and the lower case letter " $L$ " are difficult or impossible to distinguish. A response of either " $i$ " or " $L$ " is scored as correct. For example, if the letters are "I (upper case i) D s l (lower case L)" and the student names them both L, score as correct.

| Letters |  | Student Says | Scoring Procedure | Correct Letters |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I D | s | l | "l...d...s...l" | I D s s |

7. Articulation and dialect. The student is not penalized for imperfect pronunciation due to dialect, articulation, or second language interference. For example, if the student consistently says $/ \mathrm{th} /$ for /s/ and pronounces "thee" for "see" when naming the letter "C", he/she should be given credit for naming letter correctly. This is a professional judgment and should be based on the student's responses and any prior knowledge of his/her speech patterns.

| Letters | Student Says | Scoring Procedure | Correct Letters |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| c | D | s U | "thee...d...eth...u" | c |

8. Skips row. If a student skips an entire row, draw a line through the row and do not count the row in scoring.

## DIBELS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Letter Naming Fluency Assessment Integrity Checklist

Directions: As the observer, please observe setup and directions, time and score the test with the examiner, check examiner's accuracy in following procedures, and decide if examiner passes or needs more practice.

| ( | $\checkmark$ box to indicate Fine or Needs Practice |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1. Performs standardized directions verbatim: <br> Here are some letters. Tell me the names of as many letters as you can. When I say "begin," start here, and go across the page. Point to each letter and tell me the name of that letter. If you come to a letter you don't know I'll tell it to you. Put your finger on the first letter. Ready, begin. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 2. Holds clipboard and stopwatch so child cannot see what (s)he records. |  |  |
|  | 3. Starts stopwatch after saying "begin." |  |  |
|  | 4. At the end of 1 minute, places a bracket ( ] after the last letter named and says, "Stop." |  |  |
|  | 5. If child does not respond in 3 seconds, tell them the letter and score the letter as incorrect. |  |  |
|  | 6. Follows along on the examiner sheet and slashes incorrect letters. |  |  |
|  | 7. Follows discontinue rule if child does not produce any correct letter names in the first 10 letters (one row). Records score of 0 for the probe. |  |  |
|  | 8. If child says letter sounds instead of letter names, uses prompt, "Remember to tell me the letter name, not the sound it makes." Prompts once, scores further letter sounds as incorrect, and notes what child did on score sheet. |  |  |
|  | 9. Records the total number of correct letter names in 1 minute. |  |  |
|  | 10. Shadow score with the examiner. Is he/she within 2 points on the final score? |  |  |

# DIBELS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ - Initial Sound Fluency ${ }^{1}$ Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ 6th Ed. University of Oregon 

Directions for Administration and Scoring

Target Age Range


Initial Sound Fluency is intended for most children from the last year of preschool through the middle of kindergarten. It may be appropriate for monitoring the progress of older children with very low skills in phonological awareness.

## Description

DIBELS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Initial Sound Fluency (ISF) is a standardized, individually administered measure of phonological awareness that assesses a child's ability to recognize and produce the initial sound in an orally presented word (Kaminski \& Good, 1998; Laimon, 1994). The examiner presents four pictures to the child, names each picture, and then asks the child to identify (i.e., point to or say) the picture that begins with the sound produced orally by the examiner. For example, the examiner says, "This is sink, cat, gloves, and hat. Which picture begins with $/ \mathrm{s} /$ ?" and the student points to the correct picture. The child is also asked to orally produce the beginning sound for an orally presented word that matches one of the given pictures. The examiner calculates the amount of time taken to identify/produce the correct sound and converts the score into the number of onsets correct in a minute.

The ISF measure takes about 3 minutes to administer and has over 20 alternate forms to monitor progress. The ISF measure is a revision of the Onset Recognition Fluency (OnRF) measure incorporating minimal revisions. Alternate-form reliability of the OnRF measure is .72 in January of kindergarten (Good, Kaminski, Shinn, Bratten, Shinn, \& Laimon, in preparation). By repeating the assessment four times, the resulting average is estimated to have a reliability of .91 (Nunnally, 1978). The concurrent, criterion-related validity of OnRF with DIBELS PSF is .48 in January of kindergarten and .36 with the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery Readiness Cluster score (Good et al., in preparation). The predictive validity of OnRF with respect to spring-of-first-grade reading on CBM ORF is .45 , and .36 with the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery Total Reading Cluster score (Good et al., in preparation). The

[^1]benchmark goal is 25 to 35 initial sounds correct by the middle of kindergarten. Students scoring below 10 initial sounds correct in the middle of kindergarten may need intensive instructional support.

Materials: Examiner copy of probe, student practice pictures, student probe pictures, clipboard, stopwatch, colored pen.

## Directions for Administration

1. Place examiner copy of probe on clipboard and position so that student cannot see what you record.
2. Place the student copy of 4 practice pictures in front of the child.
3. Say these specific directions to the student:

This is mouse, flowers, pillow, letters. (point to each picture while saying its name) Mouse (point to mouse) begins with the sound /m/. Listen, /m/ mouse. Which one begins with the sounds $/ f l /$ ?

| CORRECT RESPONSE: <br> Student points to flowers, you <br> say, | INCORRECT RESPONSE: <br> If student gives any other response, you say, |
| :--- | :--- |
| Good. Flowers begins with <br> the sounds /fl/. | Flowers (point to flowers) begins with the <br> sounds /fl/. Listen, /fl/ flowers. Lets try it <br> again. Which one begins with the sounds <br> /fl/? |

Pillow (point to pillow) begins with the sound $/ \mathrm{p} /$. Listen, /p/ pillow. What sound does letters (point to letters) begin with?

| CORRECT RESPONSE: <br> Student says /1/, you say, | INCORRECT RESPONSE: <br> If student gives any other response, you say, |
| :---: | :---: |
| Good. Letters begins with the sound $/ \mathrm{l} /$. | Letters (point to letters) begins with the sound /IV. Listen, /// letters. Lets try it again. What sound does letters (point to letters) begin with? |

Here are some more pictures. Listen carefully to the words.
4. Show the child the first page of student probe pictures. Point to each picture and say the name following the standardized directions.
5. Present the first question as written on the score sheet. After you finish asking the question, begin your stopwatch. Stop your stopwatch as soon as the child responds. If the child does not respond after 5 seconds, score the question as zero and present the next question.
6. As soon as the student responds, present the next question promptly and clearly. Begin your stopwatch after you have said the question, and stop it as soon as the student responds, as above.
7. Score the child's response as either correct (1 point) or incorrect ( 0 points).
8. If the child stops or struggles with a question for 5 seconds, score the question as zero and present the next question.
9. After the first 4 questions, proceed to the next page of student probe pictures. Continue until the end of the questions. When the child finishes the last question, record the total time on your stopwatch in seconds and add the number of correct responses. Record the total number correct and the time in seconds on the bottom of the scoring sheet.
10. Calculate the ISF Score using the formula:

$$
\text { ISF }=\frac{60 \times \text { Number Correct }}{\text { Seconds }}
$$

11. Prompting Rule. If a child has done the examples correctly and does not answer the questions correctly, say "Remember to tell me a picture that begins with the sound (repeat stimulus sound)." This prompt can be given once.

## Directions for Scoring

1. Discontinue Rule. If a child has a score of 0 on the first five questions, discontinue the probe and give a score of 0 .
2. If the child names the correct picture instead of pointing to it, score as correct.
PROMPT:
STUDENT SAYS: SCORE:

## This is pie, letter, flower and mouse.

 Which picture begins with /p/? "pie"0

3. If the child re-names a picture and the name begins with the correct (target) initial sound, score as correct. For example, if the target picture is "hand" for $/ \mathrm{h} /$ and the student points at road and says "highway," score as correct.
PROMPT:
STUDENT SAYS: SCORE:

## This is road, barn, hand and egg.

 Which picture begins with $/ \mathrm{h} /$ ?"highway"
0 (1)
4. If the child re-names the picture and the name begins with an incorrect initial sound, score as incorrect. For example, if the target picture is "barn" for $/ \mathrm{b} /$ and the student points at barn but says, "house," score as incorrect.

STUDENT SAYS: SCORE:
This is road, barn, hand and egg.
Which picture begins with /b/?
"house"

5. Correct Initial Consonant Sound: If the word starts with an initial consonant sound, the child can respond with the first sound or initial sounds. For example, if the word is "clock" a correct initial sound would be $/ \mathrm{c} /$ or $/ \mathrm{cl} /$ or $/ \mathrm{klo} /$ but not $/ \mathrm{l} /$ or "clock."

| PROMPT: | STUDENT SAYS: | SCORE: |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| What sound does "clock" begin with? | $/ \mathrm{k} /$ | 0 |
| What sound does "clock" begin with? | $/ \mathrm{k} /$ |  |
| What sound does "clock" begin with? | $/ \mathrm{klo}$ |  |
| What sound does "clock" begin with? | $/ \mathrm{l} /$ | "clock" |
| What sound does "clock" begin with? |  |  |

6. Correct Initial Vowel Sound: If the word starts with an initial vowel sound, the child can respond with the initial vowel sound or initial sounds. For example, if the word is "elephant" a correct initial sound would be /e/ or /el/ or /ele/, but not the name of the letter /ea/.

PROMPT:
STUDENT SAYS: SCORE:

| What sound does "elephant" begin with? | /e/ | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| What sound does "elephant" begin with? | $/ \mathrm{e} /$ | $1 \mathrm{ea} /$ |
| What sound does "elephant" begin with? | /ele/ |  |
| What sound does "elephant" begin with? |  |  |

7. Schwa sound $(/ \mathbf{u} /)$ added to a consonant is not counted as an error. Some phonemes cannot be pronounced correctly in isolation without a vowel, and some early learning of sounds includes the schwa.

| PROMPT: | STUDENT SAYS: | SCORE: |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| What sound does "clock" begin with? | $/ \mathrm{ku} /$ | 0 |
| What sound does "clock" begin with? | $/ \mathrm{klu} /$ | 0 |

8. Articulation Difficulty: The student is not penalized for imperfect pronunciation due to dialect, articulation, or second language interference. For example, the student responds /th/ when asked for the first sound in "sink." If the student consistently says /th/for $/ \mathrm{s} /$, as in "thircle" for "circle," he or she should be given credit for a correct initial sound. This is a professional judgment and should be based on the student's responses and any prior knowledge of his/her speech patterns.

| PROMPT: | STUDENT SAYS: | SCORE: |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| What sound does "sink" begin with? | $/$ th/ | 1 |

## Pronunciation Guide:

Different regions of the country use different dialects of American English. These pronunciation examples may be modified or distinguished consistent with regional dialects and conventions. See scoring note on Page 12 for clarification.

| Phoneme | Phoneme Example | Phoneme | Phoneme Example |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| /ai/ | bait | /th/ | thin |
| /ea/ | bead | /TH/ | then |
| /ie/ | tie | /sh/ | shed |
| /oa/ | boat | /SH/ | measure or beige |
| /oo/ | food | /ch/ | chin |
| /a/ | bad | /j/ | jam \& edge |
| /e/ | bed | /p/ | pen |
| /i/ | bid | /t/ | tap |
| /0/ | cod or law | /k/ | can |
| /u/ | bud and "a" in about | /b/ | bat |
| /uu/ | good | /d/ | dad |
| /ow/ | cow | /g/ | gun or frog |
| /oi/ | noise or point | /m/ | man or jam |
| /ar/ | (1 phoneme) car | /n/ | nap |
| /ir/ | (1 phoneme) bird | /ng/ | sing |
| /or/ | (1 phoneme) for | /f/ | fat |
| /ai/ /r/ | (2 phonemes) chair | /v/ | van |
| /ea/ /r/ | (2 phonemes) clear | /s/ | sit |
| /oo/ /r/ | (2 phonemes) tour | /z/ | zoo |
|  |  | /r/ | rat or frog |
|  |  | /1/ | lap |
|  |  | /w/ | wet |
|  |  | /h/ | hot |
|  |  | /y/ | yell |

## DIBELS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Initial Sound Fluency Assessment Integrity Checklist

Directions: As the observer, please observe setup and directions, time and score the test with the examiner, check examiner's accuracy in following procedures, and decide if examiner passes or needs more practice.


# Phoneme Segmentation Fluency ${ }^{1}$ Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ 6th Ed. University of Oregon 

Directions for Administration and Scoring

Target Age Range


Phoneme Segmentation Fluency is intended for most children from winter of kindergarten through spring of first grade. It may be appropriate for monitoring the progress of older children with low skills in phonological awareness.

Description
DIBELS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF) is a standardized, individually administered test of phonological awareness (Good \& Kaminski, 2001). The PSF measure assesses a student's ability to segment three- and four-phoneme words into their individual phonemes fluently. The PSF measure has been found to be a good predictor of later reading achievement (Kaminski \& Good, 1996). The PSF task is administered by the examiner orally presenting words of three to four phonemes. It requires the student to produce verbally the individual phonemes for each word. For example, the examiner says, "sat," and the student says, "/s/ /a/ /t/" to receive three possible points for the word. After the student responds, the examiner presents the next word, and the number of correct phonemes produced in one minute determines the final score. The PSF measure takes about 2 minutes to administer and has over 20 alternate forms for monitoring progress. The two-week, alternate-form reliability for the PSF measure is .88 (Kaminski \& Good, 1996), and the one-month, alternate-form reliability is .79 in May of kindergarten (Good et al., in preparation). Concurrent, criterion validity of PSF is .54 with the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery Readiness Cluster score in spring of kindergarten (Good et al., in preparation). The predictive validity of spring-of-kindergarten PSF with (a) winter-of-first-grade DIBELS NWF is .62 , (b) spring-of-first-grade Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery Total Reading Cluster score is .68, and (c) spring-of-first-grade CBM ORF is . 62 (Good et al., in preparation). The benchmark goal is 35 to 45 correct phonemes per minute in the spring of kindergarten and fall of first grade. Students scoring below 10 in the spring of kindergarten and fall of first grade may need intensive instructional support to achieve benchmark goals.

Materials: Examiner probe, clipboard, stopwatch, and colored scoring pencil.

[^2]
## Directions for Administration

1. Place examiner probe on clipboard and position so that student cannot see what you record.
2. Say these specific directions to the student:

I am going to say a word. After I say it, you tell me all the sounds in the word. So, if I say, "sam," you would say/s//a/ /m/. Let's try one. (one second pause) Tell me the sounds in "mop".

| CORRECT RESPONSE: <br> If student says, $/ \mathrm{m} / / \mathrm{o} / / \mathrm{p} /$, you <br> say | INCORRECT RESPONSE: <br> If student gives any other response, you say, |
| :--- | :--- |
| Very good. The sounds in <br> "mop" are $/ \mathrm{m} / / \mathrm{o} / /$ p/. | The sounds in "mop" are /m/ /o/ /p/. <br> Your turn. Tell me the sounds in "mop". |

## OK. Here is your first word.

3. Give the student the first word and start your stopwatch. If the student does not say a sound segment after 3 seconds, give him/her the second word and score the first word as zero segments produced.
4. As the student says the sounds, mark the student response in the scoring column. Underline each different, correct, sound segment produced. Put a slash (/) through sounds produced incorrectly.
5. As soon as the student is finished saying the sounds, present the next word promptly and clearly.
6. The maximum time for each sound segment is 3 seconds. If the student does not provide the next sound segment within 3 seconds, give the student the next word. If student provides the initial sound only, wait 3 seconds for elaboration.
7. At the end of $\mathbf{1}$ minute, stop presenting words and scoring further responses. Add the number of sound segments produced correctly. Record the total number of sound segments produced correctly on the bottom of the scoring sheet.

## Directions for Scoring

1. Discontinue rule. If a student has not given any sound segments correctly in the first 5 words, discontinue the task and put a score of zero (0).
2. Underline the sound segments in the word the student produces that are correctly pronounced. Students receive 1 point for each different, correct, part of the word.
3. Put a slash (/) through segments pronounced incorrectly.
4. Correct Segmentation: A correct sound segment is any different, correct, part of the word represented by sounds that correspond to the word part. For example, the sound $/ t /$ is a correct sound segment of "trick," as are /tr/ and /tri/ (see rule 10, Incomplete Segmentation).

| WORD: | STUDENT SAYS: | SCORING <br> PROCEDURE: | CORRECT SEGMENTS: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| trick | "t...r...i...k" | /t/ $/ \mathrm{r} / \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{k}$ | $4 / 4$ |
| cat | "k...a...t" | /k/ $/ \mathrm{a} / \mathrm{lt}$ | $3 / 3$ |

5. Schwa sounds. Schwa sounds (/u/) added to consonants are not counted as errors. Some phonemes cannot be pronounced correctly in isolation without a vowel, and some early learning of sounds includes the schwa. For example, if the word is "trick," and the student says "tu...ru...i...ku" they would receive 4 of 4 points.

| WORD: | STUDENT SAYS: | SCORING <br> PROCEDURE: | CORRECT SEGMENTS: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| trick | "tu...ru...i...ku" | /t/ $/ \mathrm{r} / \mathrm{li} / \mathrm{lk}$ | $4 / 4$ |
| cat | "ku...a...tu" | /k/ /a/ /t/ | $3 / 3$ |

6. Additions. Additions are not counted as errors if they are separated from the other sounds in the word. For example, if the word is "trick," and the student says "t...r...i...ck...s," they would receive 4 of 4 points.

| WORD: | STUDENT SAYS: | SCORING <br> PROCEDURE: | CORRECT <br> SEGMENTS: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| trick | "t...r...i...ck...s" | $\underline{/ t /} / \mathrm{r} / / \mathrm{i} / \mathrm{k} /$ | $\underline{4} / 4$ |
| cat | "s...c...a...t" | $\underline{\mathrm{k} / / \mathrm{a} / \mathrm{t} /}$ | $\underline{3 / 3}$ |

7. Articulation and dialect. The student is not penalized for imperfect pronunciation due to dialect, articulation, or second language interference. For example, if the student consistently says /th/ for /s/, and he or she says, /r/ /e/ /th/ /t/ for "rest," he or she should be given credit for correct segmentation. This is a professional judgment and should be based on the student's responses and any prior knowledge of his/her speech patterns.

|  |  | SCORING | CORRECT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| WORD: | STUDENT SAYS: | PROCEDURE: | SEGMENTS: |
| rest | "r...e..th...t" | $\underline{\text { r } / / \mathrm{e} / / \mathrm{s} / / \mathrm{t} /}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{4} / 4}$ |

8. Sound elongation. The student may elongate the individual sounds and run them together as long as it is clear he or she is aware of each sound individually. For example, if the student says, "rrrrrreeeeesssstttt," with each phoneme held long enough to make it clear they know the sounds in the word, they would receive credit for 4 phonemes correct. This is a professional judgment and should be based on the student's responses and prior knowledge of the student's instruction. When in doubt, no credit is given.

|  |  | SCORING | CORRECT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| WORD: | STUDENT SAYS: | PROCEDURE: | SEGMENTS: |
| rest | "rrrrrreeeeessssttt" | $\underline{\mathrm{r} / / \mathrm{e} / / \mathrm{s} / / \mathrm{t} /}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{4} / 4}$ |

9. No segmentation: If the student repeats the entire word, no credit is given for any correct parts. For example, if the word is "trick," and the student says "trick" circle the word and give 0 points.

| WORD: | STUDENT SAYS: | SCORING <br> PROCEDURE: | CORRECT <br> SEGMENTS: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| trick | "trick" | t/ $/ \mathrm{r} / / \mathrm{i} / / \mathrm{k}$ | $-\mathbf{0} / 4$ |
| cat | "cat" | $\mathrm{k} / / \mathrm{a} / / \mathrm{t} / \mathbf{0} / 3$ |  |

10. Incomplete segmentation: The student is given credit for each correct sound segment, even if they have not segmented to the phoneme level. Use the underline to indicate the size of the sound segment. For example, if the word is "trick," and the student says "tr...ick," they would receive 2 or four points.

| WORD: | STUDENT SAYS: | SCORING | CORRECT <br> PROCEDURE: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| trick | "tr...ick" | $\underline{/ \mathrm{t} / / \mathrm{r} / \mathrm{i} / / \mathrm{k} /}$ | $\underline{\underline{2} / 4}$ |
| cat | "c...at" | $\underline{/ \mathrm{k} / / \mathrm{a} / \mathrm{t} /}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{2} / 3}$ |

11. Overlapping segmentation: The student receives credit for each different, correct, sound segment of the word. Thus, if the word is "trick," and the student says "tri...ick," the student would receive 2 of 4 points because /tri/ and /ick/ are both different, correct, sound segments of "trick."

| WORD: | STUDENT SAYS: | SCORING <br> PROCEDURE: | CORRECT <br> SEGMENTS: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| trick | "tri...ick" | $\underline{/ \mathrm{t} / / \mathrm{r} / / \mathrm{i} / \mathrm{k} /}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{2} / 4}$ |
| cat | "ca.......at" | $\frac{/ \mathrm{k} / / \mathrm{a} / \mathrm{t} /}{}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{3} / 3}$ |

12. Omissions: The student does not receive credit for sound segments that are not produced. If student provides the initial sound only, be sure to wait 3 seconds for elaboration. For example, if the word is "trick," and the student says "tr" you must wait 3 seconds before presenting the next word (see 3 second rule).

SCORING CORRECT
WORD: STUDENT SAYS: PROCEDURE: SEGMENTS:

| trick | "tr...(3 seconds)" | /t/ /r/ /i/ /k/ | $1 / 4$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| cat | "c...t" | /k/ $/ \mathrm{a} / \mathrm{lt} /$ | $2 / 3$ |

13. Segment mispronunciation: The student does not receive credit for sound segments that are mispronounced. For example, if the word is "trick," and the student says "t...r...i...ks" they would receive no credit for $/ \mathrm{ks} /$ because there is no $/ \mathrm{ks} /$ sound segment in the word "trick."

| WORD: | STUDENT SAYS: | SCORING <br> PROCEDURE: | CORRECT SEGMENTS: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| trick | "t...r...i...ks" | \|t/ |r| |il ly | $3 / 4$ |
| cat | "b...a...t" | $\text { / } / \underline{\mathrm{a} / \mathrm{lt} \mid}$ | $2 / 3$ |

## Pronunciation Guide:

Different regions of the country use different dialects of American English. These pronunciation examples may be modified or distinguished consistent with regional dialects and conventions. See scoring note on Page 17 for clarification.

| Phoneme | Phoneme Example | Phoneme | Phoneme Example |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| /ai/ | bait | /th/ | thin |
| /ea/ | bead | /TH/ | then |
| /ie/ | tie | /sh/ | shed |
| /oa/ | boat | /SH/ | measure or beige |
| /oo/ | food | /ch/ | chin |
| /a/ | bad | /j/ | jam \& edge |
| /e/ | bed | /p/ | pen |
| /i/ | bid | /t/ | tap |
| /0/ | cod or law | /k/ | can |
| /u/ | bud and "a" in about | /b/ | bat |
| /uu/ | good | /d/ | dad |
| /ow/ | cow | /g/ | gun or frog |
| /oi/ | noise or point | /m/ | man or jam |
| /ar/ | (1 phoneme) car | /n/ | nap |
| /ir/ | (1 phoneme) bird | /ng/ | sing |
| /or/ | (1 phoneme) for | /f/ | fat |
| /ai/ /r/ | (2 phonemes) chair | /v/ | van |
| /ea/ /r/ | (2 phonemes) clear | /s/ | sit |
| /oo/ /r/ | (2 phonemes) tour | /z/ | zoo |
|  |  | /r/ | rat or frog |
|  |  | /1/ | lap |
|  |  | /w/ | wet |
|  |  | /h/ | hot |
|  |  | /y/ | yell |

## DIBELS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Phoneme Segmentation Fluency Assessment Integrity Checklist

Directions: As the observer, please observe setup and directions, time and score the test with the examiner, check examiner's accuracy in following procedures, and decide if examiner passes or needs more practice.


# DIBELS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Nonsense Word Fluency ${ }^{1}$ Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ 6th Ed. University of Oregon 

Directions for Administration and Scoring

Target Age Range


Nonsense Word Fluency is intended for most children from mid to end of kindergarten through the beginning of second grade. It may be appropriate for monitoring the progress of older children with low skills in letter-sound correspondence.

## Description

DIBELS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF) is a standardized, individually-administered test of the alphabetic principle - including letter-sound correspondence and of the ability to blend letters into words in which letters represent their most common sounds (Kaminski \& Good, 1996). The student is presented an $8.5 " \times 11 "$ sheet of paper with randomly ordered VC and CVC nonsense words (e.g., sig, rav, ov) and asked to produce verbally the individual letter sound of each letter or verbally produce, or read, the whole nonsense word. For example, if the stimulus word is "vaj" the student could say $/ \mathrm{v} / / \mathrm{a} / \mathrm{j} /$ or say the word $/ \mathrm{vaj} /$ to obtain a total of three lettersounds correct. The student is allowed 1 minute to produce as many letter-sounds as he/she can, and the final score is the number of letter-sounds produced correctly in one minute. Because the measure is fluency based, students receive a higher score if they are phonologically recoding the word and receive a lower score if they are providing letter sounds in isolation. The NWF measure takes about 2 minutes to administer and has over 20 alternate forms for monitoring progress. The one-month, alternate-form reliability for NWF in January of first grade is .83 (Good et al., in preparation). The concurrent criterion-validity of DIBELS ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ NWF with the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery-Revised Readiness Cluster score is .36 in January and . 59 in February of first grade (Good et al., in preparation). The predictive validity of DIBELS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ NWF in January of first grade with (a) CBM ORF in May of first grade is .82 , (b) CBM ORF in May of second grade is .60, (c) Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery Total Reading Cluster score is . 66 (Good et al., in preparation). The benchmark goal for Nonsense Word Fluency is 50 correct letter sounds per minute by mid first grade. Students scoring below 30 in mid first grade may need intensive instructional support to achieve first grade reading goals.

[^3]Materials: Practice items; student copy of probe; examiner copy of probe, clipboard, stopwatch; colored scoring pen.

## Directions for Administration

1. Place the practice items in front of the student.
2. Place the examiner probe on clipboard and position so that the student cannot see what you record.
3. Say these specific directions to the student:

Look at this word (point to the first word on the practice probe). It's a makebelieve word. Watch me read the word: /s/ /i/ /m/ "sim" (point to each letter then run your finger fast beneath the whole word). I can say the sounds of the letters, $/ \mathbf{s} / / \mathbf{i} / / \boldsymbol{m} /$ (point to each letter), or I can read the whole word "sim"(run your finger fast beneath the whole word).

Your turn to read a make-believe word. Read this word the best you can (point to the word "lut"). Make sure you say any sounds you know.

| CORRECT RESPONSE: <br> If the child responds "lut" or <br> with all of the sounds, say | INCORRECT OR NO RESPONSE: <br> If the child does not respond within 3 seconds or <br> responds incorrectly, say |
| :--- | :--- |
| That's right. The | Remember, you can say the sounds or you |
| sounds are $/ \boldsymbol{l} / \mathbf{u} / / \boldsymbol{t} /$ or <br> "lut" <br> can say the whole word. Watch me: the <br> sounds are $/ \boldsymbol{l} / / \boldsymbol{u} / / t /$ (point to each letter) or "lut" <br> (run your finger fast through the whole word). Lets <br> try again. Read this word the best you can <br> (point to the word "lut"). |  |

4. Place the student copy of the probe in front of the child.

Here are some more make-believe words (point to the student probe). Start here (point to the first word) and go across the page (point across the page). When I say, "begin", read the words the best you can. Point to each letter and tell me the sound or read the whole word. Read the words the best you can. Put your finger on the first word. Ready, begin.
5. Start your stopwatch.
6. Follow along on the examiner copy of the probe and underline each letter sound the student provides correctly, either in isolation or read as a whole word. Put a slash (/) over each letter sound read incorrectly.
7. At the end of 1 minute, place a bracket (]) after the last letter sound provided by the student and say, "Stop."
8. These directions can be shortened by beginning with Number 4 for repeated measurement when the student clearly understands the directions and procedure.

## Directions for Scoring

1. Discontinue Rule. If the student does not get any sounds correct in words $1-5$, discontinue the task and record a score of 0 .
2. Correct letter sounds. Underline the individual letters for letter sounds produced correctly in isolation and score 1 point for each letter sound produced correctly. For example, if the stimulus word is "tob" and the student says $/ \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{/o} / / \mathrm{b} /$, the individual letters would be underlined with a score of 3 .
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{lllc}\text { Word } & & \text { Student Says } & \text { Scoring Procedure }\end{array}
$$ \begin{array}{c}Correct Letter <br>

Sounds\end{array}\right]\)| tob | "t...o...b" | $\underline{\mathbf{t}} \underline{\mathrm{o}} \underline{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| dos | "d.......s" | $\underline{\mathrm{d}} \mathrm{o} \underline{\mathrm{s}}$ |

3. Correct words. Use a single underline under multiple letters for correct letter sounds blended together and give credit for each letter sound correspondence produced correctly. For example, if the stimulus word is "tob" and the student says "tob", one underline would be used with a score of 3 .

| Word | Student Says | Scoring Procedure | Correct Letter Sounds |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| tob | "tob" | $\underline{\mathrm{tab}}$ | $3 / 3$ |
| dos | "d...os" | d OS | $3 / 3$ |

4. Partially correct words. If a word is partially correct, underline the corresponding letters for letter sounds produced correctly. Put a slash $(\boldsymbol{)}$ ) through the letter if the corresponding letter sound is incorrect. For example, if the word is "tob" and the student says "toab" (with a long o), the letters " $t$ " and " $b$ " would be underlined, and the letter " $o$ " would be slashed with a score of 2 .

| Word |  | Student Says | Scoring Procedure |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}Correct Letter <br>


Sounds\end{array}\right]\)| tob | "toab" (long o) |
| :--- | :--- |
| dos | "dot" |

5. Repeated sounds. Letter sounds given twice while sounding out the word are given credit only once. For example, if stimulus word is "tob" and the student says, $/ \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{lo} / \mathrm{lob} /$, the letter " $о$ " and the letters "ob" are underlined. The student receives only 1 point for the letter sound " $o$ " even though the correct sound was provided twice (a total of 3 for the entire word).

| Word | Student Says | Scoring Procedure | Correct Letter Sounds |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| tob | "t...o...ob" | t o b | $3 / 3$ |
| dos | "d...o...s...dos" | d o O | $3 / 3$ |

6. 3 second rule - sound by sound. If the student is providing individual letter sounds and hesitates for 3 seconds on a letter sound, score the letter sound incorrect, provide the correct letter sound, point to the next letter, and say "What sound?" This prompt may be repeated. For example, if stimulus word is "tob" and the student says, /t/ (3 seconds), prompt by saying, "/o/ (point to b) What sound?"

| Word | Student Says | Prompt | Scoring <br> Procedure | Correct Letter <br> Sounds |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| tob | "t" $(3 \mathrm{sec})$ | $/ \boldsymbol{o} /($ point to b) What sound? | $\underline{\mathrm{t}} \boldsymbol{\phi} \mathrm{b}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{1} / 3}$ |
| dos et | "d...o" $(3 \mathrm{sec})$ | $/ \mathrm{s} /($ point to e) What sound? | $\underline{\mathrm{d}} \mathrm{o} / \mathrm{e} \mathrm{t}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{2} / 5}$ |

7. 3 second rule - word by word. If the student is reading words and hesitates for 3 seconds on a word, score the word incorrect, provide the correct word, point to the next word, and say, "What word?" This prompt can be repeated. For example, if stimulus words are "tob dos et" and the student says, "tob" (3 seconds), prompt by saying, "dos (point to et) What word?"

| Words | Student Says | Prompt | Scoring Procedure |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| tob dos et | "tob" $(3 \mathrm{sec})$ | "dos (point to et) What word?" | t o b | e t |
| tuf kej ik | "tuf" $(3 \mathrm{sec})$ | "kej (point to ik) What word?" | t u f |  |

8. Sound order - sound by sound. Letter sounds produced in isolation but out of order are scored as correct. For example, if stimulus word is "tob" and the student points to and says, $/ \mathrm{b} / \mathrm{o} / \mathrm{lt} /$, all letters would be underlined, with a score of 3. The purpose of this rule is to give students credit as they are beginning to learn individual letter sound correspondences.

Correct Letter

| Word | Student Says | Scoring Procedure | Sounds |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| tob | "b...o...t" (point correctly) | $\underline{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{o} \underline{\mathrm{b}}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{3} / 3}$ |
| dos | "o...d...s" (point correctly) | $\underline{\mathrm{d}} \underline{\mathrm{o}} \underline{\mathrm{s}}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{3} / 3}$ |

9. Sound order - word by word. Blended letter sounds must be correct and in the correct place (beginning, middle, end) to receive credit. For example, if stimulus word is "tob" and the student says, "bot", only the "o" would be correct and in the correct place, for a score of 1.

Correct Letter

| Word | Student Says | Scoring Procedure | Sounds |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| tob | "bot" | $/ \mathbf{o} \nmid /$ | $\underline{\mathbf{1} / 3}$ |
| ik | "ki" | $/ \mathbf{0}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{0} / 2}$ |

10. Insertions. Insertions are not scored as incorrect. For example, if the stimulus word is "sim" and the student says "stim", the letters "s," " i ," and " m " would be underlined and full credit would given for the word with no penalty for the insertion of $/ t /$.

| Word | Student Says | Scoring Procedure | Correct Letter <br> Sounds |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| tob | "stob" | $\underline{\mathrm{t} \mathrm{o} \mathrm{b}}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{3} / 3} 3$ |
| dos | "dots" | $\underline{\mathrm{do} \mathrm{s}}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{3} / 3}$ |

11. Dialect and articulation. The student is not penalized for imperfect pronunciation due to dialect, articulation, or second language inferences. This is a professional judgment and should be based on the student's responses and any prior knowledge of their speech patterns. For example, a student may regularly substitute /th/ for /s/. If the stimulus word is "sim" and the student says "thim," the letter "s" would be underlined and credit for a correct-letter sound correspondence would be given.

| Word | Student Says | Scoring Procedure | Correct Letter <br> Sounds |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| sim | "thim" (articulation error) | $\underline{\mathrm{s} \mathrm{i} \mathrm{m}}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{3} / 3}$ |
| rit | "wit" (articulation error) | $\underline{\mathrm{r} \mathrm{i} \mathrm{t}}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{3} / 3}$ |

12. Self correct. If a student makes an error and corrects him/herself within 3 seconds, write "SC" above the letter sound or word and count it as correct.
13. Skips row. If a student skips an entire row, draw a line through the row and do not count the row in scoring.

## Pronunciation Guide:

Different regions of the country use different dialects of American English. These pronunciation examples may be modified or distinguished consistent with regional dialects and conventions. See dialect and articulation scoring note for clarification. The letters " $x$ " and " $q$ " are not used. The letters " $h$," "w," "y," and "r" are used only in the initial position. The letters "c" and "g" are used only in the final position.

| Letter | Sound | Example |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a | $\mathrm{a} /$ | bat |
| e | $\mathrm{e} /$ | bet |
| i | $/ \mathrm{i} / /$ | bit |
| o | $/ \mathrm{o} /$ | top |
| u | $\mathrm{l} /$ | hut |
| b | $/ \mathrm{b} /$ | bat |
| c | $/ \mathrm{k} /$ | tic |
| d | $/ \mathrm{d} /$ | dad |
| f | $/ \mathrm{f} /$ | fan |
| g | $/ \mathrm{g} /$ | pig |
| h | $/ \mathrm{h} /$ | hat |
| j | $\mathrm{j} /$ | jet |
| k | $\mathrm{/k} /$ | can |
| l | $/ \mathrm{l} /$ | lot |
| m | $/ \mathrm{m} /$ | man |
| n | $\mathrm{h} /$ | not |
| p | $/ \mathrm{p} /$ | pan |
| r | $/ \mathrm{r} /$ | ran |
| s | $/ \mathrm{s} /$ | sat |
| t | $/ \mathrm{t} /$ | top |
| v | $/ \mathrm{v} /$ | van |
| w | $/ \mathrm{w} /$ | wet |
| y | $/ \mathrm{y} /$ | yak |
| z | $/ \mathrm{z} /$ | zipper |

## DIBELS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Nonsense Word Fluency Assessment Integrity Checklist

Directions: As the observer, please observe setup and directions, time and score the test with the examiner, check examiner's accuracy in following procedures, and decide if examiner passes or needs more practice.


# DIBELS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Oral Reading Fluency and Retell Fluency ${ }^{1}$ Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ 6th Ed. University of Oregon 

Directions for Administration and Scoring

## Target Age Range



DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency is intended for most children from mid first grade through third grade. The benchmark goals are 40 in spring of first grade, 90 in spring of second grade, and 110 in the spring of third grade. Students may need intensive instructional support if they score below 10 in spring of first grade, below 50 in spring of second grade, and below 70 in spring of third grade.

## Description

DIBELS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Oral Reading Fluency (DORF) is a standardized, individually administered test of accuracy and fluency with connected text. The DORF passages and procedures are based on the program of research and development of Curriculum-Based Measurement of reading by Stan Deno and colleagues at the University of Minnesota and using the procedures described in Shinn (1989). A version of CBM Reading also has been published as The Test of Reading Fluency (TORF) (Children's Educational Services, 1987). DORF is a standardized set of passages and administration procedures designed to (a) identify children who may need additional instructional support, and (b) monitor progress toward instructional goals. The passages are calibrated for the goal level of reading for each grade level. Student performance is measured by having students read a passage aloud for one minute. Words omitted, substituted, and hesitations of more than three seconds are scored as errors. Words self-corrected within three seconds are scored as accurate. The number of correct words per minute from the passage is the oral reading fluency rate.

A series of studies has confirmed the technical adequacy of CBM Reading procedures in general. Test-retest reliabilities for elementary students ranged from .92 to .97 ; alternate-form reliability of different reading passages drawn from the same level ranged from .89 to .94 (Tindal, Marston, \& Deno, 1983). Criterion-related validity studied in eight separate studies in the 1980s reported coefficients ranging from .52-.91 (Good \& Jefferson, 1998).

DIBELS ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ Retell Fluency (RTF) is intended to provide a comprehension check for the DORF assessment. In general, oral reading fluency provides one of the best measures of reading competence, including comprehension, for children in first through third grades. The purpose of the RTF measure is to (a) prevent inadvertently learning or practicing a misrule, (b) identify children whose comprehension is not consistent with their fluency, (c) provide an explicit

Good, R. H., \& Kaminski, R. A., \& Dill, S. (2002). DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency. In R. H. Good \& R. A. Kaminski (Eds.), Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (6th ed.). Eugene, OR: Institute for the Development of Educational Achievement. Available: http://dibels.uoregon.edu/.
linkage to the core components in the NRP report, and (d) increase the face validity of the DORF.
(1) The misrule that we want to prevent is that speed-reading without attending to meaning is either desirable or the intent of the oral reading fluency measure. With a prompted retell, children will be less likely to conclude that simply reading as fast as they can is the desired behavior, and teachers will be less likely to imply that simply reading as fast as they can is desired.
(2) Teachers frequently are concerned about children who read fluently and do not comprehend. My read of the data is that this pattern is infrequent - but may apply to some children. It seems to me this procedure may identify those children without increasing unduly the amount of time spent in the assessment.
(3) The National Reading Panel (2000) report is clear on the core components of early reading, and DIBELS maps explicitly onto the first three, Retell Fluency is included to provide a brief measure that corresponds directly to the comprehension core component. The current oral reading fluency measure corresponds about as well as anything to reading comprehension. Retell Fluency provides an additional, explicit score that corresponds to the National Reading Panel core components.
(4) A primary concern teachers have about oral reading fluency is the face validity of the measure. Incorporation of an explicit comprehension check may help teachers feel increasingly comfortable with oral reading fluency.

Guidelines for Interpreting Retell Fluency. Preliminary evidence indicates that the Retell Fluency measures correlates with measures of oral reading fluency about .59. It appears children's retell scores may be typically about $50 \%$ of their oral reading fluency score, and that it is unusual for children reading more than 40 words per minute to have a retell score $25 \%$ or less than their oral reading fluency score. So, a rough rule of thumb may be that, for children whose retell is about $50 \%$ of their oral reading fluency score, their oral reading fluency score provides a good overall indication of their reading proficiency, including comprehension. But, for children who are reading over 40 words per minute and whose retell score is $25 \%$ or less of their oral reading fluency, their oral reading fluency score alone may not be providing a good indication of their overall reading proficiency. For example, a child reading 60 words correct in one minute would be expected to use about 30 words in their retell of the passage. If their retell is about 30, then their oral reading fluency of 60 is providing a good indication of their reading skills. If their retell is 15 or less, then there may be a comprehension concern that is not represented by their fluency.

Materials: Student copy of passage; examiner copy, clipboard, stopwatch; colored scoring pen.

## Directions for Administration - Part 1: Oral Reading Fluency

1. Place the reading passage in front of the student.
2. Place the examiner copy on clipboard and position so that the student cannot see what you record.
3. Say these specific directions to the student:

Please read this (point) out loud. If you get stuck, I will tell you the word so you can keep reading. When I say, "stop" I may ask you to tell me about
what you read, so do your best reading. Start here (point to the first word of the passage). Begin.
4. Start your stopwatch when the student says the first word of the passage. The title is not counted. If the student fails to say the first word after 3 seconds, tell them the word and mark it as incorrect, then start your stopwatch.
5. The maximum time for each word is 3 seconds. If the student does not provide the word within 3 seconds, say the word and mark the word as incorrect.
6. Follow along on the examiner copy of the probe. Put a slash $(\boldsymbol{/})$ over words read incorrectly.
7. At the end of $\mathbf{1}$ minute, place a bracket ( ] ) after the last word provided by the student, stop and reset the stopwatch, and say

Stop. (remove the passage)

## Directions for Administration - Part 2: Retell

8. If the student reads 10 or more words correct, administer Part 2: Retell. Say,

Please tell me all about what you just read. Try to tell me everything you can. Begin.
9. Start your stopwatch after you say "begin".
10. Count the number of words the child produces in his or her retell by moving your pen through the numbers as the student is responding. Try to record accurately the number of words in the student's response. Put a circle around the total number of words in the student's response.
Example: If the student says "The bird had a nest. There was a mommy bird." Move your pen through the numbers as the student responds and circle the total words.

11. The first time the student does not say anything for 3 seconds, say "Try to tell me everything you can." This prompt can be used only once.
12. After the first prompt, if the student does not say anything or gets off track for 5 seconds, circle the total number of words in the student's retell and say, "Stop."
13. At the end of $\mathbf{1}$ minute, circle the total number of words in the student's retell and say, "Stop."

## Directions for Scoring - Part 1: Oral Reading Fluency

1. Score reading passages immediately after administration.
2. Discontinue Rule. If the student does not read any words correctly in the first row of the first passage, discontinue the task and record a score of 0 on the front cover.
3. Record the total number of words read correctly on the bottom of the scoring sheet for each passage.
4. If the student reads fewer than 10 words correct on the first passage, record their score on the front cover and do not administer passages 2 and 3 .
5. If the student reads 3 passages, record their middle score on the front cover. For example, if the student gets scores of 27,36 , and 25 , record a score of 27 on the front cover. If they read only 1 passage, have them read the middle (second) passage.
6. Hesitate or struggle with words. If a student hesitates or struggles with a word for 3 seconds, tell the student the word and mark the word as incorrect. If necessary, indicate for the student to continue with the next word.

| Passage | Student Says | Scoring Procedure | Correct Words <br> / Total Words |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I have a goldfish. | "I have a $\ldots(3$ seconds $) "$ | I have a goldfish. | $\underline{\mathbf{3} / 4}$ |

7. Hyphenated words. Hyphenated words count as two words if both parts can stand alone as individual words. Hyphenated words count as one word if either part cannot stand alone as an individual word.

|  | Passage |
| :--- | :---: |
| Number of |  |
| I gave Ben a red yo-yo. | Words |
| We did push-ups, pull-ups, and sit-ups. | 6 |

8. Numerals. Numerals must be read correctly in the context of the sentence.

Correct Words

| Passage $\quad$ Student Says | Scoring Procedure $/$ Total Words |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |


| My father is 36. | "My father is thirty-six." | My father is 36. | $\underline{4} / 4$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| My father is 36. | "My father is three six." | My father is 36. | $\underline{\mathbf{3} / 4}$ |
| I am 6 years old. | "I am six years old." | I am 6 years old. | $\underline{\mathbf{5} / 5}$ |

9. Mispronounced words. A word is scored as correct if it is pronounced correctly in the context of the sentence. If the word is mispronounced in the context, it is scored as an error. Correct Words

| Passage | Student Says | Scoring Procedure | / Total Words |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| It was a live fish. | "It was a liv fish." (i.e., <br> short i) | It was a lỉt fish. | $\underline{\mathbf{3} / 4}$ |
| I ate too much. | "I eat too much." | I 扎 too much. | $\underline{\mathbf{3} / 4}$ |

10. Self Corrections. A word is scored as correct if it is initially mispronounced but the student self corrects within 3 seconds. Mark SC above the word and score as correct.

Correct Words

| Passage | Student Says | Scoring Procedure | / Total Words |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| It was a live fish. | "It was a liv ... live | It was a S' |  |
|  | fish." (i.e., self-corrects fish. |  | $\underline{4} / 4$ |
|  | to long i within 3 sec.) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

11. Repeated Words. Words that are repeated are not scored as incorrect and are ignored in scoring.

| Passage | Student Says | Scoring Procedure | Correct Words <br> / Total Words |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I have a goldfish. | "I have a ... I have a <br> goldfish." | I have a goldfish. | $\underline{4 / 4}$ |

12. Articulation and dialect. The student is not penalized for imperfect pronunciation due to dialect, articulation, or second language interference. For example, if the student consistently says $/ \mathrm{th} / \mathrm{for} / \mathrm{s} /$, and reads "rest" as "retht," he or she should be given credit for a correct word. This is a professional judgment and should be based on the student's responses and any prior knowledge of his/her speech patterns.

Correct Words

| Passage | Student Says | Scoring Procedure | / Total Words |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| It is time for a rest. | "It is time for a retht." | It is time for a rest. | $\underline{\mathbf{6} / 6}$ | (articulation)

We took the short cut. "We took the shot cut." We took the short cut. _5/5 (dialect)
13. Inserted words. Inserted words are ignored and not counted as errors. The student also does not get additional credit for inserted words. If the student frequently inserts extra words, note the pattern at the bottom of the scoring page.

Correct Words

| Passage | Student Says | Scoring Procedure | / Total Words |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| It is time for a rest. | "It is time for a long rest." | It is time for a rest. | $\underline{\mathbf{6} / 6}$ |
| I ate too much. | "I ate way too much.". | I ate too much. | $\underline{\mathbf{4} / 4}$ |

14. Omitted words. Omitted words are scored as incorrect.

Correct Words

| Passage | Student Says | Scoring Procedure | / Total Words |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| It is time for a rest. | "It is time for rest." | It is time for $/$ rest. | $\underline{\mathbf{5} / 6}$ |
| I ate too much. | "I ate much." | I ate t/fo much. | $\underline{\mathbf{3} / 4} 4$ |

15. Word Order. All words that are read correctly but in the wrong order are scored as incorrect. Correct Words

| Passage | Student Says | Scoring Procedure | / Total Words |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| The ice cream man | "The cream ice man | The $\nless \mathrm{Ce}$ cratm man | $\underline{\mathbf{3} / 5}$ |
| comes. | comes." | comes. |  |
| I ate too much. | "I too ate much." | I gle t/o much. | $\underline{\mathbf{2} / 4}$ |

16. Abbreviations. Abbreviations should be read in the way you would normally pronounce the abbreviation in conversation. For example, TV could be read as "teevee" or "television" but Mr. would be read as "mister."

Correct Words

| Passage | Student Says | Scoring Procedure | / Total Words |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| May I watch TV? | "May I watch teevee?" | May I watch TV? | $\underline{\mathbf{4} / 4}$ |
| May I watch TV? | "May I watch television?" May I watch TV? | $\underline{\mathbf{4} / 4}$ |  |
| My teacher is Mr. | "My teacher is mister | My teacher is Mr. |  |
| Smith. | Smith." | Smith. | $\underline{\mathbf{5} / 5}$ |
| My teacher is Mr. | "My teacher is 'm' 'r', | My teacher is Y/r. <br> Smith. | Smith. |

Directions for Scoring - Part 2: Retell Fluency

1. Score retell while the child is responding. Circle total number of words immediately after examiner says, "Stop."
2. Number of retell words. Count the number of words the child retells that illustrate their understanding of the passage.
3. Exclamations are not counted. Only actual words are counted. If the child inserts mazes or other sounds, inserted sounds are not counted.

Passage
Student Says

I love going to the library downtown. There are so many books. There is a big room in the library that is just for kids. I can reach all the books by myself.

[^4]4. Count contractions as one word. For example, if the child uses "She's," or "We'll" they would only count as one word.
Passage
I love going to the library downtown.
There are so many books. There is a big
room in the library that is just for kids. I can
reach all the books by myself.

Student Says
They're going to the library. It's downtown. There's a room. room in the library that is just for kids. I can reach all the books by myself.

| -1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

5. Songs or recitations are not included. If the child recites the ABC's or tells a song or poem, even if relevant to the retell, the recitation, song, or poem is not counted.

Passage
Student Says

I love going to the library downtown. There are so many books. There is a big room in the library that is just for kids. I can reach all the books by myself.

They're going to the library. The books have letters like, A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z.

6. Minor repetitions, redundancies, irrelevancies, and inaccuracies are counted. The crucial judgment is whether the student is retelling the passage or has gotten off track on another story or topic. In this example, the child (a) goes from "they" to "I", (b) changes "love" to "like," (c) changes the order of events, (d) repeats "library," (e) confuses "room" and "books," and (f) confuses "reach" and "read." However, their retell is fundamentally on track. and all words would count.

Passage
I love going to the library downtown. There are so many books. There is a big room in the library that is just for kids. I can reach all the books by myself.

Student Says
They're going to the library. The library is downtown. I like the library. They have books just for kids. I can read them myself.

7. Rote repetitions of words or phrases are not counted.

Passage
I love going to the library downtown. There are so many books. There is a big room in the library that is just for kids. I can reach all the books by myself.

Student Says
They're going to the library. They're going to the library. They're going to the library. (sing-song voice)

8. Repeating their retell is not counted. Especially when children are prompted to "try to tell me everything you can" they may simply repeat what they have already provided.

| Passage | Student Says |
| :--- | :--- |
| I love going to the library downtown. | They're going to the library. Lots of books. |
| There are so many books. There is a big |  |
| room in the library that is just for kids. I can | [prompt] They're going to the library. |
| reach all the books by myself. |  |


9. Stories or irrelevancies that are off track are not counted. Children may start telling something from their own experience that is vaguely related to the passage. Such stories are not counted.

$$
\text { Passage } \quad \text { Student Says }
$$

I love going to the library downtown. There are so many books. There is a big room in the library that is just for kids. I can reach all the books by myself.

They're going to the library. They have lots of books. My mom took me to the library. We got Dr. Seuss and Willy Wonka. They are my favorite books.

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## DIBELS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Oral Reading Fluency Assessment Integrity Checklist

Directions: As the observer, please observe setup and directions, time and score the test with the examiner, check examiner's accuracy in following procedures, and decide if examiner passes or needs more practice.

| 3 | 1. Performs standardized directions verbatim: <br> Please read this out loud. If you get stuck, I will tell you the word so you can keep reading. When <br> I say, "stop" I may ask you to tell me about what you read, so do your best reading. Start here. <br> Begin. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. Holds clipboard and stopwatch so child cannot see what (s)he records. |  |

# DIBELS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ - Word Use Fluency ${ }^{1}$ <br> Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ 6th Ed. <br> University of Oregon 

Directions for Administration and Scoring
Target Age Range

|  |  |  | Word Use Fluency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Preschool |  | End | Kindergarten |  |  | First Grade |  |  | Second Grade |  |  | Third Grade |  |  |

Word Use Fluency (WUF) is intended for most children from fall of kindergarten through third grade. A benchmark goal is not provided for WUF because additional research is needed to establish its linkage to other big ideas of early literacy (phonological awareness, alphabetic principle, and accuracy and fluency with connected text). Tentatively, students in the lowest 20 percent of a school district using local norms should be considered at risk for poor language and reading outcomes, and those between the $20^{\text {th }}$ percentile and $40^{\text {th }}$ percentile should be considered at some risk.

## Materials: Examiner probe, Clipboard, Stopwatch, Pencil or Pen.

## Directions for Administration

1. Place examiner probe on clipboard and position so that student cannot see what you record.
2. Say these specific directions to the student:

Listen to me use this word, "green". (pause) The grass is green. Here is another word, "jump" (pause) I like to jump rope. Your turn to use a word (pause) "rabbit".

| CORRECT RESPONSE: <br> If student uses the word correctly in a <br> phrase, say | INCORRECT RESPONSE: |
| :--- | :--- |
| If student gives any other response, |  |
| say, |  |

[^5]
## OK. Here is your first word.

3. Give the student the first word and start your stopwatch. If the student does not begin to use the word after 5 seconds, give him/her the second word and score the first word as zero.
4. Provide the next word when the student has used the word in a phrase, expression, or utterance or when the student hesitates or pauses for 5 seconds. As soon as the student is finished using the word, present the next word promptly and clearly.
5. At the end of $\mathbf{1}$ minute, stop presenting words and recording further responses. Count the number of words used correctly in phrases, expressions, or sentences, and record at the end of the row. Total these scores and record at the bottom of the scoring sheet.

## Directions for Scoring:

1. The total score will be the total number of words used correctly in an utterance. An utterance may be a phrase, expression, definition, or sentence. For each target word, the words in the final and/or most complete utterance will be counted.
2. Number of words. Count the number of words the child produces in response to a word by moving your pen through the numbers as the student is responding. Try to record accurately the number of words in the student's response. Put a circle around the total number of words in the student's response.

- Count only actual words, not exclamations such as "um."
- Score contractions (e.g., "She's," "We'll") as one word.
- Words do not include songs or recitations (e.g., the ABC's and 1, 2, 3, etc.) performed either individually or in a group.
- If a child perseverates on a word (e.g., "beep, beep, beep, beep"), count the word as a single-word utterance (if it is the only word stated by a child) or as one word in a multi-word utterance.

Example: If the word is "stone" and the student says "I threw the stone in the water." Move your pen through the numbers as the student responds and circle the total words.

3. Correct utterance. Mark the usage of the word in an utterance as correct or incorrect. Correct utterances are scored liberally. If the utterance conveys the accurate meaning of the word and could be correct, score it as correct. A response is considered correct when it meets the requirement for either correct use, or correct definition.

- Correct Use: For an utterance to be considered correct in terms of use, the target word is used correctly in a phrase, expression, or sentence.
- Correct Definition: Correct definitions are accepted as a correct utterance. Correct definitions do not need to contain the target word to be accepted as correct. Synonyms are considered definitions.

4. Total number of words in correct utterances. At the end of 1 minute, add up the number of words in each correct utterance to obtain the total number of words in correct utterances. Note, do not count words used in incorrect responses. Count the number of words used in correct utterances only.
5. Discontinue Rule. If a student has not used any of the first 5 words correctly in a phrase, expression, or sentence, discontinue the task and put a score of zero (0).

## Scoring Examples

## Correct use

1. Correct use. If the word is used in a phrase, expression or sentence and conveys the meaning of the word, the response is correct.
Example: If the word is "stone" and the student says "I threw the stone in the water." Circle the total words, mark the utterance as correct, and write the total number of words in the blank.

| stone |  | 7 CI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

Example: If the word is "school" and the student says, "I like school because it's fun." Circle the total words, mark the utterance as correct, and write the total number of words in the blank.

| stone | (1) | 6 (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

2. False starts within a correct use are not counted.

Example, if the word is "school" and the student says, "School. I like school. I like school because it's fun." Score the final/most complete utterance only. Circle the number of words in the final utterance, mark the utterance as correct, and write the total number of words in the blank.

| school |  | 6 (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

3. Repetitions of words or phrases within a correct use are not counted.

Example: Student says, "School... school... I like ... I like .... I like school because it's fun." Circle the total words in the final/most complete utterance ("I like school because it's fun"), mark the utterance as correct, and write the total number of words in the blank.

4. Words used as fillers within a correct use are not counted.

Example: Student says, "School...um...well...you know...um...I...um...like school because it's...um...you know...fun. Circle the total words in the final/most complete utterance ("I like school because it's fun"), mark the utterance as correct, and write the total number of words in the blank.

| school |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

5. Homophone. Correct use of a homophone is scored as correct. Use of a word that sounds the same as the target word would be counted as a correct use.

Example: If the word is "board" and the student says "I am bored." Circle the total words, mark the utterance as correct, and write the total number of words in the blank.

6. Correct definition is scored as a correct use. A correct definition or synonym conveys the meaning of the word and would be counted as a correct use.

Example: If the word is "stone" and the student says "Something that is round and hard." Circle the total words, mark the utterance as correct, and write the total number of words in the blank.


Example: If the word is "red" and the student says "color." A definition or synonym would be scored as a correct use, even if it is only one word. Circle the total words, mark the utterance as correct, and write the total number of words.

| red |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Non example: If the word is "red" and the student says "robin." The word robin is not a correct use or definition of the target word, red. Circle the total words and mark the utterance as incorrect.


Example: Target word is "red". The student says "red robin." Circle the total words, mark the utterance as correct, and write the total number of words.

7. Changing tense, number, or parts of speech. If the student changes the tense or number of the word and uses the word correctly in an utterance, score as correct.

Example: If the word is "stone" and the student says "Don't throw stones." Circle the total words, mark the utterance as correct, and write the total number of words in the blank.

| stone | O | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  | 3 | 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Example: If the word is "dress" and the student says "get dressed." "Dress" can be used correctly as a verb (to put clothing on) and as a noun (dress as a piece of clothing). Circle the total words, mark the utterance as correct, and write the total number of words in the blank.

8. Long response or multiple utterances. Count only the words in the most complete utterance in which the target word was used. Stop counting and redirect the student back to the task by providing the next word.
Example: If the word is "stone" and the student says, "I like to throw stones in the morning and I especially like to throw stones when we go fishing. I went fishing with my dad this weekend and we didn't catch anything at all. I was sad and my dad was too." Circle the total words in the first utterance in which the target word was used, mark the utterance as correct, and write the total number of words in the blank.


## Incorrect Usage

1. Incorrect response. The target word is used in the response, but the response does not make sense. The word is used incorrectly or the utterance does not convey the accurate meaning of the word.

Example: If the word is "stone" and the student says, "I like to eat stones for lunch." Circle the total words and mark the utterance as incorrect.


Example: , If the word is "school" and the student says, "I school my jumps". Circle the total words and mark the utterance as incorrect.

2. Repeating the target word is not a correct use. Simply repeating the word, does not convey or imply correct meaning or use of the word, and would be scored as an incorrect use.
For example, if the word is "school" and student says, "School." Circle the total words and mark the phrase or utterance as incorrect.

| school | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  | 0 | (I) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

3. No response. If student doesn't respond in 5 seconds, circle zero, proceed to the next word and score as incorrect.

Example: If the word is "stone" and the student does not say any words [5 seconds]. Circle the zero and mark the phrase or utterance as incorrect.

| ne | $\begin{array}{lllllllll}2 & 13 & 14 & 15 & 16 & 17 & 18 & 19 & 20\end{array}$ | 0 (I) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

4. "I don't know". If the student says, "I don't know that one." Circle zero, proceed to the next word and score as incorrect.

Example: If the word is "stone" and the student says, "I don't know that one". Circle the total words and mark the phrase or utterance as incorrect.

| stone | $(1)$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  | 0 | 0 | d |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## DIBELS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Approved Accommodations

The purpose of accommodations is to facilitate assessment for children for whom a standard administration may not provide an accurate estimate of their skills in the core early literacy skill areas. Assessment and accommodations to assessment should be consistent with the primary goal of accurately estimating the child's skills in phonemic awareness, phonics or alphabetic principle, accuracy and fluency with connected text, reading comprehension, and vocabulary development.

DIBELS approved accommodations are accommodations that are unlikely to change substantially the meaning or interpretation of scores on the measures or the target skill being assessed by the measure. When DIBELS approved accommodations are used, the regular DIBELS interpretation guidelines apply, and the scores can be entered into the DIBELS Data System for reporting and interpretation. The "Tested with DIBELS Approved Accommodations" box should be checked in the student demographics section.

When the DIBELS assessments are administered in ways different from both a DIBELS standard administration and the DIBELS approved accommodations, the administration would be considered an unstandardized administration and the resulting scores cannot be interpreted with the DIBELS interpretive and reporting procedures. Scores from a nonstandard administration using unapproved accommodations should not be entered into the DIBELS Data System for reporting and analysis. For example, extended time or un-timed administration would not be a DIBELS Approved Accommodation. For the DIBELS measures, fluency is an integral aspect of the construct being assessed. Scores from an un-timed administration would not be comparable or interpretable with the procedures for reporting and interpreting DIBELS scores. An interventionist may elect to administer the DIBELS in an un-timed way, but the scores should not be entered into the DIBELS Data System, the reliability and validity data for DIBELS would not be applicable, and the benchmark goals would not be relevant or appropriate.

## Changes in Test Administration and Scoring that are Not Approved Accommodations

Timing. Changes in the timing of DIBELS assessments or un-timed administrations are not approved accommodations. If the DIBELS measures are administered under un-timed conditions or with extended time, the scores should not be entered into the DIBELS Data System. In addition, the research establishing the reliability and validity of the measures would not apply to un-timed or extended time administrations. In addition, the scoring guidelines for interpreting level of risk and for making instructional recommendations would not apply.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Approved Accommodations for Retesting and Test-Teach- <br> Test |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A powerful accommodation for students who experience a <br> variety of difficulties is to repeat the assessment under different <br> conditions or with different testers. Retesting should take place <br> on different days with different probes under different conditions <br> that are considered to potentially impact student performance. | X | X | X | X | X | X |  |
| The median of the three most recent assessments should be used <br> as the best indicator of the child's skills. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Response to instruction is a second, powerful accommodation to <br> for students who experience a variety of difficulties. Repeated <br> assessment on different days with different probes in the context <br> of explicit instruction on the target skills. The target skills are <br> phonemic awareness, phonics, and accuracy and fluency with <br> text. The target skills should be explicitly taught, under no <br> conditions should the specific items on a probe be explicitly <br> taught. The median of the three most recent assessments should <br> be used as the best indicator of the child's skills. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| If necessary，the child can be provided with a lead example in addition to the model example．＂The sounds in＇sam＇are／s／／a／ $/ \mathrm{m} /$ ．Do it with me，$/ \mathrm{s} / / \mathrm{a} / / \mathrm{m} /$. ．＂ | X | X | X |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The child＇s understanding of directions can be checked．For example，the child can be asked to repeat or summarize the directions． | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| The directions can be provided in a manner more accessible to the child．For example，directions can be provided in sign language for a child who would be more comfortable with sign than verbal directions．A child with limited English proficiency may be provided with the directions in their primary language． For example，to assess a child＇s early literacy skills in English， directions for the task may be provided in Spanish and stimulus items presented in English． | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Approved Accommodations for Stimulus Materials | $\stackrel{\text { 苞 }}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | ${ }^{1}$ | 号 | 炭 | 官 |
| Large print or enlarged edition of stimulus materials may be used． | X |  | X | X | X |  |
| Closed－circuit TV for enlargement of print and picture stimuli is appropriate if necessary to enhance performance for students with low vision． | X |  | X | X | X |  |
| Colored overlays，filters，or lighting is appropriate if vision and performance are enhanced． | X |  | X | X | X |  |
| If a student has sufficient skills with Braille，a Braille edition of stimulus materials may be used．A Braille edition of materials is in development．Scores for the Braille edition may not be directly comparable． |  |  | X | X | X |  |
| An alternate font for stimulus materials may be used．For example，most print materials use a Times font as a frequently encountered font in reading materials in first and second grade． The target for any font is a font that would be used in reading materials in first grade． |  |  | X | X | X |  |
| Stimulus materials may be printed in color for ease of identification and use． | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alternate pictures of the target words may be used if pictures that are more familiar to the student are available．The target word should not be changed． | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| If the words used in the Initial Sound Fluency are unfamiliar vocabulary for the student，the student can be asked to repeat the word associated with each picture．For example，＂This is mouse．What is this？This is flowers．What is this？This is pillow．What is this？This is letters．What is this？＂ | X |  |  |  |  |  |


| If the words used in the Initial Sound Fluency are unfamiliar <br> vocabulary for the student, the vocabulary can be pre-taught <br> prior to administration of the measure. The words selected for <br> the ISF measure are drawn from written materials appropriate <br> for first and second grade students, so students can be expected <br> to encounter the words in their reading. |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Amplification or a direct sound system from tester to student are <br> appropriate if it will facilitate hear of directions or test stimuli. | $\mathbf{X}$ | $\mathbf{X}$ | $\mathbf{X}$ | $\mathbf{X}$ | $\mathbf{X}$ | $\mathbf{X}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# DIBELS ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ Instructional Recommendations: Intensive, Strategic, and Benchmark ${ }^{7}$ Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ 6th Ed. University of Oregon 

The purpose of this technical report is to provide a compilation of the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ (DIBELS ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$, Good \& Kaminski, 2002) decision rules for intensive, strategic, and benchmark instructional recommendations. These decision rules represent a revision of the initial decision rules used in the DIBELS Data System. The initial decision rules focused on the longitudinal predictive validity of specific benchmark goals: Initial Sound Fluency (ISF) in middle of kindergarten, Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF) at the end of kindergarten, Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF) in middle of first grade, and DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (DORF) at the end of first, second, and third grades. The revised decision rules utilize the longitudinal predictive information from all participants in the DIBELS Data System to identify progressive benchmark goals en route to the initial goals. Within-academic-year predictive utilities are based on all schools participating in the DIBELS Data System during the 2001 - 2002 academic year. For example, the predictive utility of a beginning kindergarten recommendation for an end of kindergarten goal would be a within-year utility. Across year predictive utilities are based on all schools participating in the DIBELS Data System during the 2000 - 2001 and 2001 - 2002 academic years. For example, the predictive utility of a beginning kindergarten recommendation for an end of first grade goal would be an across-year predictive utility.

In establishing the DIBELS decision rules and instructional recommendations, we followed some general rules and principles. A first guiding principle is that we wanted to establish cutoffs and goals for healthy reading outcomes where the odds would be in favor of achieving subsequent early literacy goals and outcomes. For individual indicators, the level of performance where the odds are in favor of achieving subsequent outcomes was referred to as low risk if the measure was administered prior to the benchmark goal and it was referred to as established if the measure was administered at the time of the benchmark goal or after. When all available information from the DIBELS Benchmark Assessment is considered and an overall recommendation made, patterns of performance with the odds in favor of achieving subsequent goals received a recommendation of Benchmark - At grade level. In general, we tried to establish cutoffs and rules where the odds in favor of achieving subsequent goals meant that approximately $80 \%$ or more of students with the pattern would achieve the goal.

A secondary goal of the decision rules was to identify students with the odds against achieving subsequent early literacy goals for whom intervention would be indicated. We tried to establish cutoffs where the odds against meant that approximately $20 \%$ or fewer of students with the pattern would achieve subsequent goals. For individual indicators, the level of performance where the odds are against achieving subsequent goals was referred to as at risk if the measure was administered prior to the benchmark goal, and deficit if the measure was administered at the benchmark goal or later. An instructional recommendation based on all of the DIBELS

[^6]Benchmark Assessment measures for students with the odds against achieving subsequent goals was Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention.

The third level of performance was when a clear prediction was not possible. In this case, the odds would be neither in favor nor against. We tried to establish cutoffs for the middle category where approximately $50 \%$ of students achieved subsequent early literacy goals. For individual indicators, the middle category was referred to as some risk prior to a benchmark goal, and emerging at a benchmark goal or later. When the pattern of performance across all of the DIBELS Benchmark Assessment measures does not yield a clear prediction, i.e., $50-50$ odds, the instructional recommendation was Strategic - Additional Intervention.

On an individual measure basis, multiple factors were considered when establishing the cutoff points. The primary consideration was the odds of achieving subsequent early literacy goals. An additional factor that was considered was the percent of students in each decision category. A rough target was 20 percent to be identified as at risk or intensive, and 20 percent identified as some risk or strategic. A rough goal of effective reform would be 5 percent requiring intensive instructional intervention and $15 \%$ requiring strategic instructional support so that $100 \%$ achieve benchmark early literacy goals.

For each individual measure, Receiver Operator Characteristic (ROC) curves were examined to identify the tradeoff in sensitivity and specificity for possible cutoff scores. For each measure, ROC curves were generated and evaluated for relevant subsequent benchmark goals. For example, in the beginning of kindergarten, ROC curves were examined for 4 benchmark goals: (a) ISF in middle of kindergarten, (b) PSF in end of kindergarten, (c) NWF in middle of first grade, and (d) DORF in end of first grade. For each measure and each benchmark goal, 2 ROC curves were considered: (a) with respect to a goal outcome of reading health (i.e., odds in favor of achieving subsequent goals), and (b) with respect to a goal outcome of reading difficulty (i.e., the level of the goal with odds against achieving subsequent goals). So, for example, for ISF at the beginning of kindergarten, 8 different ROC curves were considered and evaluated.

An additional consideration in establishing DIBELS decision rules and instructional recommendations was the theoretical structure and linkage of beginning reading skills with respect to literacy outcomes. Needless to say, it was seldom possible to establish a decision rule that satisfied all of these factors and considerations equally. A tradeoff of desirable features was frequently required. The overarching priority was to establish instructional recommendations and instructional goals where the odds are in favor of achieving subsequent literacy outcomes. Complete information on the development and specification of these decision rules is in preparation as CIRCUITS Technical Reports 1 through 11 and should be available by January, 2003.

Beginning of Kindergarten Instructional Recommendation
The specific cutoffs for the DIBELS Benchmark Assessment measures in the beginning of kindergarten are reported in Table 1. For example, students with ISF less than 4 would be at risk, and students with ISF of 8 or more would be at low risk. The DIBELS instructional recommendations and the percent of students with each DIBELS pattern who achieve subsequent goals is reported in Table 2. For each DIBELS pattern, at risk on ISF and at risk on LNF for example, the percent of students with the pattern who achieve each subsequent early literacy goal is provided. For example, of the students who are at risk on both ISF and LNF, 9 percent achieved the ISF goal in middle of kindergarten, $44 \%$ achieved the PSF goal at the end of kindergarten, 24 percent achieved the NWF goal in the middle of first grade, and 34 percent
achieved the DORF goal at the end of first grade. The average column is the average percent achieving subsequent goals. The patterns of performance are ordered by the average percent achieving subsequent goals. For each pattern, the percentile rank for the pattern is provided. For example, a student who is at risk on both ISF and LNF is at the $3^{\text {rd }}$ percentile compared to other students in the DIBELS Data System. This means they scored as well as or better than 3 percent of students in the DIBELS Data System in beginning of kindergarten. Percentile ranks were computed by adding one half of the percent of students with the same pattern plus the percent of students in patterns with a lower average achieving subsequent goals (Salvia, \& Ysseldyke, 2001).

Table 1
Descriptive Levels of Performance in Beginning of Kindergarten

| Measure | Performance | Descriptor |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| DIBELS Initial Sound Fluency | ISF $<4$ | At Risk |
| DIBELS Letter Naming Fluency | $4<=\mathrm{ISF}<8$ | Some Risk |
|  | $\mathrm{ISF}>=8$ | Low Risk |
|  | $\mathrm{LNF}<2$ | At Risk |
|  | $2<=\mathrm{LNF}<8$ | Some Risk |
|  | LNF $>=8$ | Low Risk |

Table 2
Instructional Recommendations for Individual Patterns of Performance on Beginning of Kindergarten DIBELS Benchmark
Assessment

| Initial Sound Fluency | Letter Naming Fluency | Pctile | Percent Meeting Later Goals |  |  |  |  | Incidence | Instructional Support Recommendation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Mid K ISF | End K PSF | Mid 1 NWF | End 1 ORF | Avg. |  |  |
| At Risk | At Risk | 3 | 9 | 44 | 24 | 34 | 27 | More Common | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| Some Risk | At Risk | 9 | 13 | 48 | 27 | 31 | 30 | More Common | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| At Risk | Some Risk | 13 | 13 | 53 | 32 | 44 | 35 | More Common | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| Some Risk | Some Risk | 19 | 18 | 58 | 33 | 45 | 39 | More Common | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Low Risk | At Risk | 25 | 26 | 57 | 30 | 43 | 39 | More Common | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Low Risk | Some Risk | 33 | 35 | 68 | 43 | 56 | 51 | More Common | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| At Risk | Low Risk | 42 | 23 | 59 | 50 | 74 | 51 | More Common | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Some Risk | Low Risk | 50 | 30 | 71 | 51 | 75 | 57 | More Common | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Low Risk | Low Risk | 76 | 62 | 83 | 69 | 87 | 75 | More Common | Benchmark - At grade level |

Note. Percent meeting goal is the conditional percent of children who meet the (a) middle kindergarten goal of 25 on ISF, (b) end of kindergarten goal of 35 on PSF, (c) middle of first grade goal of 50 on NWF, and (d) end of first grade goal of 40 or more on DIBELS ORF.

The incidence column in Table 2 is intended to provide an indication of how often the pattern of performance occurs. In later decision rules, some patterns of performance are extremely rare. In the beginning of kindergarten, all patterns of performance were more common.

## Middle of Kindergarten Instructional Recommendation

The cut scores for the middle of kindergarten benchmark assessment are reported in Table 3, and the corresponding instructional recommendations for all patterns of performance are reported in Table 4. The NWF measure is optional in middle of kindergarten, and so it is not incorporated in the patterns of performance and corresponding instructional recommendations. In the middle of kindergarten, the benchmark goal is 25 or better on ISF so descriptors for ISF are established, emerging, and benchmark. For the other measures, there is no instructional benchmark goal (LNF) or the measures are administered before the benchmark goal (PSF, NWF) so the descriptors are at risk, some risk, and low risk.

The instructional recommendations in Table 4 are based on the pattern of performance on ISF, LNF, and PSF. The goal is established skills on ISF in the middle of kindergarten, and some patterns with established ISF skills have very good odds of achieving later reading goals. For example, for children who have established initial sounds on ISF and who are low risk on LNF and PSF, the odds are 93 percent of achieving the first grade DORF goal. For other patterns with established initial sounds on ISF, the odds are much lower resulting in recommendations of strategic instructional support. For example, students with established skills on ISF but who are at risk on LNF and PSF have odds of only 31 percent of achieving the first grade DORF benchmark goal. However, ISF established, LNF at risk, and PSF at risk is an extremely rare and implausible pattern. When a student is very proficient with initial sounds, they should be scoring much higher than 7 on the phoneme segmentation fluency measure, in particular.

Table 3
Descriptive Levels of Performance in Middle of Kindergarten

| Measure | Performance | Descriptor |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| DIBELS Initial Sound Fluency | ISF $<10$ | Deficit |
|  | $10<=\mathrm{ISF}<25$ | Emerging |
| DIBELS Letter Naming Fluency | ISF $>=25$ | Established |
|  | LNF $<15$ | At Risk |
| DIBELS Phoneme Segmentation Fluency | $15<=\mathrm{LNF}<27$ | Some Risk |
|  | LNF $>=27$ | Low Risk |
|  | $7<=\mathrm{PSF}<7$ | At Risk |
| DIBELS Nonsense Word Fluency | PSF $>=18$ | Some Risk |
|  | $\mathrm{NWF}<5$ | Low Risk |
|  | $5<=\mathrm{NWF}<13$ | At Risk |
|  | NWF $>=13$ | Lome Risk Risk |

Table 4
Instructional Recommendations for Individual Patterns of Performance on Middle of Kindergarten DIBELS Benchmark Assessment

| Initial Sound Fluency | Letter Naming Fluency | Phoneme Segmentation Fluency | Pctile | Percent Meeting Later Goals |  |  |  | Incidence | Instructional Support Recommendation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | End K PSF | Mid 1 NWF | End 1 ORF | Avg. |  |  |
| Deficit | At Risk | At Risk | 3 | 18 | 14 | 19 | 17 | More Common | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| Deficit | At Risk | Some Risk | 7 | 34 | 13 | 21 | 23 | Unusual | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| Emerging | At Risk | At Risk | 9 | 28 | 20 | 28 | 25 | More Common | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| Emerging | At Risk | Some Risk | 11 | 41 | 17 | 22 | 27 | More Common | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| Deficit | Some Risk | At Risk | 13 | 24 | 28 | 48 | 33 | More Common | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| Deficit | At Risk | Low Risk | 15 | 60 | 21 | 25 | 35 | Unusual | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| Deficit | Some Risk | Some Risk | 16 | 37 | 30 | 40 | 36 | Unusual | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Established | At Risk | At Risk | 17 | 45 | 32 | 31 | 36 | Extremely Rare | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Emerging | Some Risk | At Risk | 18 | 37 | 30 | 49 | 38 | Unusual | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Deficit | Low Risk | At Risk | 20 | 30 | 37 | 58 | 42 | Unusual | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Established | Some Risk | At Risk | 21 | 42 | 38 | 49 | 43 | Extremely Rare | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Emerging | Some Risk | Some Risk | 22 | 47 | 36 | 51 | 45 | More Common | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Established | At Risk | Some Risk | 24 | 52 | 38 | 47 | 45 | Extremely Rare | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Emerging | At Risk | Low Risk | 26 | 75 | 29 | 36 | 47 | More Common | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Deficit | Low Risk | Some Risk | 28 | 43 | 42 | 68 | 51 | Unusual | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Deficit | Some Risk | Low Risk | 29 | 66 | 41 | 55 | 54 | Extremely Rare | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Emerging | Low Risk | At Risk | 31 | 42 | 50 | 70 | 54 | More Common | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Established | Some Risk | Some Risk | 33 | 55 | 44 | 64 | 54 | Unusual | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Established | At Risk | Low Risk | 34 | 82 | 34 | 47 | 54 | Unusual | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Emerging | Low Risk | Some Risk | 38 | 53 | 53 | 80 | 62 | More Common | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Emerging | Some Risk | Low Risk | 44 | 82 | 47 | 59 | 63 | More Common | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Established | Low Risk | At Risk | 47 | 51 | 58 | 89 | 66 | Extremely Rare | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Established | Low Risk | Some Risk | 49 | 58 | 62 | 87 | 69 | More Common | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Deficit | Low Risk | Low Risk | 52 | 74 | 60 | 75 | 70 | Unusual | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Established | Some Risk | Low Risk | 54 | 88 | 56 | 69 | 71 | More Common | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Emerging | Low Risk | Low Risk | 64 | 88 | 68 | 83 | 80 | More Common | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Established | Low Risk | Low Risk | 86 | 93 | 80 | 93 | 89 | More Common | Benchmark - At grade level |

Note. Percent meeting goal is the conditional percent of children who meet the end of first grade goal of 40 or more on DIBELS ORF.
Based on $n$ of approximately 32000 students, 638 schools, and 255 school districts.

## End of Kindergarten Instructional Recommendation

The end of kindergarten cut points for risk and established skills are summarized in Table 5, and the instructional recommendations for patterns of DIBELS performance at the end of kindergarten are summarized in Table 6. At the end of kindergarten, it appears to be important for students to have established phonemic awareness on PSF and to be at low risk on NWF with a score of 25 or higher to be confident that the student has the odds in favor of achieving subsequent literacy goals. For most students who achieved 35 on PSF and 25 on NWF, the odds of achieving first grade reading outcomes were 68 percent to 92 percent. Only those students who had the pattern PSF established, NWF low risk, and LNF at risk (an unusual pattern) had odds of about $50-50$ of achieving subsequent literacy goals.

Table 5
Descriptive Levels of Performance in End of Kindergarten

| Measure | Performance | Descriptor |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| DIBELS Letter Naming Fluency | LNF $<29$ | At Risk |
|  | $29<=\mathrm{LNF}<40$ | Some Risk |
| DIBELS Phoneme Segmentation Fluency | LNF $>=40$ | Low Risk |
|  | $\mathrm{PSF}<10$ | Deficit |
| DIBELS Nonsense Word Fluency | $10<=\mathrm{PSF}<35$ | Emerging |
|  | $\mathrm{PSF}>=35$ | Established |
|  | $\mathrm{NWF}<15$ | At Risk |
|  | $15<=\mathrm{NWF}<25$ | Some Risk |
|  | $\mathrm{NWF}>=25$ | Low Risk |

Table 6
Instructional Recommendations for Individual Patterns of Performance on End of Kindergarten DIBELS Benchmark Assessment

| Letter Naming Fluency | Phoneme Segmentation Fluency | Nonsense Word Fluency | Pctile | Percent Meeting Later Goals |  |  | Incidence | Instructional Support Recommendation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Middle 1 NWF | End 1 <br> DORF | Average |  |  |
| At Risk | Deficit | At Risk | 2 | 8 | 19 | 13 | More Common | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| At Risk | Emerging | At Risk | 6 | 15 | 24 | 19 | More Common | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| At Risk | Established | At Risk | 10 | 17 | 25 | 21 | More Common | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| At Risk | Deficit | Some Risk | 12 | 21 | 27 | 24 | Extremely Rare | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| At Risk | Established | Some Risk | 13 | 27 | 33 | 30 | More Common | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| At Risk | Emerging | Some Risk | 15 | 27 | 37 | 32 | Unusual | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| Some Risk | Deficit | At Risk | 16 | 22 | 43 | 33 | Unusual | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| At Risk | Emerging | Low Risk | 17 | 28 | 39 | 33 | Extremely Rare | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Some Risk | Established | At Risk | 18 | 26 | 46 | 36 | Unusual | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Some Risk | Emerging | At Risk | 20 | 28 | 46 | 37 | More Common | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Some Risk | Deficit | Some Risk | 22 | 24 | 56 | 40 | Extremely Rare | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Some Risk | Emerging | Some Risk | 23 | 35 | 55 | 45 | More Common | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| At Risk | Established | Low Risk | 25 | 40 | 52 | 46 | Unusual | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Low Risk | Deficit | At Risk | 26 | 34 | 64 | 49 | Extremely Rare | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| At Risk | Deficit | Low Risk | 27 | 36 | 63 | 49 | Extremely Rare | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Low Risk | Emerging | At Risk | 28 | 34 | 65 | 50 | Unusual | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Some Risk | Established | Some Risk | 30 | 41 | 60 | 50 | More Common | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Some Risk | Deficit | Low Risk | 33 | 41 | 62 | 51 | Extremely Rare | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Low Risk | Deficit | Some Risk | 33 | 41 | 65 | 53 | Extremely Rare | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Some Risk | Emerging | Low Risk | 35 | 53 | 65 | 59 | More Common | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Some Risk | Established | Low Risk | 38 | 56 | 68 | 62 | More Common | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Low Risk | Established | At Risk | 42 | 46 | 81 | 63 | Unusual | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Low Risk | Emerging | Some Risk | 44 | 51 | 79 | 65 | More Common | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Low Risk | Established | Some Risk | 48 | 52 | 79 | 66 | More Common | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Low Risk | Deficit | Low Risk | 52 | 59 | 80 | 69 | Extremely Rare | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Low Risk | Emerging | Low Risk | 55 | 68 | 87 | 78 | More Common | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Low Risk | Established | Low Risk | 79 | 81 | 92 | 87 | More Common | Benchmark - At grade level |

Note. Percent meeting goal is the conditional percent of children who meet the end of first grade goal of 40 or more on DIBELS ORF. Based on $n$ of approximately 32000 students, 638 schools, and 255 school districts.

## Beginning of First Grade Instructional Recommendation

The cutoff scores for risk and established skills for the beginning of first grade are summarized in Table 7. A summer effect is apparent in that NWF of 25 is required for low risk at the end of kindergarten, but NWF of 24 is sufficient for low risk at the beginning of first grade. A similar pattern is noticeable for LNF. The instructional recommendation for each pattern of performance at the beginning of first grade is provided in Table 8. As with the end of kindergarten patterns, established skills on PSF and low risk on NWF appear to be important instructional targets for students to be on track for reading outcomes. Even for students who are at risk on LNF, if they achieve the 35 on PSF and 24 on NWF, the odds are 56 percent of achieving the first grade reading goal (an unusual pattern with a strategic support instructional recommendation).

Table 7
Descriptive Levels of Performance in Beginning of First Grade

| Measure | Performance | Descriptor |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| DIBELS Letter Naming Fluency | LNF $<25$ | At Risk |
|  | $25<=\mathrm{LNF}<37$ | Some Risk |
| DIBELS Phoneme Segmentation Fluency | $\mathrm{LNF}>=37$ | Low Risk |
|  | $\mathrm{PSF}<10$ | Deficit |
| DIBELS Nonsense Word Fluency | $10<=\mathrm{PSF}<35$ | Emerging |
|  | $\mathrm{PSF}>=35$ | Established |
|  | $\mathrm{NWF}<13$ | At Risk |
|  | $13<=\mathrm{NWF}<24$ | Some Risk |
|  | $\mathrm{NWF}>=24$ | Low Risk |

Table 8
Instructional Recommendations for Individual Patterns of Performance on Beginning First Grade DIBELS Benchmark Assessment

| Letter <br> Naming <br> Fluency | Phoneme Segmentation Fluency | Nonsense <br> Word <br> Fluency | Pctile | Percent Meeting Later Goals |  |  | Incidence | Instructional Support Recommendation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Middle <br> 1 NWF | End 1 DORF | Average |  |  |
| At Risk | Deficit | At Risk | 3 | 6 | 13 | 10 | More Common | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| At Risk | Emerging | At Risk | 8 | 10 | 18 | 14 | More Common | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| At Risk | Established | At Risk | 11 | 11 | 20 | 16 | Unusual | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| At Risk | Deficit | Some Risk | 12 | 15 | 27 | 21 | Unusual | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| Some Risk | Deficit | At Risk | 13 | 12 | 31 | 21 | Unusual | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| At Risk | Emerging | Some Risk | 15 | 20 | 32 | 26 | More Common | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Some Risk | Emerging | At Risk | 17 | 18 | 37 | 27 | Unusual | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Some Risk | Established | At Risk | 19 | 20 | 35 | 28 | Unusual | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| At Risk | Established | Some Risk | 20 | 25 | 32 | 28 | Unusual | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Low Risk | Deficit | At Risk | 21 | 22 | 46 | 34 | Extremely Rare | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Some Risk | Deficit | Some Risk | 22 | 21 | 47 | 34 | Unusual | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Some Risk | Emerging | Some Risk | 24 | 26 | 47 | 37 | More Common | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| At Risk | Deficit | Low Risk | 26 | 30 | 45 | 37 | Extremely Rare | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Some Risk | Established | Some Risk | 28 | 29 | 49 | 39 | More Common | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Low Risk | Emerging | At Risk | 30 | 29 | 57 | 43 | Unusual | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Low Risk | Established | At Risk | 31 | 33 | 59 | 46 | Extremely Rare | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| At Risk | Emerging | Low Risk | 31 | 40 | 54 | 47 | Extremely Rare | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Some Risk | Deficit | Low Risk | 32 | 37 | 61 | 49 | Extremely Rare | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| At Risk | Established | Low Risk | 33 | 43 | 56 | 49 | Unusual | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Low Risk | Deficit | Some Risk | 34 | 35 | 66 | 50 | Unusual | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Low Risk | Emerging | Some Risk | 36 | 36 | 72 | 54 | More Common | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Low Risk | Established | Some Risk | 40 | 41 | 71 | 56 | More Common | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Some Risk | Emerging | Low Risk | 44 | 46 | 68 | 57 | More Common | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Some Risk | Established | Low Risk | 47 | 51 | 66 | 59 | More Common | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Low Risk | Deficit | Low Risk | 51 | 51 | 76 | 64 | Unusual | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Low Risk | Emerging | Low Risk | 56 | 66 | 86 | 76 | More Common | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Low Risk | Established | Low Risk | 81 | 78 | 90 | 84 | More Common | Benchmark - At grade level |

Note. Percent meeting goal is the conditional percent of children who meet the end of first grade goal of 40 or more on DIBELS ORF. Based on $n$ of approximately 32000 students, 638 schools, and 255 school districts.

## Middle of First Grade Instructional Recommendation

In the middle of first grade, the cut scores for established skills and risk status are summarized in Table 9. The instructional recommendations corresponding to patterns of performance in the middle of first grade are summarized in Table 10. The benchmark goal for the middle of first grade is a score of 50 or more on the NWF measure. For the most part, it is extremely rare for a student to have established skills on NWF and less than established skills on PSF. In addition to established skills on NWF, it also appears important that students are beginning to apply those skills in connected text reading at least 20 correct words per minute on the DORF measure. For students with established skills on NWF and who are reading at least 20 words correct per minute, the odds of achieving the first grade reading outcomes are 97 to 100 percent. However, even if students have established skills on PSF and NWF, if they are reading fewer than 20 words correct per minute, their odds of achieving the first grade reading goal fall to 24 or 49 percent (with an instructional recommendation of strategic support). Students with combined risk factors in NWF and DORF are likely to require intensive intervention to achieve first grade reading outcomes.

In the middle of first grade the ordering of DIBELS performance patterns does not follow exactly the conditional percent achieving reading outcomes. In particular, 100 percent of students with a deficit on PSF, established on NWF, and low risk on DORF achieved the first grade reading goal. However, that pattern was extremely rare and we decided to rank it below the similar patterns with higher phonemic awareness skills. A similar change in ordering of patterns was done for emerging NWF and low risk on DORF.

Table 9
Descriptive Levels of Performance in Middle of First Grade

| Measure | Performance | Descriptor |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| DIBELS Phoneme Segmentation Fluency | $\mathrm{PSF}<10$ | Deficit |
| DIBELS Nonsense Word Fluency | $10<=\mathrm{PSF}<35$ | Emerging |
|  | $\mathrm{PSF}>=35$ | Established |
|  | $\mathrm{NWF}<30$ | Deficit |
| DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency | $30<=\mathrm{NWF}<50$ | Emerging |
|  | $\mathrm{NWF}>=50$ | Established |
|  | $\mathrm{DORF}<8$ | At Risk |
|  | $8<=\mathrm{DORF}<20$ | Some Risk |
|  | $\mathrm{DORF}>=20$ | Low Risk |

Table 10
Instructional Recommendations for Individual Patterns of Performance on Middle First Grade DIBELS Benchmark Assessment

|  | Phoneme <br> Segmentation <br> Fluency | Nonsense <br> Word <br> Fluency | DIBELS Oral <br> Reading <br> Fluency | Percentile | Percent <br> Meeting End <br> DORF Goal |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Deficit | Deficit | At Risk | 1 | Incidence | Instructional Support Recommendation |
| Emerging | Deficit | At Risk | 3 | 1 | Unusual |
| Established | Deficit | At Risk | 6 | 2 | More Common |

Note. Percent meeting goal is the conditional percent of children who meet the end of first grade goal of 40 or more on DIBELS ORF. Based on $n=34794$ students, 666 schools, 266 school districts.

## End of First Grade Instructional Recommendation

At the end of first grade, instructional recommendations are based directly on DORF reading level. Students who meet the DORF goal of 40 or more words correct per minute are likely to have established PSF and NWF skills as well. Reading 40 or more words correct per minute and displaying a deficit in either PSF or NWF is an extremely rare pattern, and indicates a need to retest the students' skills on PSF and NWF if there is any concern about their performance. Students who meet the end of first grade benchmark goal on DORF have odds of 75 to 92 percent of achieving the second grade goal for more common patterns of performance. Students who are reading below 20 words correct per minute at the end of first grade are at risk for reading difficulty in second grade with odds of 10 to 18 percent of achieving the second grade reading goal for more common patterns. For students reading less than 20 words correct at the end of first grade, substantial, intensive instructional intervention is recommended.

Table 11
Descriptive Levels of Performance in End of First Grade

| Measure | Performance | Descriptor |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| DIBELS Phoneme Segmentation Fluency | $\mathrm{PSF}<10$ | Deficit |
| DIBELS Nonsense Word Fluency | $10<=\mathrm{PSF}<35$ | Emerging |
|  | $\mathrm{PSF}>=35$ | Established |
|  | $\mathrm{NWF}<30$ | Deficit |
| DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency | $30<=\mathrm{NWF}<50$ | Emerging |
|  | $\mathrm{NWF}>=50$ | Established |
|  | $\mathrm{DORF}<20$ | At Risk |
|  | $20<=\mathrm{DORF}<40$ | Some Risk |
|  | $\mathrm{DORF}>=40$ | Low Risk |

Table 12
Instructional Recommendations for Individual Patterns of Performance on End of First Grade DIBELS Benchmark Assessment

| Phoneme <br> Segmentation <br> Fluency | Nonsense Word Fluency | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { DIBELS Oral } \\ \text { Reading } \\ \text { Fluency } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Percentile | Percent Meeting End Second Goal | Incidence | Instructional Support Recommendation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Deficit | Deficit | At Risk | 0 | 4 | Extremely Rare | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| Emerging | Deficit | At Risk | 1 | 3 | Unusual | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| Established | Deficit | At Risk | 2 | 5 | Unusual | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| Deficit | Emerging | At Risk | 3 | 0 | Extremely Rare | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| Emerging | Emerging | At Risk | 4 | 8 | Unusual | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| Established | Emerging | At Risk | 7 | 10 | More Common | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| Deficit | Established | At Risk | 9 | 0 | Extremely Rare | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| Emerging | Established | At Risk | 9 | 24 | Extremely Rare | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| Established | Established | At Risk | 11 | 18 | More Common | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| Deficit | Deficit | Some Risk | 12 | 0 | Extremely Rare | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Emerging | Deficit | Some Risk | 13 | 35 | Extremely Rare | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Established | Deficit | Some Risk | 13 | 20 | Extremely Rare | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Deficit | Emerging | Some Risk | 14 | 0 | Extremely Rare | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Emerging | Emerging | Some Risk | 14 | 36 | Unusual | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Established | Emerging | Some Risk | 18 | 31 | More Common | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Deficit | Established | Some Risk | 21 | 0 | Extremely Rare | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Emerging | Established | Some Risk | 22 | 48 | Unusual | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Established | Established | Some Risk | 28 | 47 | More Common | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| Deficit | Deficit | Low Risk | 35 | 100 | Extremely Rare | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Emerging | Deficit | Low Risk | 35 | 65 | Extremely Rare | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Established | Deficit | Low Risk | 35 | 65 | Extremely Rare | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Deficit | Emerging | Low Risk | 35 | 0 | Extremely Rare | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Emerging | Emerging | Low Risk | 36 | 86 | Unusual | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Established | Emerging | Low Risk | 39 | 75 | More Common | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Deficit | Established | Low Risk | 42 | 75 | Extremely Rare | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Emerging | Established | Low Risk | 44 | 92 | More Common | Benchmark - At grade level |
| Established | Established | Low Risk | 74 | 92 | More Common | Benchmark - At grade level |

Note. Percent meeting goal is the conditional percent of children who meet the end of second grade goal of 90 or more on DIBELS ORF. Based on $n=6239$ students, 64 participating districts, and 137 participating schools.

## Beginning Second Grade Instructional Recommendation

The recommended beginning of second grade cut scores for low risk and at risk are reported in Table 13 along with the accompanying instructional recommendation. The beginning of second grade cut scores are not directly comparable to the end of first grade cutoffs. Both the at risk score and the low risk score are higher at the beginning of second grade. In part, the higher scores are due to the need for continual growth in reading skills in order for a student to be on track for successful reading outcomes. The end of first grade encompasses the final 3 months of first grade. The beginning of second grade includes the first 3 months of second grade. Students should be making continual progress over that span of time. The higher cutoff scores are also due to more rigorous cutoffs. At the end of first grade, the cutoffs of 20 and 40 correspond to the $13^{\text {th }}$ and $35^{\text {th }}$ percentiles, respectively. In the beginning of second grade, the cutoffs of 26 and 44 correspond to the $20^{\text {th }}$ and $40^{\text {th }}$ percentiles, respectively. However, the odds of achieving second grade reading goals are similar for students with an intensive instructional recommendation: 6 percent at end of first grade, 10 percent in beginning of second. The odds also are similar for students with a benchmark instructional recommendation: $90 \%$ at end of first grade, 89 percent in the beginning of second grade. The odds of achieving subsequent benchmark goals were the primary consideration in establishing cutoff scores.

Table 13
Descriptive Levels of Performance in Beginning of Second Grade

|  | Conditional <br> Percent <br> Reading 90 or <br> More on End of <br> Second Grade <br> DIBELS ORF |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Performance | Descriptor | Instructional Recommendation |  |
| DORF $<26$ | At Risk | $6 \%$ | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| $26<=$ DORF $<44$ | Some Risk | $35 \%$ | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| DORF $>=44$ | Low Risk | $89 \%$ | Benchmark - At Grade Level |

Note. Based on $n=13,612$ students, 107 participating districts, and 262 participating schools.

## Middle of Second Grade Instructional Recommendation

The cutoff scores for levels of risk and corresponding instructional recommendations for the middle of second grade are reported in Table 14. A consistent pattern emerges in second and later grades. When students are on track for successful reading outcomes (i.e., at benchmark or low risk status), the odds are strongly in favor of achieving subsequent goals (about 90 percent) as intended with the decision rules. The odds are strongly against achieving subsequent goals (less than 10 percent unless they receive very intensive intervention) for students identified as at risk or as needing intensive intervention. Both of these odds are consistent with the primary consideration in establishing cutoffs for DIBELS benchmark assessment. However, for the strategic instructional recommendation, the intent was for the odds to be about $50-50$ of
achieving subsequent literacy goals, as obtained for earlier grade levels. Beginning at about the end of first grade, the odds of achieving subsequent goals for students identified as needing strategic instructional support fall increasingly below 50 percent.

Table 14
Descriptive Levels of Performance in Middle of Second Grade

|  | Percent <br> Achieving <br> Second Grade <br> Goal |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Performance | Descriptor | Instructional Recommendation |  |
| DORF $<52$ | At Risk | $8 \%$ | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| $52<=$ DORF $<68$ | Some Risk | $38 \%$ | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| DORF $>=68$ | Low Risk | $90 \%$ | Benchmark - At Grade Level |

Note. Based on $n=15,806$ students, 120 participating districts, and 299 participating schools.

## End of Second Grade Instructional Recommendation

The cutoff scores for levels of risk and corresponding instructional recommendations for the end of second grade are reported in Table 15. At the end of second grade, the crucial outcome is end of third grade reading skills. With each subsequent grade, the predictive utility becomes stronger - meaning that we can have more confidence in our decisions but also meaning that it become increasingly difficult to thwart the predictions of reading success or difficulty.

Table 15
Descriptive Levels of Performance in End of Second Grade

|  | Percent <br> Achieving <br> Third Grade <br> Goal |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Performance | Descriptor | Instructional Recommendation |  |
| DORF $<70$ | At Risk | $7 \%$ | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| $70<=$ DORF $<90$ | Some Risk | $34 \%$ | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| DORF $>=90$ | Low Risk | $89 \%$ | Benchmark - At Grade Level |

Note. Based on $n=3,758$ students, 31 participating districts, and 79 participating schools.
Beginning Third Grade Instructional Recommendation
The cutoff scores for levels of risk and corresponding instructional recommendations for the beginning of third grade are reported in Table 16. For students identified as at risk at the
beginning of third grade, about 20 percent from the system-wide percentile ranks (Good, Wallin, Simmons, Kameenui, \& Kaminski, 2002), the odds of achieving the end of third grade reading outcome are of serious concern. For students identified as low risk with a benchmark instructional recommendation, about 60 percent based on the system-wide percentile ranks, the odds of achieving the end of third grade reading outcome are strongly in their favor.

Table 16
Descriptive Levels of Performance in Beginning Third Grade

|  | Percent <br> Achieving <br> Third Grade <br> Goal |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Performance | Descriptor | Instructional Recommendation |  |
| DORF $<53$ | At Risk | $3 \%$ | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| $53<=$ DORF $<77$ | Some Risk | $34 \%$ | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| DORF $>=77$ | Low Risk | $90 \%$ | Benchmark - At Grade Level |

Note. Based on $n=9,662$ students, 78 participating districts, and 180 participating schools.

Middle Third Grade Instructional Recommendation
The cutoff scores for levels of risk and corresponding instructional recommendations for the middle of third grade are reported in Table 17. The cutoff scores again correspond to the $20^{\text {th }}$ and $40^{\text {th }}$ percentile based on the system-wide percentile ranks (Good, Wallin, Simmons, Kameenui, \& Kaminski, 2002).

Table 17
Descriptive Levels of Performance in the Middle of Third Grade

|  | Percent <br> Achieving <br> Third Grade <br> Goal |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Performance | Descriptor | Instructional Recommendation |  |
| DORF $<67$ | At Risk | $3 \%$ | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| $67<=$ DORF $<92$ | Some Risk | $27 \%$ | Strategic - Additional Intervention |
| DORF $>=92$ | Low Risk | $90 \%$ | Benchmark - At Grade Level |

Note. Based on $n=11,811$ students, 91 participating districts, and 219 participating schools.

## End Third Grade Instructional Recommendation

The cutoff scores for levels of risk and corresponding instructional recommendations for the end of third grade are reported in Table 18. The cutoff scores correspond to the 16th and 40th percentile based on the system-wide percentile ranks (Good, Wallin, Simmons, Kame'enui, \& Kaminski, 2002). In Table 18, the odds of achieving subsequent reading goals are represented by a question mark because the most important and meaningful literacy outcome is likely to vary from state to state. For example, Good, Simmons, \& Kame'enui (2001) reported that the odds of receiving a rating of "meets expectations" or "exceeds expectations" on the Oregon Statewide Assessment Test were 96 percent if students scored in the low risk or benchmark range on the DORF at the end of third grade. Sibley, Biwer, \& Hesch, (2001) reported that the odds of meeting or exceeding standards on the Illinois State Assessment Test were 99 percent for students scoring in the low risk or benchmark range on the end of third grade DIBELS benchmark assessment. Similar results were found by Linner (2001, January).

The DIBELS Data System has the capability to include an external outcome measure that can be used to evaluate the predictive utility of the DORF. Each state assessment should be examined in this way by users of the DIBELS benchmark assessment to evaluate the predictive utility of the measures for their state context.

Table 18
Descriptive Levels of Performance in the End of Third Grade

|  |  | Percent <br> Achieving <br> Subsequent <br> Reading Goal | Instructional Recommendation |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| DORformance | Descriptor | An | At Risk |
| $80<=$ DORF $<110$ | Some Risk | $?$ | Intensive - Needs Substantial Intervention |
| DORF $>=110$ | Low Risk | $?$ | Strategic - Additional Intervention |

## Discussion

This technical report is intended to make public the decision rules used in the DIBELS Data System, and to summarize evidence on the predictive utility of the DIBELS cutoffs both as indicators of risk and as instructional goals. At any point in time, students who are at risk at that point in time have the odds seriously against achieving subsequent early literacy goals - unless they are provided with substantial, sustained, intensive intervention support. But, even more important, for students prior to that point in time, the benchmark goal represents an instructional target that will establish the odds in favor of achieving subsequent early literacy goals.
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