




## THREE REASONS WHY THE UO RECOMMENDED DIBELS NEXT BENCHMARK GOALS ARE NECESSARY

### UO DIBELS Data System

In this session we'll answer the question:

Why were the DIBELS Next **recommended** goals established?

## A Timeline for Critical Review of DIBELS Next Goals



# What's wrong with the former DIBELS Next goals?

Former DIBELS Next goals ...


1. Vary widely, yet still miss substantial numbers of children who *need* intervention (UO-CTL, 2012c, p. 9)
  - On average, the former goals miss 40% of students who may need additional, strategic support
  - On average, the former goals miss 56% of students who may need intensive support
2. Are based on a small sample that does not represent the diversity of U.S. children (DMG, 2011, p. 39)
3. Do not use a consistent, external criterion measure to determine risk and cut-points (DMG, 2011, pp. 48-49)

Reason 1:

## DMG Former Goals Miss Children Who Require Intervention


# What's wrong with the former DIBELS Next goals?

Assume we assess 100 students ...




# What's wrong with the former DIBELS Next goals?

And 40% need intervention ...



## What's wrong with the former DIBELS Next goals?


And half of those (or 20% overall)  
need intensive intervention ...



## What's wrong with the former DIBELS Next goals?

(University of Oregon-CTL, 2012c, p. 9)


The **former** goals will, on average, **miss 40%**  
of **students needing intervention**



## What's wrong with the former DIBELS Next goals?

(University of Oregon-CTL, 2012c, p. 9)


And the **former** goals will, on average, **miss 56%**  
of **students needing intensive intervention**



## What's right about the new DIBELS Next goals?

(University of Oregon-CTL, 2012c, p. 9)

The **UO-CTL recommended** goals identify **90%** of students who may  
**need support**—ensuring more **confidence** in decision making



## Why the discrepancies?

### DMG did not follow recommended, research-based practices to create their goals

The DMG former goals were created with:

- a sample of students that was small, and not representative of the nation
- procedures that do not meet test and measurement standards in the field of education (*Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*, AERA, APA, NCME, 1999; National Center on Response to Instruction)

## Reason 2:

### DMG Former Goals Lack a Representative School & Student Sample


## Representative Sample

Critical and required for **generalizability**.

Representative samples should include *descriptions of the ethnicity and race, socioeconomic status, gender, and geographic locations of the participants*, so that the **sample can be appropriately compared to other students and schools at other time points** (*Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*, AERA, APA, NCME, 1999).


## Let's compare samples

DMG Former (DMG, 2011, p. 39); UO Recommended (UO-CTL, 2012a, p. 2); U.S. (NCES, 2011)



## Let's compare samples

Percent of students who qualify for Free and Reduced Lunch



## Reason 3:

DMG Former Goals Were Developed Using an Inconsistent and Non-Validated Process to Determine Goals and Cut Points

## Key Terms

**Benchmark Goal:** Students above the benchmark goal have a strong likelihood of meeting end-of-year performance standards on an important outcome measure ....

*as long as continued good teaching occurs.*

*Ensuring confidence in decision making.*


## Key Terms

**Cut Point for Risk:** Students who score below the cut point have a strong likelihood of NOT meeting end of year performance standards on an important outcome measure . . .

*if intensive intervention is not provided.*


## Why do schools use screening measures?

**THE GOAL:** To quickly determine how well students are performing and identify students at-risk for reading difficulties or who need additional intervention.




## Why does your school use a screening measure?

**NOT THE GOAL:** To see if students will meet the DIBELS Next composite score.



## Process Used to Establish the DMG Former Goals (DMG, 2011, pp. 48-49)




The DMG goal-setting process did not meet recommended research-based educational standards

The *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (AERA, APA, NCME, 1999) recommend a link between student performance on screening measures (e.g. DIBELS Next measures) and a standardized, widely used, *external criterion measure* (e.g. SAT10).




### Variability Associated with the FORMER Goals



Source for Percentiles: Cummings, Kennedy, Otterstedt, Baker, S.K., & Kame'enui, 2011



### Variability Associated with the FORMER Goals



Source for Percentiles: Cummings, Kennedy, Otterstedt, Baker, S.K., & Kame'enui, 2011




## Why does this negatively impact students and schools?

- Complicates school-level planning and coordination of intervention efforts
  - The former benchmark goals vary widely across measures, grades, and times of the year.
- Makes evaluating progress within and across school years very unclear
  - When a non-standard linking procedure is used, the actual “value” of the former goals is inconsistent across grades and measures.



## Recommended Linking Procedure for Establishing Goals





## SUMMARY

**New goals were needed to assist schools in making sound educational decisions.**

**DMG former goals are problematic because they:**

1. Miss substantial numbers of children who need intervention—*provide a false level of confidence*
2. Are based on a sample that does not represent current U.S. public schools in terms of region, ethnicity, and SES
3. Did not use a consistent or valid process to determine goals and cut-points



**The UO DIBELS Data System is committed to providing teachers with the tools they need to meet the needs of all students.**

**The UO Recommended Goals are research-based to support schools in making educational decisions they can have **confidence** in that are in the best interest of their students.**



## Thank you!

For free resources please visit:

**DIBELS Data System**

Research and Training pages

<https://dibels.uoregon.edu>

You can call us at (888) 497-4290.

We're here to support you!



## References

- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (1999). *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Cummings, K.D., Kennedy, P.C., Otterstedt, J., Baker, S.K., & Kame'enui, E.J. (2011). *DIBELS Data System: 2010-2011 Percentile Ranks for DIBELS Next Benchmark Assessments (Technical Report 1101)*. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.
- Dynamic Measurement Group (2011). *DIBELS Next Technical Manual*. Eugene, OR: Author.
- Joint Committee on Testing Practices (2004). *Code of Fair Testing Practices in Education*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.theaaceonline.com/codefair.pdf>
- National Center on Response to Intervention. (2011). *Standard protocol for evaluating response to intervention tools: Screening reading and math [Screening tool evaluation protocol]*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Pearson Education, Inc. (2007). *Stanford Achievement Test—10th Edition (SAT10): Normative update*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Author.





- University of Oregon, Center on Teaching and Learning (2012a). *2012-2013 DIBELS Data System Update Part I: DIBELS Next Composite Score (Technical Brief 1202)*. Retrieved from <https://dibels.uoregon.edu/docs/techreports/DDS2012TechnicalBriefPart1.pdf>
- University of Oregon, Center on Teaching and Learning (2012b). *2012-2013 DIBELS Data System Update Part II: DIBELS Next Benchmark Goals (Technical Brief 1203)*. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon. Retrieved from <https://dibels.uoregon.edu/docs/techreports/DDS2012TechnicalBriefPart2.pdf>
- University of Oregon, Center on Teaching and Learning (2012c). *DIBELS Next Recommended Benchmark Goals: Technical Supplement (Technical Report 1204)*. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon. Retrieved from <https://dibels.uoregon.edu/docs/techreports/DDS2012TechnicalSupplement.pdf>