In this session we’ll answer the question:

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

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

What’s wrong with the former DIBELS Next goals?
And the former goals will, on average, miss 56% of students needing intensive intervention

What’s right about the new DIBELS Next goals?
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)

All Schools in the U.S.

DMG Former Goals

- White: 20
- Hispanic: 4.7
- African American: 0.7
- American Indian: 1.2
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 0.7
- Other: 4.3
- Multiracial: 0.7

UO Recommended Goals

- White: 55.1
- Hispanic: 14.4
- African American: 19.7
- American Indian: 1.1
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 4.7
- Other: 19.7
- Multiracial: 50.9
Let’s compare samples

Percent of students who qualify for Free and Reduced Lunch

- 52.4% U.S. average
- 63.7% UO recommended goals average
- 16.0% DMG former goals average

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.*

**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.*

Ensuring confidence in decision making.
**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.

**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)

**BEGINNING OF YEAR**

- Composite Score

**MIDDLE OF YEAR**

- Individual DIBELS Next Measures

**END OF YEAR**

- Global Outcome Measure

**Step 1**

- Step 2

**Step 3**

- Step 4

**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).
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

- **BEGINNING OF YEAR**
  - Goals & Cut Points
- **MIDDLE OF YEAR**
  - Goals & Cut Points
- **END OF YEAR**
  - Goals & Cut Points

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