SUMMARY
DIBELS Benchmark Goals, Indicators of Risk and Proficiency
Bozeman Public Schools

Grade	Probe	At Risk - Intensive			At Risk - Strategic			Low Risk			Proficient
		FALL	WINTER	SPRING	FALL	WINTER	SPRING	FALL	WINTER	SPRING	
K	ISF	0-3	0-9	N/A	4-7	10-24	N/A	8 +	25 +	N/A	N/A
	LNF	0-1	0-14	0-28	2-7	15-26	29-39	8 +	27 +	40 +	41 +
	PSF	N/A	0-6	0-9	N/A	7-17	10-34	N/A	18 +	35 +	36 +
	NWF	N/A	0-4	0-14	N/A	5-12	15-24	N/A	13 +	25 +	26 +
1	LNF	0-24	N/A	N/A	25-36	N/A	N/A	37 +	N/A	N/A	N/A
	PSF	0-9	0-9	0-9	10-34	10-34	10-34	35 +	35 +	35 +	36 +
	NWF	0-12	0-29	0-29	13-23	30-49	30-49	24 +	50 +	50 +	51 +
	ORF	N/A	0-7	0-19	N/A	8-19	20-39	N/A	20 +	40 +	41 +
2	NWF	0-29	N/A	N/A	30-49	N/A	N/A	50 +	N/A	N/A	N/A
	ORF	0-25	0-51	0-69	26-43	52-67	70-89	44 +	68 +	90 +	91 +
3	ORF	0-52	0-66	0-79	53-76	67-91	80-109	77 +	92 +	110 +	111 +
4	ORF	0-70	0-82	0-95	71092	83-104	96-117	93 +	105 +	118 +	*119 +
5	ORF	0-80	0-93	0-102	81-103	94-114	103-123	104 +	115 +	124 +	*125 +

** Students achieving this score do not need to be benchmarked again for the school year in which the score is attained. Benchmark participation should be resumed the following school year.*

>Benchmark goals for Retell Fluency and Word Use Fluency have not been established by the University of Oregon.

DIBELS Data System

DIBELS Benchmark Goals
Three Assessment Periods Per Year

KINDERGARTEN

	Beginning of Year Month 1 - 3		Middle of Year Month 4 - 6		End of Year Month 7 - 10	
DIBELS Measure	**Scores**	**Status**	**Scores**	**Status**	**Scores**	**Status**
Initial Sound Fluency (ISF)	0 - 3 4 - 7 8 and above	At risk Some risk Low risk	0 -9 10 - 24 25 and above	Deficit Emerging Established	Not administered during this assessment period	
Letter Naming Fluency (LNF)	0 - 1 2 - 7 8 and above	At risk Some risk Low risk	0 - 14 15 - 26 27 and above	At risk Some risk Low risk	0 - 28 29 - 39 40 and above	At risk Some risk Low risk
Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF)	Not administered during this assessment period		0 - 6 7 - 17 18 and above	At risk Some risk Low risk	0 - 9 10 - 34 35 and above	Deficit Emerging Established
Nonsense Word Word Fluency (NWF-CLS)	Not administered during this assessment period		0 - 4 5 - 12 13 and above	At risk Some risk Low risk	0 - 14 15 - 24 25 and above	At risk Some risk Low risk
Word Use Fluency (WUF)	BENCHMARK GOALS FOR THIS MEASURE HAVE NOT BEEN ESTABLISHED. 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 20th percentile and 40th percentile should be considered at some risk.					

© University of Oregon Center on Teaching and Learning. All rights reserved.
Revision Date: July-31-2008

DIBELS Data System

DIBELS Benchmark Goals
Three Assessment Periods Per Year

FIRST GRADE

	Beginning of Year Month 1 - 3		Middle of Year Month 4 - 6		End of Year Month 7 - 10	
DIBELS Measure	**Scores**	**Status**	**Scores**	**Status**	**Scores**	**Status**
Letter Naming Fluency (LNF)	0 - 24 25 - 36 37 and above	At risk Some risk Low risk	Not administered during this assessment period		Not administered during this assessment period	
Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF)	0 - 9 10 - 34 35 and above	Deficit Emerging Established	0 - 9 10 - 34 35 and above	Deficit Emerging Established	0 - 9 10 - 34 35 and above	Deficit Emerging Established
Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF-CLS)	0 - 12 13 - 23 24 and above	At risk Some risk Low risk	0 - 29 30 - 49 50 and above	Deficit Emerging Established	0 - 29 30 - 49 50 and above	Deficit Emerging Established
Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	Not administered during this assessment period		0 - 7 8 - 19 20 and above	At risk Some risk Low risk	0 - 19 20 - 39 40 and above	At risk Some risk Low risk
Retell Fluency (RTF)	Not administered during this assessment period		BENCHMARK GOALS FOR THIS MEASURE HAVE NOT YET BEEN ESTABLISHED. Preliminary evidence indicates that for students to be on track with comprehension they should meet both of the following criteria: 1) meet the Oral Reading Fluency benchmark goal and 2) have a retell score of at least 25% of their Oral Reading Fluency score.			
Word Use Fluency (WUF)	BENCHMARK GOALS FOR THIS MEASURE HAVE NOT BEEN ESTABLISHED. 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 20th percentile and 40th percentile should be considered at some risk.					

© University of Oregon Center on Teaching and Learning. All rights reserved.
Revision Date: July-31-2008

DIBELS Data System

DIBELS Benchmark Goals
Three Assessment Periods Per Year

SECOND GRADE	Beginning of Year Month 1 - 3		Middle of Year Month 4 - 6		End of Year Month 7 - 10	
DIBELS Measure	**Scores**	**Status**	**Scores**	**Status**	**Scores**	**Status**
Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF-CLS)	0 - 29 30 - 49 50 and above	Deficit Emerging Established	Not administered during this assessment period		Not administered during this assessment period	
Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	0 - 25 26 - 43 44 and above	At risk Some risk Low risk	0 - 51 52 - 67 68 and above	At risk Some risk Low risk	0 - 69 70 - 89 90 and above	At risk Some risk Low risk
Retell Fluency (RTF) [1]	BENCHMARK GOALS FOR THIS MEASURE HAVE NOT BEEN ESTABLISHED. [1]					
Word Use Fluency (WUF) [2]	BENCHMARK GOALS FOR THIS MEASURE HAVE NOT BEEN ESTABLISHED. [2]					

THIRD GRADE	Beginning of Year Month 1 - 3		Middle of Year Month 4 - 6		End of Year Month 7 - 10	
DIBELS Measure	**Scores**	**Status**	**Scores**	**Status**	**Scores**	**Status**
Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	0 - 52 53 - 76 77 and above	At risk Some risk Low risk	0 - 66 67 - 91 92 and above	At risk Some risk Low risk	0 - 79 80 - 109 110 and above	At risk Some risk Low risk
Retell Fluency (RTF) [1]	BENCHMARK GOALS FOR THIS MEASURE HAVE NOT BEEN ESTABLISHED. [1]					
Word Use Fluency (WUF) [2]	BENCHMARK GOALS FOR THIS MEASURE HAVE NOT BEEN ESTABLISHED. [2]					

1: BENCHMARK GOALS FOR THIS MEASURE HAVE NOT YET BEEN ESTABLISHED. Preliminary evidence indicates that for students to be on track with comprehension they should meet both of the following criteria: 1) meet the Oral Reading Fluency benchmark goal and 2) have a retell score of at least 25% of their Oral Reading Fluency score.

2: BENCHMARK GOALS FOR THIS MEASURE HAVE NOT BEEN ESTABLISHED. 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 20th and percentile and 40th percentile should be considered at some risk.

© University of Oregon Center on Teaching and Learning. All rights reserved.
Revision Date: July-31-2008

DIBELS Data System

DIBELS Benchmark Goals
Three Assessment Periods Per Year

FOURTH GRADE	Beginning of Year Month 1 - 3		Middle of Year Month 4 - 6		End of Year Month 7 - 10	
DIBELS Measure	**Scores**	**Status**	**Scores**	**Status**	**Scores**	**Status**
DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	0 - 70	At risk	0 - 82	At risk	0 - 95	At risk
	71 - 92	Some risk	83 - 104	Some risk	96 - 117	Some risk
	93 and above	Low risk	105 and above	Low risk	118 and above	Low risk
DIBELS Retell Fluency (RTF)	BENCHMARK GOALS FOR THIS MEASURE HAVE NOT BEEN ESTABLISHED.*					

FIFTH GRADE	Beginning of Year Month 1 - 3		Middle of Year Month 4 - 6		End of Year Month 7 - 10	
DIBELS Measure	**Scores**	**Status**	**Scores**	**Status**	**Scores**	**Status**
DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	0 - 80	At risk	0 - 93	At risk	0 - 102	At risk
	81 - 103	Some risk	94 - 114	Some risk	103 - 123	Some risk
	104 and above	Low risk	115 and above	Low risk	124 and above	Low risk
DIBELS Retell Fluency (RTF)	BENCHMARK GOALS FOR THIS MEASURE HAVE NOT BEEN ESTABLISHED.*					

SIXTH GRADE	Beginning of Year Month 1 - 3		Middle of Year Month 4 - 6		End of Year Month 7 - 10	
DIBELS Measure	**Scores**	**Status**	**Scores**	**Status**	**Scores**	**Status**
DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	0 - 82	At risk	0 - 98	At risk	0 - 103	At risk
	83 - 108	Some risk	99 - 119	Some risk	104 - 124	Some risk
	109 and above	Low risk	120 and above	Low risk	125 and above	Low risk
DIBELS Retell Fluency (RTF)	BENCHMARK GOALS FOR THIS MEASURE HAVE NOT BEEN ESTABLISHED.*					

*Preliminary evidence indicates that children's retell scores should typically be 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. A retell score of less than 25% of the oral reading fluency score may indicate a problem with comprehension.

dibels.uoregon.edu
© University of Oregon Center on Teaching and Learning. All rights reserved.

Revision Date: July-31-2008

Note: Goals and cutpoints for risk for Grades 4 through 6 are based on CBM normative information from 4th and 5th grade students in Fall, Winter and Spring from Hasbrouck and Tindal (1992) as well as average slope of reading progress information from Fuchs, Fuchs, Hamlett, Walz, & Germann (1993). Empirical evidence of the percent achieving subsequent literacy goals is not yet available for these initial estimates.

In addition to these preliminary estimates of goals and risk indicators, local normative information is available for each participating school district. A reasonable approximation of goals and cut scores for risk are also available from the local norms. The 40th percentile using local norms provides an approximate goal, and below the 20th percentile using local norms provides an approximate at-risk indicator.

With additional research these preliminary estimates will be refined based on the odds of achieving subsequent literacy goals. Each district can examine these odds by entering scores on a selected outcome for relevant grade levels. For example, in Oregon, a state assessment is given in fifth grade with a specific goal for meeting expectations. If a participating school district enters the fifth grade scores for all fifth grade students and the Oregon State Assessment goal, the **DIBELS Data System** will provide the odds of achieving the goal for these initial estimates of goals and risk indicators.

References

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Hamlett, C. L., Walz, L., & Germann, G. (1993). Formative evaluation of academic progress: How much growth can we expect? *School Psychology Review*, *22*, 27-48.

Hasbrouck, J. E., & Tindal, G. (1992, Spring). Curriculum-based oral reading fluency norms for students in grades 2 through 5. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, pp. 41-44.

© University of Oregon Center on Teaching and Learning. All rights reserved.