

DIBELS® Next Benchmark Goals and Composite Score

© Dynamic Measurement Group, Inc. / September 12, 2016

The DIBELS Next assessment provides two types of scores at each benchmark assessment period: a) a raw score for each individual measure and b) a composite score (the DIBELS Composite Score or DCS). Each of the scores is interpreted relative to benchmark goals and cut points for risk to determine if a student's score is at or above the benchmark, below the benchmark, or below the cut point for risk (well below the benchmark).

Benchmark Goals and Cut Points for Risk

DIBELS *benchmark goals* are empirically derived, criterion-referenced target scores that represent adequate reading skill for a particular grade and time of year. Benchmark goals and cut points for risk are provided for the DIBELS Composite Score as well as for individual DIBELS measures. Benchmark goals are based on research that examined the predictive probability of a score on a measure at a particular point in time, compared to later DIBELS measures and external measures of reading proficiency and achievement. (Additional information about the benchmark goals research is included in the *DIBELS Next Technical Manual*, available from <http://dibels.org/>.)

A *benchmark goal* indicates a level of skill at which students are likely to achieve the next DIBELS benchmark goal or reading outcome. Thus, for students who achieve a benchmark goal, the odds are in their favor of achieving later reading outcomes if they receive effective core reading instruction.

Conversely, the *cut points for risk* indicate a level of skill below which students are unlikely to achieve subsequent reading goals without receiving additional, targeted instructional support. For students who have scores below the cut point for risk, the probability of achieving later reading goals is low unless intensive support is provided.

DIBELS Next benchmark goals and cut points for risk provide three primary benchmark status levels that describe students' performance: a) At or Above Benchmark, b) Below Benchmark, and c) Well Below Benchmark. These levels are based on the overall likelihood of achieving specified goals on subsequent DIBELS Next assessments or external measures of reading achievement.

At or Above Benchmark. For students who score at or above the benchmark goal, the overall likelihood of achieving subsequent reading goals is approximately 80% to 90%. These students are likely to need effective core instruction to meet subsequent early literacy and/or reading goals. Within this range, the likelihood of achieving subsequent goals is lower for students whose scores are right at the benchmark goal and increases as scores increase above the benchmark (see Table 1).

To assist in setting ambitious goals for students, the At or Above Benchmark level is subdivided into *At Benchmark* and *Above Benchmark* levels.

At Benchmark. In the At Benchmark range, the overall likelihood of achieving subsequent early literacy or reading goals is 70% to 85%. Some of these students, especially those with scores near the benchmark, may require monitoring and/or strategic support on specific component skills.

Above Benchmark. In the Above Benchmark range, the overall likelihood of achieving subsequent early literacy and/or reading goals is 90% to 99%. While all students with scores in this range will likely benefit from core support, some students with scores in this range may benefit from instruction on more advanced skills.

Below Benchmark. Between the benchmark goal and cut point for risk is a range of scores where students' future performance is more difficult to predict. For students with scores in this range, the overall likelihood of achieving subsequent early literacy/reading goals is approximately 40% to 60%. These students are likely to need strategic support to ensure their achievement of future goals. Strategic support generally consists of carefully targeted supplemental support in specific skill areas in which students are having difficulty. To ensure that the greatest number of students achieve later reading success, it is best for students with scores in this range to be monitored regularly to ensure that they are making adequate progress and to receive increased or modified support if necessary to achieve subsequent reading goals.

Well Below Benchmark. For students who score below the cut point for risk, the overall likelihood of achieving subsequent early literacy/reading goals is low, approximately 10% to 20%. These students are identified as likely to need intensive support. Intensive support refers to interventions that incorporate something more or something different from the core curriculum or supplemental support.

Intensive support might entail:

- delivering instruction in a smaller group or individually,
- providing more instructional time or more practice,
- presenting smaller skill steps in the instructional hierarchy,
- providing more explicit modeling and instruction, and/or
- providing greater scaffolding and practice.

Because students who need intensive support are likely to have individual needs, we recommend that their progress be monitored frequently and their intervention modified dynamically to ensure adequate progress.

Table 1 summarizes the design specifications for achieving later reading outcomes and provides descriptions for the likely need for support for each of the benchmark status levels. It is important to note that while there is an overall likelihood for each benchmark status level, within each level the likelihood of achieving later reading outcomes increases as students' scores increase. This is illustrated in the first column of Table 1.

Table 1. Likelihood of Meeting Later Reading Goals and DIBELS® Next Benchmark Status

Likelihood of Meeting Later Reading Goals	Benchmark Status	Benchmark Status Including Above Benchmark	What It Means
>99%			
95%			
90%			
80%			
70%			
60%			
55%			
50%			
45%			
40%			
30%			
20%			
10%			
<5%			

The addition of the Above Benchmark status level has not changed the benchmark goals. A benchmark goal is still the point at which the odds are in the student's favor of meeting later reading goals (approximately 60% likelihood or higher). The higher above the benchmark goal the student scores, the better the odds. For students who are already at benchmark, the Above Benchmark status level also provides a higher goal to aim for. "Overall likelihood" refers to the approximate percentage of students within the category who achieve later goals, although the exact percentage varies by grade, year, and measure (see *DIBELS Next Benchmark Goals and Composite Score document*). Instructional decisions should be made based on students' patterns of performance across all measures, in addition to other available information on student skills, such as diagnostic assessment or in-class work. *DIBELS is a registered trademark of Dynamic Measurement Group, Inc. <http://dibels.org/>*

DIBELS Composite Score

The DIBELS Composite Score is a combination of multiple DIBELS scores and provides the best overall estimate of students' early literacy skills and/or reading proficiency. Most data management services will calculate the DIBELS Composite Score for you, provided that all required measures necessary for calculating the composite score have been administered. To calculate the DIBELS Composite Score yourself, see the *DIBELS Next Composite Score Worksheets* at the end of this document.

Benchmark goals and cut points for risk for the DIBELS Composite Score are based on the same logic and procedures as the benchmark goals for the individual DIBELS measures. However, because the DIBELS Composite Score provides the best overall estimate of a student's skills, the DIBELS Composite Score should generally be interpreted first. If a student is at or above the benchmark goal on the DIBELS Composite Score, the odds are in the student's favor of reaching later important reading outcomes. Some students who score at or above the DIBELS Composite Score benchmark goal may still need additional support in one of the basic early literacy skills, as indicated by a below benchmark score on an individual DIBELS Next measure (FSF, PSF, NWF, DORF, or Daze). This potential need for additional support is especially true for a student whose composite score is close to the benchmark goal.

The DIBELS Next measures that are used to calculate the DIBELS Composite Score vary by grade and time of year. As such, the composite score is not comparable across different grades and does not provide a direct measure of growth across grades. For grades K through 2, the composite score is also not comparable across different times of year and should not be used as an indicator of growth within a grade. However, because the logic and procedures used to establish benchmark goals are consistent across grades and times of year, the percent of students at different benchmark status levels can be compared, even though the mean scores are not comparable.

Benchmark Goals Study

The DIBELS Next benchmark goals, cut points for risk, and Composite Score were developed based upon data collected in a study conducted during the 2009–2010 school year. The goals represent a series of conditional probabilities of meeting later important reading outcomes. The external criterion was the Group Reading and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE; Williams, 2001). The 40th percentile on the GRADE assessment was used as an indicator that the students had adequate early reading and/or reading skills for their grade. Data for the study were collected in thirteen elementary and middle schools in five states. Data collection included administering the DIBELS Next measures to participating students in grades K–6 in addition to the GRADE. Participants in the study were 3,816 students across grades K–6 from general education classrooms who were receiving English language reading instruction, including students with disabilities and students who were English language learners, provided they had the response capabilities to participate. The study included both students who were struggling in reading and those who were typically achieving. A subset of the total sample participated in the GRADE assessment ($n = 1,306$ across grades K–6). Additional information about the study is included in the *DIBELS Next Technical Manual*, available from <http://dibels.org/>.

Frequently Asked Questions About DIBELS Next Benchmark Goals

1. Why doesn't Letter Naming Fluency have benchmark goals?

Answer:

Letter Naming Fluency (LNF) is included in DIBELS Next as an *indicator of risk*, rather than an instructional target. The ability to recognize and name letters in preschool and at the beginning of kindergarten is a strong predictor of later reading achievement (e.g., National Early Literacy Panel, 2008; Schatschneider, Francis, Carlson, Fletcher, & Foorman, 2004; Walsh, Price, & Gillingham, 1988). However, little is known about the function of letter name knowledge in learning to read. While there is some support that letter name knowledge paired with phonemic awareness training may facilitate learning letter sound correspondences for preschool and kindergarten children (Kim, Foorman, Petscher, & Zhou, 2010; Piasta & Wagner, 2010), it is also clear that simply teaching letter names to students who also have poor phonemic awareness skills does little to help in the acquisition of reading. In fact, studies have demonstrated that successful learning of letter-sound correspondences that leads to reading acquisition can occur without knowledge of letter names (Bruck, Genesee, & Caravolas, 1997; Mann & Wimmer, 2002). Because learning letter names is not a powerful instructional target for elementary school-age students, especially for those beyond kindergarten who are struggling to learn to read, benchmark goals are not provided for LNF. LNF is a strong predictor of later reading, however, so it is included as a part of the DIBELS Composite Score in kindergarten and early first grade.

2. Why are the sixth-grade benchmark goals lower than the fifth-grade goals?

Answer:

The difficulty level of the passages used for DORF and Daze changes by grade, so composite scores and benchmark goals can't be directly compared across grades. The difficulty level of the passages increases by grade in a roughly linear fashion. However, student performance increases in a curve, with the most growth occurring in the earlier grades, and slower growth in the upper grades. Between fifth and sixth grade, the difficulty level of the materials increases at a faster rate than student performance, so benchmark goals are lower in sixth grade than in fifth.

3. My school uses benchmark goals that are different from the official DIBELS Next benchmark goals. What goals do you recommend?

Answer:

We recommend using the official DIBELS Next benchmark goals, which have been developed to meet the design specifications based on predictive probabilities outlined in this paper and are based on research conducted by the authors of DIBELS Next. We do not support non-official goals that may be based on a different rationale, educational decision model, and/or research. The official benchmark goals support the use of DIBELS for the purposes for which the assessment was designed: a) for identifying which students are likely to be on track and which students are likely to need additional instructional support to become successful readers, b) enabling educators to set meaningful goals, and c) for monitoring the progress of students toward important reading outcomes.

The official DIBELS Next benchmark goals typically fall around the 39th percentile. This represents the lowest level of skill that puts the odds in a student's favor of meeting subsequent reading goals. It is a level we want **all** students to reach, including our lowest performing students. This means that average-performing and high-performing students will score above or well above the benchmark goal.

Further information on the official benchmark goals and their interpretation is described in Chapter 3 of the *DIBELS Next Assessment Manual* ("Interpreting DIBELS Next Data"). For additional information about the design specifications and construction of the benchmark goals, please see Chapter 4 of the *DIBELS Next Technical Manual*, available from <http://dibels.org/>.

References

- Bruck, M., Genesee, F., & Caravolas, M. (1997). A cross-linguistic study of early literacy acquisition. In B. Blachman (Ed.), *Foundations of reading acquisition and dyslexia: Implications for early intervention* (pp. 145–162). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kim, Y., Foorman, B., Petscher, Y., & Zhou, C. (2010). The contributions of phonological awareness and letter-name knowledge to letter-sound acquisition—a cross-classified multilevel model approach. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102*(2), 313–326.
- Mann, V.A., & Wimmer, H. (2002). Phoneme awareness and pathways into literacy: A comparison of German and American children. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 15*, 653–682.
- National Early Literacy Panel. (2008). *Developing early literacy: Report of the National Early Literacy Panel*. Washington, DC: National Institute for Literacy.
- Piasta, S.B., & Wagner, R.K. (2010). Learning letter names and sounds: Effects of instruction, letter type, and phonological processing skill. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 105*, 324–344.
- Schatschneider, Francis, Carlson, Fletcher, & Foorman (2004). Kindergarten prediction of reading skills: A longitudinal comparative analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96*(2), 265–282.
- Walsh, D.J., Price, G.G., & Gillingham, M.G. (1988). The critical but transitory importance of letter naming. *Reading Research Quarterly, 23*, 108–122.
- Williams, K.T. (2001). *Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE)*. New York: Pearson.

DIBELS Next®: Summary of Benchmark Goals and Cut Points for Risk

DIBELS Composite Score		289		349		405		341		386		466		435		478																									
26		220		285		330		290		357		415		344		380																									
13		180		235		280		245		258		310		280		324																									
First Sound Fluency (FSF)																																									
16		208		256		287		341		383		446		466		478																									
10		155		190		238		290		330		391		415		380																									
5		111		145		180		245		290		330		340		324																									
Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF)																																									
44		202		256		287		341		386		466		435		478																									
20		141		190		238		290		357		415		344		380																									
10		109		145		180		245		258		310		280		324																									
Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF)																																									
28		81		99		99		98		99		99		99		99																									
17		58		65		72		79		86		95		101		105																									
8		47		55		65		79		86		95		101		105																									
4		33		47		65		79		86		95		101		105																									
1		17		25		31		36		40		46		52		50																									
0		8		13		18		14		18		22		25		24																									
0		3		6		18		14		18		22		25		24																									
DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (DORF)																																									
34		68		91		104		104		121		133		143		151																									
23		52		72		87		90		111		120		130		120																									
16		37		55		65		70		96		105		105		95																									
86%		96%		99%		99%		98%		99%		99%		99%		99%																									
78%		90%		96%		97%		96%		98%		98%		99%		98%																									
68%		82%		91%		93%		93%		95%		96%		97%		96%																									
17		25		31		39		36		40		46		52		50																									
15		16		21		27		27		33		36		36		32																									
0		8		13		18		14		22		25		25		24																									
Retail		Retail		Retail		Retail		Retail		Retail		Retail		Retail		Retail																									
Quality of Response		Quality of Response		Quality of Response		Quality of Response		Quality of Response		Quality of Response		Quality of Response		Quality of Response		Quality of Response																									
2		2		2		2		2		2		2		2		2																									
1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1		1																									
Daze Adjusted Score																																									
11		16		23		28		28		21		28		27		30																									
8		11		19		24		15		18		24		18		21																									
5		7		14		20		10		12		18		14		15																									
Beg		Mid		End		Beg		Mid		End		Beg		Mid		End																									
Kindergarten						First Grade						Second Grade						Third Grade						Fourth Grade						Fifth Grade						Sixth Grade					

DIBELS Composite Score: A combination of multiple DIBELS scores, which provides the best overall estimate of the student's reading proficiency. For information on how to calculate the composite score, see the *DIBELS Next Benchmark Goals and Composite Score* document available from <http://dibels.org/>.

ABOVE BENCHMARK (small blue number in each box): Students scoring above the benchmark are highly likely to achieve important reading outcomes (approximately 90% to 99% overall). These scores are identified as *Above Benchmark*. While students scoring *Above Benchmark* are likely to need *Core Support*, some may benefit from instruction on more advanced skills.

BENCHMARK GOAL (large bold number in the middle of the box): Students scoring at or above the benchmark goal have the odds in their favor (approximately 80% to 90% overall) of achieving later important reading outcomes. These scores are identified as *At or Above Benchmark* and the students are likely to need *Core Support*.

CUT POINT FOR RISK (small red number in each box): Students scoring below the cut point for risk are unlikely (approximately 10%–20%) to achieve subsequent goals without receiving additional, targeted instructional support. These scores are identified as *Well Below Benchmark* and the students are likely to need *Intensive Support*.

Scores below the benchmark goal and at or above the cut point for risk are identified as *Below Benchmark*. In this range, a student's future performance is harder to predict, and these students are likely to need *Strategic Support*.

Note: There is no benchmark goal for Letter Naming Fluency (LNF). This is a summary of the DIBELS Next benchmark goals. For a full description, see the *DIBELS Next Benchmark Goals and Composite Score* document available from <http://dibels.org/>. DIBELS is a registered trademark of Dynamic Measurement Group, Inc. This page is adapted from a chart developed by Cache County School District.

Kindergarten Benchmark Goals and Cut Points for Risk

DIBELS Measure	Benchmark Status	Likely Need for Support	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	End of Year
DIBELS Composite Score	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	38 +	156 +	152 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	26 - 37	122 - 155	119 - 151
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	<i>13 - 25</i>	<i>85 - 121</i>	<i>89 - 118</i>
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	<i>0 - 12</i>	<i>0 - 84</i>	<i>0 - 88</i>
FSF	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	16 +	43 +	
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	10 - 15	30 - 42	
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	<i>5 - 9</i>	<i>20 - 29</i>	
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	<i>0 - 4</i>	<i>0 - 19</i>	
PSF	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a		44 +	56 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b		20 - 43	40 - 55
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support		<i>10 - 19</i>	<i>25 - 39</i>
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support		<i>0 - 9</i>	<i>0 - 24</i>
NWF-CLS	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a		28 +	40 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b		17 - 27	28 - 39
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support		<i>8 - 16</i>	<i>15 - 27</i>
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support		<i>0 - 7</i>	<i>0 - 14</i>

The benchmark goal is the number that is **bold**. The cut point for risk is the number that is *italicized*.

^a Some students may benefit from instruction on more advanced skills.

^b Some students may require monitoring and strategic support on component skills.

First Grade Benchmark Goals and Cut Points for Risk

DIBELS Measure	Benchmark Status	Likely Need for Support	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	End of Year
DIBELS Composite Score	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	129 +	177 +	208 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	113 - 128	130 - 176	155 - 207
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	97 - 112	100 - 129	111 - 154
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 96	0 - 99	0 - 110
PSF	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	47 +		
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	40 - 46		
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	25 - 39		
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 24		
NWF-CLS	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	34 +	59 +	81 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	27 - 33	43 - 58	58 - 80
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	18 - 26	33 - 42	47 - 57
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 17	0 - 32	0 - 46
NWF-WWR	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	4 +	17 +	25 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	1 - 3	8 - 16	13 - 24
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	0	3 - 7	6 - 12
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support		0 - 2	0 - 5
DORF Words Correct	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a		34 +	67 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b		23 - 33	47 - 66
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support		16 - 22	32 - 46
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support		0 - 15	0 - 31
DORF Accuracy	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a		86% +	97% +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b		78% - 85%	90% - 96%
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support		68% - 77%	82% - 89%
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support		0% - 67%	0% - 81%
Retell	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a			17 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b			15 - 16
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support			0 - 14
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support			

The benchmark goal is the number that is **bold**. The cut point for risk is the number that is *italicized*.

^a Some students may benefit from instruction on more advanced skills.

^b Some students may require monitoring and strategic support on component skills.

Second Grade Benchmark Goals and Cut Points for Risk

DIBELS Measure	Benchmark Status	Likely Need for Support	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	End of Year
DIBELS Composite Score	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	202 +	256 +	287 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	141 - 201	190 - 255	238 - 286
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	109 - 140	145 - 189	180 - 237
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 108	0 - 144	0 - 179
NWF-CLS	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	72 +		
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	54 - 71		
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	35 - 53		
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 34		
NWF-WWR	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	21 +		
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	13 - 20		
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	6 - 12		
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 5		
DORF Words Correct	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	68 +	91 +	104 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	52 - 67	72 - 90	87 - 103
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	37 - 51	55 - 71	65 - 86
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 36	0 - 54	0 - 64
DORF Accuracy	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	96% +	99% +	99% +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	90% - 95%	96% - 98%	97% - 98%
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	81% - 89%	91% - 95%	93% - 96%
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0% - 80%	0% - 90%	0% - 92%
Retell	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	25 +	31 +	39 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	16 - 24	21 - 30	27 - 38
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	8 - 15	13 - 20	18 - 26
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 7	0 - 12	0 - 17
Retell Quality of Response	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b		2 +	2 +
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support		1	1
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support			

The benchmark goal is the number that is **bold**. The cut point for risk is the number that is *italicized*.

^a Some students may benefit from instruction on more advanced skills.

^b Some students may require monitoring and strategic support on component skills.

Third Grade Benchmark Goals and Cut Points for Risk

DIBELS Measure	Benchmark Status	Likely Need for Support	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	End of Year
DIBELS Composite Score	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	289 +	349 +	405 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	220 - 288	285 - 348	330 - 404
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	<i>180 - 219</i>	<i>235 - 284</i>	<i>280 - 329</i>
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	<i>0 - 179</i>	<i>0 - 234</i>	<i>0 - 279</i>
DORF Words Correct	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	90 +	105 +	118 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	70 - 89	86 - 104	100 - 117
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	<i>55 - 69</i>	<i>68 - 85</i>	<i>80 - 99</i>
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	<i>0 - 54</i>	<i>0 - 67</i>	<i>0 - 79</i>
DORF Accuracy	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	98% +	99% +	99% +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	95% - 97%	96% - 98%	97% - 98%
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	<i>89% - 94%</i>	<i>92% - 95%</i>	<i>94% - 96%</i>
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	<i>0% - 88%</i>	<i>0% - 91%</i>	<i>0% - 93%</i>
Retell	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	33 +	40 +	46 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	20 - 32	26 - 39	30 - 45
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	<i>10 - 19</i>	<i>18 - 25</i>	<i>20 - 29</i>
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	<i>0 - 9</i>	<i>0 - 17</i>	<i>0 - 19</i>
Retell Quality of Response	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	2 +	2 +	3 +
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support			<i>1</i>
Daze Adjusted Score	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	11 +	16 +	23 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	8 - 10	11 - 15	19 - 22
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	<i>5 - 7</i>	<i>7 - 10</i>	<i>14 - 18</i>
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	<i>0 - 4</i>	<i>0 - 6</i>	<i>0 - 13</i>

The benchmark goal is the number that is **bold**. The cut point for risk is the number that is *italicized*.

^a Some students may benefit from instruction on more advanced skills.

^b Some students may require monitoring and strategic support on component skills.

Fourth Grade Benchmark Goals and Cut Points for Risk

DIBELS Measure	Benchmark Status	Likely Need for Support	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	End of Year
DIBELS Composite Score	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	341 +	383 +	446 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	290 - 340	330 - 382	391 - 445
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	245 - 289	290 - 329	330 - 390
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 244	0 - 289	0 - 329
DORF Words Correct	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	104 +	121 +	133 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	90 - 103	103 - 120	115 - 132
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	70 - 89	79 - 102	95 - 114
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 69	0 - 78	0 - 94
DORF Accuracy	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	98% +	99% +	100% +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	96% - 97%	97% - 98%	98% - 99%
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	93% - 95%	94% - 96%	95% - 97%
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0% - 92%	0% - 93%	0% - 94%
Retell	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	36 +	39 +	46 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	27 - 35	30 - 38	33 - 45
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	14 - 26	20 - 29	24 - 32
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 13	0 - 19	0 - 23
Retell Quality of Response	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	2 +	2 +	3 +
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	2
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support			1
Daze Adjusted Score	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	18 +	20 +	28 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	15 - 17	17 - 19	24 - 27
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	10 - 14	12 - 16	20 - 23
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 9	0 - 11	0 - 19

The benchmark goal is the number that is **bold**. The cut point for risk is the number that is *italicized*.

^a Some students may benefit from instruction on more advanced skills.

^b Some students may require monitoring and strategic support on component skills.

Fifth Grade Benchmark Goals and Cut Points for Risk

DIBELS Measure	Benchmark Status	Likely Need for Support	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	End of Year
DIBELS Composite Score	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	386 +	411 +	466 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	357 - 385	372 - 410	415 - 465
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	258 - 356	310 - 371	340 - 414
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 257	0 - 309	0 - 339
DORF Words Correct	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	121 +	133 +	143 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	111 - 120	120 - 132	130 - 142
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	96 - 110	101 - 119	105 - 129
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 95	0 - 100	0 - 104
DORF Accuracy	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	99% +	99% +	100%
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	98%	98%	99%
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	95% - 97%	96% - 97%	97% - 98%
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0% - 94%	0% - 95%	0% - 96%
Retell	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	40 +	46 +	52 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	33 - 39	36 - 45	36 - 51
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	22 - 32	25 - 35	25 - 35
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 21	0 - 24	0 - 24
Retell Quality of Response	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	2 +	3 +	3 +
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	<i>1</i>	2	2
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support		1	1
Daze Adjusted Score	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	21 +	21 +	28 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	18 - 20	20	24 - 27
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	12 - 17	13 - 19	18 - 23
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 11	0 - 12	0 - 17

The benchmark goal is the number that is **bold**. The cut point for risk is the number that is *italicized*.

^a Some students may benefit from instruction on more advanced skills.

^b Some students may require monitoring and strategic support on component skills.

Sixth Grade Benchmark Goals and Cut Points for Risk

DIBELS Measure	Benchmark Status	Likely Need for Support	Beginning of Year	Middle of Year	End of Year
DIBELS Composite Score	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	435 +	461 +	478 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	344 - 434	358 - 460	380 - 477
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	280 - 343	285 - 357	324 - 379
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 279	0 - 284	0 - 323
DORF Words Correct	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	139 +	141 +	151 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	107 - 138	109 - 140	120 - 150
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	90 - 106	92 - 108	95 - 119
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 89	0 - 91	0 - 94
DORF Accuracy	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	99% +	99% +	100%
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	97% - 98%	97% - 98%	98% - 99%
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	94% - 96%	94% - 96%	96% - 97%
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0% - 93%	0% - 93%	0% - 95%
Retell	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	43 +	48 +	50 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	27 - 42	29 - 47	32 - 49
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	16 - 26	18 - 28	24 - 31
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 15	0 - 17	0 - 23
Retell Quality of Response	At or Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	2 +	2 +	3 +
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	1	1	2
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support			1
Daze Adjusted Score	Above Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support ^a	27 +	30 +	30 +
	At Benchmark	Likely to Need Core Support^b	18 - 26	19 - 29	21 - 29
	Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Strategic Support	14 - 17	14 - 18	15 - 20
	Well Below Benchmark	Likely to Need Intensive Support	0 - 13	0 - 13	0 - 14

The benchmark goal is the number that is **bold**. The cut point for risk is the number that is *italicized*.

^a Some students may benefit from instruction on more advanced skills.

^b Some students may require monitoring and strategic support on component skills.

Kindergarten Percentage of Students Who Meet Later Outcomes on the DIBELS® Composite Score Based On Benchmark Status on Individual DIBELS® Measures

DIBELS Measure	Benchmark Status	Percent of students	Percent of students	Percent of students	Percent of students
		At or Above Benchmark on middle-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on beginning-of-year status	Above Benchmark on middle-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on beginning-of-year status	At or Above Benchmark on end-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on middle-of-year status	Above Benchmark on end-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on middle-of-year status
DIBELS Composite Score	At or Above Benchmark	85%	58%	93%	59%
	Above Benchmark	91%	67%	98%	77%
	At Benchmark	70%	35%	85%	32%
	Below Benchmark	54%	24%	56%	13%
	Well Below Benchmark	32%	12%	18%	3%
FSF	At or Above Benchmark	83%	57%	86%	52%
	Above Benchmark	88%	64%	93%	65%
	At Benchmark	69%	36%	80%	41%
	Below Benchmark	56%	26%	54%	19%
	Well Below Benchmark	42%	18%	22%	5%
PSF	At or Above Benchmark	–	–	86%	52%
	Above Benchmark	–	–	94%	66%
	At Benchmark	–	–	79%	38%
	Below Benchmark	–	–	53%	18%
	Well Below Benchmark	–	–	26%	7%
NWF Correct Letter Sounds	At or Above Benchmark	–	–	87%	53%
	Above Benchmark	–	–	96%	72%
	At Benchmark	–	–	78%	31%
	Below Benchmark	–	–	47%	11%
	Well Below Benchmark	–	–	18%	4%

Note. This table shows the percent of students that are on track on the DIBELS® Composite Score at the middle and end of the year based on the student's DIBELS® measure score at the beginning and middle of the year. N = 441,923 students who had DIBELS Next® data for the 2013–2014 school year. Data exported from mCLASS®, VPORT®, and DIBELSnet® data reporting service.

First Grade Percentage of Students Who Meet Later Outcomes on the DIBELS® Composite Score Based On Benchmark Status on Individual DIBELS® Measures

DIBELS Measure	Benchmark Status	Percent of students	Percent of students	Percent of students	Percent of students
		At or Above Benchmark on middle-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on beginning-of-year status	Above Benchmark on middle-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on beginning-of-year status	At or Above Benchmark on end-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on middle-of-year status	Above Benchmark on end-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on middle-of-year status
DIBELS Composite Score	At or Above Benchmark	87%	68%	92%	66%
	Above Benchmark	93%	79%	99%	85%
	At Benchmark	74%	44%	75%	20%
	Below Benchmark	59%	29%	36%	5%
	Well Below Benchmark	28%	11%	7%	1%
PSF	At or Above Benchmark	77%	56%	–	–
	Above Benchmark	79%	59%	–	–
	At Benchmark	74%	52%	–	–
	Below Benchmark	64%	43%	–	–
	Well Below Benchmark	36%	21%	–	–
NWF Correct Letter Sounds	At or Above Benchmark	85%	66%	86%	63%
	Above Benchmark	91%	77%	95%	81%
	At Benchmark	68%	37%	67%	28%
	Below Benchmark	49%	22%	43%	12%
	Well Below Benchmark	22%	8%	18%	4%
NWF Whole Words Read	At or Above Benchmark	83%	64%	83%	59%
	Above Benchmark	92%	78%	96%	80%
	At Benchmark	66%	36%	63%	25%
	Below Benchmark	37%	16%	36%	10%
	Well Below Benchmark	–	–	17%	5%
DORF Words Correct	At or Above Benchmark			91%	66%
	Above Benchmark			98%	83%
	At Benchmark			74%	24%
	Below Benchmark			35%	6%
	Well Below Benchmark			7%	1%
DORF Accuracy	At or Above Benchmark			91%	67%
	Above Benchmark			97%	80%
	At Benchmark			74%	27%
	Below Benchmark			43%	10%
	Well Below Benchmark			9%	2%

Note. This table shows the percent of students that are on track on the DIBELS® Composite Score at the middle and end of the year based on the student's DIBELS® measure score at the beginning and middle of the year. N = 452,530 students who had DIBELS Next® data for the 2013–2014 school year. Data exported from mCLASS®, VPORT®, and DIBELSnet® data reporting service.

Second Grade Percentage of Students Who Meet Later Outcomes on the DIBELS® Composite Score Based On Benchmark Status on Individual DIBELS® Measures

DIBELS Measure	Benchmark Status	Percent of students	Percent of students	Percent of students	Percent of students
		At or Above Benchmark on middle-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on beginning-of-year status	Above Benchmark on middle-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on beginning-of-year status	At or Above Benchmark on end-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on middle-of-year status	Above Benchmark on end-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on middle-of-year status
DIBELS Composite Score	At or Above Benchmark	93%	64%	91%	64%
	Above Benchmark	99%	83%	98%	84%
	At Benchmark	85%	36%	77%	28%
	Below Benchmark	46%	8%	35%	7%
	Well Below Benchmark	11%	1%	8%	1%
NWF Correct Letter Sounds	At or Above Benchmark	92%	66%	–	–
	Above Benchmark	96%	76%	–	–
	At Benchmark	82%	46%	–	–
	Below Benchmark	61%	26%	–	–
	Well Below Benchmark	37%	13%	–	–
NWF Whole Words Read	At or Above Benchmark	90%	64%	–	–
	Above Benchmark	96%	76%	–	–
	At Benchmark	80%	43%	–	–
	Below Benchmark	57%	23%	–	–
	Well Below Benchmark	36%	13%	–	–
DORF Words Correct	At or Above Benchmark	96%	71%	94%	69%
	Above Benchmark	99%	84%	98%	84%
	At Benchmark	90%	42%	85%	40%
	Below Benchmark	64%	15%	54%	15%
	Well Below Benchmark	16%	2%	12%	2%
DORF Accuracy	At or Above Benchmark	92%	63%	91%	65%
	Above Benchmark	98%	79%	96%	77%
	At Benchmark	82%	37%	81%	44%
	Below Benchmark	45%	11%	44%	14%
	Well Below Benchmark	11%	2%	11%	4%
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	89%	63%	84%	60%
	Above Benchmark	94%	74%	91%	72%
	At Benchmark	80%	41%	71%	37%
	Below Benchmark	62%	22%	48%	18%
	Well Below Benchmark	33%	9%	24%	8%

Note. This table shows the percent of students that are on track on the DIBELS® Composite Score at the middle and end of the year based on the student's DIBELS® measure score at the beginning and middle of the year. N = 394,821 students who had DIBELS Next® data for the 2013–2014 school year. Data exported from mCLASS®, VPORT®, and DIBELSnet® data reporting service.

Third Grade Percentage of Students Who Meet Later Outcomes on the DIBELS® Composite Score Based On Benchmark Status on Individual DIBELS® Measures

DIBELS Measure	Benchmark Status	Percent of students	Percent of students	Percent of students	Percent of students
		At or Above Benchmark on middle-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on beginning-of-year status	Above Benchmark on middle-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on beginning-of-year status	At or Above Benchmark on end-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on middle-of-year status	Above Benchmark on end-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on middle-of-year status
DIBELS Composite Score	At or Above Benchmark	90%	62%	93%	64%
	Above Benchmark	98%	82%	99%	84%
	At Benchmark	76%	29%	83%	29%
	Below Benchmark	43%	9%	46%	7%
	Well Below Benchmark	12%	2%	9%	1%
DORF Words Correct	At or Above Benchmark	91%	64%	92%	65%
	Above Benchmark	97%	82%	98%	83%
	At Benchmark	79%	35%	83%	36%
	Below Benchmark	49%	12%	50%	11%
	Well Below Benchmark	14%	2%	12%	2%
DORF Accuracy	At or Above Benchmark	87%	60%	85%	57%
	Above Benchmark	94%	75%	92%	69%
	At Benchmark	78%	42%	76%	39%
	Below Benchmark	46%	16%	38%	11%
	Well Below Benchmark	10%	3%	8%	2%
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	79%	53%	82%	55%
	Above Benchmark	89%	68%	91%	69%
	At Benchmark	65%	32%	69%	34%
	Below Benchmark	39%	14%	46%	16%
	Well Below Benchmark	22%	8%	25%	7%
DAZE Adjusted Score	At or Above Benchmark	89%	65%	90%	65%
	Above Benchmark	94%	76%	96%	78%
	At Benchmark	78%	43%	80%	44%
	Below Benchmark	58%	23%	58%	22%
	Well Below Benchmark	29%	9%	26%	7%

Note. This table shows the percent of students that are on track on the DIBELS® Composite Score at the middle and end of the year based on the student's DIBELS® measure score at the beginning and middle of the year. N = 303,928 students who had DIBELS Next® data for the 2013–2014 school year. Data exported from mCLASS®, VPORT®, and DIBELSnet® data reporting service.

Fourth Grade Percentage of Students Who Meet Later Outcomes on the DIBELS® Composite Score Based On Benchmark Status on Individual DIBELS® Measures

DIBELS Measure	Benchmark Status	Percent of students	Percent of students	Percent of students	Percent of students
		At or Above Benchmark on middle-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on beginning-of-year status	Above Benchmark on middle-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on beginning-of-year status	At or Above Benchmark on end-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on middle-of-year status	Above Benchmark on end-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on middle-of-year status
DIBELS Composite Score	At or Above Benchmark	91%	68%	91%	65%
	Above Benchmark	97%	84%	98%	83%
	At Benchmark	76%	32%	77%	29%
	Below Benchmark	45%	11%	45%	8%
	Well Below Benchmark	9%	2%	9%	1%
DORF Words Correct	At or Above Benchmark	92%	72%	90%	66%
	Above Benchmark	97%	82%	97%	82%
	At Benchmark	79%	41%	76%	33%
	Below Benchmark	54%	19%	42%	11%
	Well Below Benchmark	12%	2%	7%	1%
DORF Accuracy	At or Above Benchmark	82%	60%	80%	55%
	Above Benchmark	89%	69%	88%	66%
	At Benchmark	68%	39%	67%	35%
	Below Benchmark	46%	20%	36%	12%
	Well Below Benchmark	12%	4%	7%	2%
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	79%	58%	81%	57%
	Above Benchmark	86%	68%	88%	66%
	At Benchmark	63%	37%	66%	36%
	Below Benchmark	40%	18%	45%	20%
	Well Below Benchmark	17%	6%	19%	7%
DAZE Adjusted Score	At or Above Benchmark	89%	68%	88%	67%
	Above Benchmark	94%	78%	95%	79%
	At Benchmark	73%	39%	75%	41%
	Below Benchmark	47%	19%	50%	20%
	Well Below Benchmark	14%	4%	18%	5%

Note. This table shows the percent of students that are on track on the DIBELS® Composite Score at the middle and end of the year based on the student's DIBELS® measure score at the beginning and middle of the year. N = 114,567 students who had DIBELS Next® data for the 2013–2014 school year. Data exported from mCLASS®, VPORT®, and DIBELSnet® data reporting service.

Fifth Grade Percentage of Students Who Meet Later Outcomes on the DIBELS® Composite Score Based On Benchmark Status on Individual DIBELS® Measures

DIBELS Measure	Benchmark Status	Percent of students	Percent of students	Percent of students	Percent of students
		At or Above Benchmark on middle-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on beginning-of-year status	Above Benchmark on middle-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on beginning-of-year status	At or Above Benchmark on end-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on middle-of-year status	Above Benchmark on end-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on middle-of-year status
DIBELS Composite Score	At or Above Benchmark	92%	76%	90%	68%
	Above Benchmark	96%	84%	96%	82%
	At Benchmark	75%	41%	73%	32%
	Below Benchmark	37%	13%	35%	9%
	Well Below Benchmark	3%	1%	3%	1%
DORF Words Correct	At or Above Benchmark	91%	76%	91%	72%
	Above Benchmark	95%	83%	95%	81%
	At Benchmark	75%	46%	76%	42%
	Below Benchmark	56%	26%	47%	18%
	Well Below Benchmark	16%	5%	8%	2%
DORF Accuracy	At or Above Benchmark	80%	63%	76%	55%
	Above Benchmark	89%	76%	88%	74%
	At Benchmark	76%	57%	71%	48%
	Below Benchmark	42%	22%	38%	18%
	Well Below Benchmark	11%	4%	10%	4%
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	76%	59%	75%	55%
	Above Benchmark	82%	67%	83%	66%
	At Benchmark	60%	39%	59%	34%
	Below Benchmark	42%	23%	39%	19%
	Well Below Benchmark	18%	9%	17%	7%
DAZE Adjusted Score	At or Above Benchmark	86%	69%	91%	74%
	Above Benchmark	91%	78%	92%	77%
	At Benchmark	67%	41%	77%	48%
	Below Benchmark	45%	22%	52%	25%
	Well Below Benchmark	15%	6%	14%	4%

Note. This table shows the percent of students that are on track on the DIBELS® Composite Score at the middle and end of the year based on the student's DIBELS® measure score at the beginning and middle of the year. N = 98,565 students who had DIBELS Next® data for the 2013–2014 school year. Data exported from mCLASS®, VPORT®, and DIBELSnet® data reporting service.

Sixth Grade Percentage of Students Who Meet Later Outcomes on the DIBELS® Composite Score Based On Benchmark Status on Individual DIBELS® Measures

DIBELS Measure	Benchmark Status	Percent of students	Percent of students	Percent of students	Percent of students
		At or Above Benchmark on middle-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on beginning-of-year status	Above Benchmark on middle-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on beginning-of-year status	At or Above Benchmark on end-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on middle-of-year status	Above Benchmark on end-of-year DIBELS Composite Score based on middle-of-year status
DIBELS Composite Score	At or Above Benchmark	93%	54%	94%	55%
	Above Benchmark	99%	82%	100%	83%
	At Benchmark	85%	20%	87%	21%
	Below Benchmark	32%	2%	35%	1%
	Well Below Benchmark	3%	0%	3%	0%
DORF Words Correct	At or Above Benchmark	92%	55%	93%	56%
	Above Benchmark	99%	80%	99%	80%
	At Benchmark	85%	26%	85%	27%
	Below Benchmark	44%	3%	50%	5%
	Well Below Benchmark	8%	0%	11%	1%
DORF Accuracy	At or Above Benchmark	86%	49%	86%	50%
	Above Benchmark	92%	61%	94%	66%
	At Benchmark	83%	45%	83%	43%
	Below Benchmark	46%	12%	46%	10%
	Well Below Benchmark	9%	2%	10%	1%
Retell	At or Above Benchmark	85%	50%	86%	51%
	Above Benchmark	93%	65%	95%	68%
	At Benchmark	75%	33%	76%	31%
	Below Benchmark	52%	15%	49%	10%
	Well Below Benchmark	26%	5%	21%	3%
DAZE Adjusted Score	At or Above Benchmark	89%	51%	90%	53%
	Above Benchmark	98%	77%	99%	78%
	At Benchmark	78%	24%	81%	27%
	Below Benchmark	36%	4%	43%	6%
	Well Below Benchmark	13%	2%	12%	1%

Note. This table shows the percent of students that are on track on the DIBELS® Composite Score at the middle and end of the year based on the student's DIBELS® measure score at the beginning and middle of the year. N = 32,337 students who had DIBELS Next® data for the 2013–2014 school year. Data exported from mCLASS®, VPORT®, and DIBELSnet® data reporting service.

Percent of Students Who Met Outcomes on the GRADE

DIBELS Measure	End-of-Year Benchmark Status	Likelihood of Being on Track on the GRADE by Grade Level						
		K	1	2	3	4	5	6
DIBELS Composite Score	At or Above Benchmark	74%	90%	89%	90%	84%	87%	93%
	Below Benchmark	50%	48%	45%	48%	58%	45%	45%
	Well Below Benchmark	36%	10%	14%	7%	3%	7%	13%
FSF	At or Above Benchmark	70%						
	Below Benchmark	56%						
	Well Below Benchmark	50%						
PSF	At or Above Benchmark	74%	83%					
	Below Benchmark	63%	59%					
	Well Below Benchmark	20%	32%					
NWF Correct Letter Sounds	At or Above Benchmark		90%					
	Below Benchmark		42%					
	Well Below Benchmark		10%					
NWF Whole Words Read	At or Above Benchmark		89%					
	Below Benchmark		36%					
	Well Below Benchmark		13%					
DORF Words Correct	At or Above Benchmark		87%	89%	89%	85%	83%	90%
	Below Benchmark		62%	43%	50%	59%	57%	64%
	Well Below Benchmark			14%	18%	3%	11%	25%
DORF Accuracy	At or Above Benchmark			88%	87%	75%	82%	90%
	Below Benchmark			39%	38%	54%	55%	69%
	Well Below Benchmark			26%	19%	6%	16%	30%
Retell	At or Above Benchmark			86%	86%	83%	86%	90%
	Below Benchmark			56%	48%	53%	39%	60%
	Well Below Benchmark			19%	20%	12%	20%	25%
Retell Quality of Response	At or Above Benchmark			81%	87%	87%	83%	92%
	Below Benchmark			41%	60%	52%	38%	68%
	Well Below Benchmark				15%	19%	11%	25%
Daze Adjusted Score	At or Above Benchmark				90%	80%	82%	90%
	Below Benchmark				48%	65%	61%	57%
	Well Below Benchmark				14%	14%	20%	20%

Note. This table shows the likelihood of being on track on the GRADE assessment administered at the end of the year, based on the student's individual end-of-year DIBELS measure benchmark status. The 40th percentile for the GRADE assessment was used to indicate whether the student was on track.

K Kindergarten DIBELS® Next Composite Score Worksheet

© Dynamic Measurement Group, Inc. / August 31, 2010

The DIBELS Composite Score is used to interpret student results for DIBELS Next. Most data management services will calculate the composite score for you. If you do not use a data management service or if your data management service does not calculate it, you can use this worksheet to calculate the composite score.

Name: _____

Class: _____

Beginning of Year Benchmark

FSF Score = _____ [1]

LNF Score = _____ [2]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–2) =

Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

Middle of Year Benchmark

FSF Score = _____ [1]

LNF Score = _____ [2]

PSF Score = _____ [3]

NWF CLS Score = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

End of Year Benchmark

LNF Score = _____ [1]

PSF Score = _____ [2]

NWF CLS Score = _____ [3]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–3) =

Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

1 First Grade DIBELS® Next Composite Score Worksheet

© Dynamic Measurement Group, Inc. / August 31, 2010

The DIBELS Composite Score is used to interpret student results for DIBELS Next. Most data management services will calculate the composite score for you. If you do not use a data management service or if your data management service does not calculate it, you can use this worksheet to calculate the composite score.

Name: _____

Class: _____

Beginning of Year Benchmark

LNF Score = _____ [1]

PSF Score = _____ [2]

NWF CLS Score = _____ [3]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–3) =

Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

Middle of Year	
DORF Accuracy Percent	Accuracy Value
0% – 49%	0
50% – 52%	2
53% – 55%	8
56% – 58%	14
59% – 61%	20
62% – 64%	26
65% – 67%	32
68% – 70%	38
71% – 73%	44
74% – 76%	50
77% – 79%	56
80% – 82%	62
83% – 85%	68
86% – 88%	74
89% – 91%	80
92% – 94%	86
95% – 97%	92
98% – 100%	98

Middle of Year Benchmark

NWF CLS Score = _____ [1]

NWF WWR Score = _____ [2]

DORF Words Correct = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %

100 x (Words Correct / (Words Correct + Errors))

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

End of Year	
DORF Accuracy Percent	Accuracy Value
0% – 64%	0
65% – 66%	3
67% – 68%	9
69% – 70%	15
71% – 72%	21
73% – 74%	27
75% – 76%	33
77% – 78%	39
79% – 80%	45
81% – 82%	51
83% – 84%	57
85% – 86%	63
87% – 88%	69
89% – 90%	75
91% – 92%	81
93% – 94%	87
95% – 96%	93
97% – 98%	99
99% – 100%	105

End of Year Benchmark

NWF WWR Score _____ x 2 = _____ [1]

DORF Words Correct = _____ [2]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %

100 x (Words Correct / (Words Correct + Errors))

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [3]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–3) =

Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

2 Second Grade DIBELS® Next Composite Score Worksheet

© Dynamic Measurement Group, Inc. / August 31, 2010

The DIBELS Composite Score is used to interpret student results for DIBELS Next. Most data management services will calculate the composite score for you. If you do not use a data management service or if your data management service does not calculate it, you can use this worksheet to calculate the composite score.

Name: _____

Class: _____

Beginning of Year	
DORF Accuracy Percent	Accuracy Value
0% – 64%	0
65% – 66%	3
67% – 68%	9
69% – 70%	15
71% – 72%	21
73% – 74%	27
75% – 76%	33
77% – 78%	39
79% – 80%	45
81% – 82%	51
83% – 84%	57
85% – 86%	63
87% – 88%	69
89% – 90%	75
91% – 92%	81
93% – 94%	87
95% – 96%	93
97% – 98%	99
99% – 100%	105

Beginning of Year Benchmark

NWF WWR Score _____ x 2 = _____ [1]

DORF Words Correct = _____ [2]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [3]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–3) =

Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

Middle and End of Year	
DORF Accuracy Percent	Accuracy Value
0% – 85%	0
86%	8
87%	16
88%	24
89%	32
90%	40
91%	48
92%	56
93%	64
94%	72
95%	80
96%	88
97%	96
98%	104
99%	112
100%	120

Middle of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [3]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–3) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

End of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [3]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–3) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

3 Third Grade DIBELS® Next Composite Score Worksheet

© Dynamic Measurement Group, Inc. / August 31, 2010

The DIBELS Composite Score is used to interpret student results for DIBELS Next. Most data management services will calculate the composite score for you. If you do not use a data management service or if your data management service does not calculate it, you can use this worksheet to calculate the composite score.

Name: _____

Class: _____

Beginning, Middle, and End of Year	
DORF Accuracy Percent	Accuracy Value
0% – 85%	0
86%	8
87%	16
88%	24
89%	32
90%	40
91%	48
92%	56
93%	64
94%	72
95%	80
96%	88
97%	96
98%	104
99%	112
100%	120

Beginning of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

Middle of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

End of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

4 Fourth Grade DIBELS® Next Composite Score Worksheet

© Dynamic Measurement Group, Inc. / August 31, 2010

The DIBELS Composite Score is used to interpret student results for DIBELS Next. Most data management services will calculate the composite score for you. If you do not use a data management service or if your data management service does not calculate it, you can use this worksheet to calculate the composite score.

Name: _____

Class: _____

Beginning, Middle, and End of Year	
DORF Accuracy Percent	Accuracy Value
0% – 85%	0
86%	8
87%	16
88%	24
89%	32
90%	40
91%	48
92%	56
93%	64
94%	72
95%	80
96%	88
97%	96
98%	104
99%	112
100%	120

Beginning of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

Middle of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

End of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

5 Fifth Grade DIBELS® Next Composite Score Worksheet

© Dynamic Measurement Group, Inc. / August 31, 2010

The DIBELS Composite Score is used to interpret student results for DIBELS Next. Most data management services will calculate the composite score for you. If you do not use a data management service or if your data management service does not calculate it, you can use this worksheet to calculate the composite score.

Name: _____

Class: _____

Beginning, Middle, and End of Year	
DORF Accuracy Percent	Accuracy Value
0% – 85%	0
86%	8
87%	16
88%	24
89%	32
90%	40
91%	48
92%	56
93%	64
94%	72
95%	80
96%	88
97%	96
98%	104
99%	112
100%	120

Beginning of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

Middle of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

End of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

6 Sixth Grade DIBELS® Next Composite Score Worksheet

© Dynamic Measurement Group, Inc. / August 31, 2010

The DIBELS Composite Score is used to interpret student results for DIBELS Next. Most data management services will calculate the composite score for you. If you do not use a data management service or if your data management service does not calculate it, you can use this worksheet to calculate the composite score.

Name: _____

Class: _____

Beginning, Middle, and End of Year	
DORF Accuracy Percent	Accuracy Value
0% – 85%	0
86%	8
87%	16
88%	24
89%	32
90%	40
91%	48
92%	56
93%	64
94%	72
95%	80
96%	88
97%	96
98%	104
99%	112
100%	120

Beginning of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

Middle of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.

End of Year Benchmark

DORF Words Correct = _____ [1]

Retell Score _____ x 2 = _____ [2]

Daze Adjusted Score _____ x 4 = _____ [3]

DORF Accuracy Percent: _____ %
 $100 \times (\text{Words Correct} / (\text{Words Correct} + \text{Errors}))$

Accuracy Value from Table = _____ [4]

DIBELS Composite Score (add values 1–4) =

If DORF is below 40 and Retell is not administered, use 0 for the Retell value only for calculating the DIBELS Composite Score. Do not calculate the composite score if any of the values are missing.