Development, Validation, and Decision-Making Utility of Reading Survey and Diagnostic Tools Linked To DIBELS®

Kelly A. Powell-Smith, Ph.D., NCSP & Ruth A. Kaminski, Ph.D./Dynamic Measurement Group

This poster describes the development and application of a reading survey and a set of brief diagnostic assessments linked to the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS). DIBELS survey includes guidelines and decision rules for using DIBELS to set goals, monitor progress and make instructional decisions. The process is designed to increase decision-making precision regarding instructional level material, appropriate goals, frequency of progress monitoring, and progress monitoring material. The brief diagnostic tools, called DIBELS Deep, map on to the five areas of early reading instruction described by the National Reading Panel (2000). Their primary function is to assist teachers with differentiating instruction for elementary-aged students identified as at-risk for reading difficulties. Sample tasks will be presented for each set of measures, and their use described within a prevention-oriented decision-making model. Flowcharts showing the decision-making process will be shared. The results from initial validation studies are presented. Finally, directions for future research also are discussed.



DIBELS Deep Purpose & Specifications

Purpose

0

• to provide a set of time & cost efficient brief diagnostic assessments designed to provide specific information for targeting instruction corresponding to the 5 essential components of effective reading programs.

Specifications

- Skill sequence corresponds to recognized sequences of instruction (c.f., Carnine, et. al., 2006; National Research Council, 1998; Nippold, 2007; Simmons & Kame'enui, 1999; Wagner, Muse, & Tannenbaum, 2007).
- Identify specific needs; assist in differentiating instruction
- User-friendly, cost-effective, & linked to DIBELS



DIBELS Deep Word Reading & Decoding



DIBELS Deep Phonemic Awareness

Two probes:

• Deep PA Probe 1 samples the following skills: blending word parts in compound words, segmenting compound words, blending syllables, segmenting syllables, blending onset-rime, matching rimes, segmenting onset-rime, saying rhyming words, recognizing rhyming words.

• Deep PA Probe 2 samples the following skills: blending 2 and 3 phoneme words, recognizing and producing initial sounds, recognizing and producing final sounds, segmenting 2-3 phoneme words and segmenting a 3 phoneme words with blends.

Section C: Blending Phoneme 21. Blending Two-Phoneme Word

I am going to say some sounds that can be put together to make a new word. Like this: The sounds /t/ (pause) */ie/ go together to make the word* _____. (Pause for up to three seconds.) If no response, say, *Tie. /t/ and /ie/ go together to make the word "tie."*

Teaching	the Task: Try one of the prompts below to teach the desired response.
Sur	Hold up one hand for each phoneme, and then bring hands together for the whole word. For example, say, /t / (hold up right hand) (pause) /ie / (hold up left hand) (pause) tie (bring hands together). We have the child do the above with you.
S MAR	Clap or tap the phonemes of the word. Have the child clap the phonemes of the word with you.
K	Place the appropriate number of cubes in front of the child. Touch and/or move a cube for each phoneme as you say the word. Have the child touch and/or move the cubes along with you—one for each phoneme—as he/she says the word with you.
	Place the sound box strip in front of the child. Touch a box on the strip for each phoneme as you say the word. Have the child touch a box on the sound box strip for each phoneme as he/she says the word with you.
m going to out one se	o say more sounds that go together. See if you know what word I am saying. Say sounds, separating each sound l cond.
1./ea /(pause) /t/ (eat) After three seconds, ask, <i>What word is this, /ea/-/t/?</i>
2. /sh/(ípause) / oo / (shoe)
3./p / (p	bause) / ie / (pie)
4. / t / (p	ause) / ea / (tea)
5./ie/ (j	pause) / s / (ice)

Quick Screen & Five Additional Probes Covering Range of Skills in Grades K-3:

• Probe 1 kindergarten skills (e.g., letter-sound correspondence, blending VC and CVC words).

 Probes 2 and 3 first grade skills (e.g., blending CVCC, CCVC, CCVCC words, blending words with consonant digraphs, blending one-syllable words with vowel diagraphs and diphthongs, etc.).

 Probe 4 second grade skills (e.g., blending two-syllable words) with r-controlled vowels, blending words with inflectional endings, blending multisyllabic words, etc.).

• Probe 5 third grade skills (e.g., blending two-syllable words with diphthongs, blending words with irregular vowel teams, blending words with consonant trigraphs).

Section A: Reading Compound Words

A1. Real Words

Here are some words. Read each word the best you can. Begin here (point) and read down the list (demonstrate by pointing). If you come to a word you do not know, make your best guess. Put your finger on the first word. Begin. (Pause for up to three seconds.) If no response, score the item as incorrect and try using the prompting procedures and/or teaching sequence below*.

Prompting a Response Point to the word and say, Do you know what this word is? If "yes" then ask the child to tell you the word. If "no" then say, Try sounding it out. If no response or incorrect, say, What is the first sound in this word (point)? If no response or incorrect, say, Do you know any of the sounds in the word? If no response or incorrect, try teaching the task. Teaching the Task

• Point to the word "waterfall" and say, This word is "waterfall." Listen to me as I read the word (pause) /w//o//t//ir//f//a//l/, waterfall. Now your turn to read this word (point to "waterfall") by yourself, what word? (Pause.) Proceed with the remaining test items by saying, Let's try some more words. (Point to "toenail.") *NOTE: Examiners/teachers should use the language of the instructional curriculum in prompting and teaching. Prompts may be given to the child and examiners may use their inventiveness to teach the desired response in the first two items only.

DIBELS Survey: Purpose & Materials

What is DIBELS Survey?

- Purpose(s)
- To determine type(s) and level(s) of progress monitoring material for students with reading skills below grade level.
- To determine primary skills of instructional opportunity for increasing overall reading skills.
- To better target an entry point into DIBELS Deep or better pinpoint areas for further diagnostic assessment.

What is included?

If student's score is
Benchmark (low risk)
Strategic (some risk)
Intensive (at risk)

DIBELS Survey Exc for lan–4th Grade Student

Testing bega

Example of Out-of Progress Monitori



Linking DIBELS Survey and Deep



For students in 3rd grade and above, if the median score is < 20 WRC, drop down two levels. For example, a 5th grade student earns a median score of 18 WRC on 5th grade benchmark passages, then drop down to 3rd grade level passages. If the median score on 3rd grade passages is 19, then drop down two more levels to first grade passages.

• Set of materials for K-6 in one testing booklet. • Guidelines for "backtesting."

• DORF & Retell for grades 1–6, NWF, PSF, FSF

and accuracy is	consider
95 or greater	continued good teaching
90–94	DIBELS Deep assessment
< 90	Continued Survey
95 or greater	building fluency, checking subskills
90–94	DIBELS Deep assessment
< 90	Continued Survey
	Continued Survey

-								
ample	DIBELS	D	BE	LS®	Su	r vey (Be	eta)	
	DIDLLJ			Scor	ina Ba	noklet		
	Tan Grade A Tak							
	School:	Lan	Ordu		D	istrict:		
			error and ac	curacy)			Median Accuracy	
	Measure	61	Score	Errors	Accuracy	Status (circle)	$\langle circle \rangle$	
	ORF	6.2				104–124 Some Risk	≥ 9370 90–94%	
		6.3				0–103 At Risk	< 90%	
		5.1				124+ Low Risk	> 95%	
		5.2				103–123 Some Risk	90-94%	
_		5.3				0–102 At Risk	< 90%	
ın here ——		4.1	(33)	(14)	$\overline{(70)}$	118+ Low Risk	≥95%	
		4.2	42		84	96–117 Some Risk	90–94%	
		4.3	32	16	66	0–95 At Risk	€ 90%	
		3.1	40	17	ZO	110+ Low Risk	≥95%	
		3.2	(40)	9	(78)	80–109 Some Risk	90-94%	
		3.3	42	8	84	0–79 At Risk	90%	
		2.1	(45)	(5)	(90)	90+ Low Risk	≥95%	
		2.2	52	3	95	70–89 Some Risk	0-94%	
		2.3	42	7	86	0–69 At Risk	< 90%	
fGrado		1.1	54	6	90	40+ Low Risk	295%	
I Gruue		1.2	(57)	(3)	(95)	20-39 Some Risk	90–94%	
		1.3	61	2	97	0–19 At Risk	< 90%	
ina	NWF	1				50+ Established	\geq 95%	
						30–49 Emerging	90–94%	
	DOD					0–29 Deficit	< 90%	
	PSF	K				35+ Established	$\geq 95\%$	
							00%	
							95%	
		:::			::)94%	
							90%	
X		: : :			<u></u>			
× •								
X								
×**								
						Nar Tea Sch		
						ne: cher ool:		
						ΪΙ <u>Ϊ</u> Ι.		
						Ma		
						n		
Nov. Dec. Jan. Fe	b. Marc	<u>- † •</u> h	April	<u> </u>	une			
s Scores Scores Scores Sco 53 79 02	res Score	is S	Scores S	cores Sc	ores	an		
<u> </u>					_	la		
70 76 91								
68 85								

Study 1: DIBELS Survey Beta

Participants:

- Sites (n = 28 schools, 10 districts, 8 states) -Locales ranged from Rural to Suburban
- –School size ranged from 202 951
- -Student/Teacher ratio ranged from 12:1 to 24:1 –78% of schools were Title 1 eligible
- –Free/reduced lunch ranged from 2% 94%
- -Ethnicity ranged from 0–98% Native American,
- 0–19% Asian, 0–99% Black, 0–94% Hispanic, 1%–97% White students

Survey Beta Measures Means and Standard Deviations By Grade

Mooguro			Student Grade Level			
Measure	6th (n=62)	5th (n=83)	4th (n=79)	3rd (n=87)	2nd (m=72)	1st (n=60)
ORF-G6	119 (11.8) (n = 5).	_	_	_	_	_
ORF-G5	98.9 (19.8) (n = 49)	97.9 (21.9) (n = 24)	_	_	_	_
ORF-G4	96.6 (22.3) (n = 44)	93.6 (21.7) (n = 62)	82.6 (18.3) (n = 54)	_	_	_
ORF-G3	94.6 (20.5) (n = 35)	99.0 (20.8) (n = 47)	93.1 (19.2) (n = 58)	78.3 (20.6) (n = 58)	_	_
ORF-G2	92.0 (19.6) (n = 15)	86.4 (16.2) (n = 14)	85.2 (22.8) (n = 26)	78.3 (18.6) (n = 65)	51.1 (20.8) (n = 41)	_
ORF-G1	61.0 (16.0) (n = 4)	66.0 (19.4) (n = 4)	55.0 (24.0) (n = 6)	62.7 (14.8) (n = 26)	49.3 (17.2) (n = 69)	12.5 (10.7) (n = 41)
NWF	18.0 (n = 1)	69.0 (n = 1)	41.0 (15.6) (n = 2)	47.8 (7.53) (n = 5)	60.2 (20.7) (n = 32)	40.9 (14.2) (n = 55)
PSF	23.0 (n = 1)	58.0 (n = 1)	36.0 (n = 1)	51.0 (n = 1)	55.8 (17.1) (n = 21)	53.1 (17.8) (n = 41)
FSF	38.0 (n = 1)	32.0 (n = 1)	_	_	44.3 (15.9) (n = 14)	37.5 (16.6) (n = 21)

Research Questions

1. Do educators agree on monitoring & goal setting decisions?

Materials	Monitoring Frequency	Numeric Goal (Score)*	Timeframe*
 44% absolute agree- ment, 87% general agreement In 88% of the cases where disagreement occurred, DMG research scientists chose more 	 50% absolute agree- ment In 68% of the cases where disagreement occurred, school per- sonnel chose more fre- quent monitoring 	 64% agreement (raters' scores were not more than 5 points apart) In 69% of the cases where disagreement occurred, DMG research scientists chose a higher score as the goal 	 55% absolute agree- ment
challenging material		score as the goal	

* Only calculated for those cases with absolute agreement on materials. Interpret with caution due to missing data.

2. Which goal do teachers believe is more attainable or meaningful?

Item	Ν	Mean Rating (SD)
Goals set based on DIBELS Survey are more attainable than a student's grade level Benchmark goals.	58	4.6(.99)
Goals set based on DIBELS Survey are more meaningful than a student's grade level Benchmark goals.	60	4.5(1.07)
<i>Note.</i> 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Disagree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 5 = Agree, 6 = Strongly Agree		

3. Do educators believe Survey resulted in greater decision-making precision than benchmarking alone?

Compared to Benchmark testing alone, the u setting goals.

Compared to Benchmark testing alone, the u selecting materials for progress monitoring.

Compared to Benchmark testing alone, the planning instructional content.

Compared to Benchmark testing alone, the planning instructional groups.

Note. 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Disagree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 5 = Agree, 6 = Strongly Agree

4. Do teachers find Survey data useful for instructional planning?

DIBELS Survey is helpful in planning reading in *Note.* 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Disagree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 5 = Agree, 6 = Strongly Agree

5. To what extent are consumers satisfied with DIBELS Survey?

I would recommend the use of DIBELS Survey *Note.* 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Disagree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 5 = Agree, 6 = Strongly Agree



• **Students** (n = 443)

- -All students selected were in the some or at-risk range on the DIBELS winter benchmark assessment.
- **Teachers and examiners** (n = 61) -All teachers of participating students and examiners for the study were invited to complete questionnaires.

Note. ORF = Oral Reading Fluency, NWF = Nonsense Word Fluency, PSF = Phoneme Segmentation Fluency, FSF = First Sound Fluency, G# = Grade Level (i.e., G6 = Grade 6).

ltem	Ν	Mean Rating (SD)
use of DIBELS Survey helped me be more precise in	61	4.7(1.02)
use of DIBELS Survey helped me be more precise in	59	4.7(.98)
use of DIBELS Survey helped me be more precise in	58	4.5(.94)
use of DIBELS Survey helped me be more precise in	58	4.6(.99)

ltem	Ν	Mean Rating (SD)
nstruction.	61	4.8(.94)
	·	

ltem	Ν	Mean Rating (SD)	
o others.	60	4.8(1.07)	
Samaulat Aaraa E - Aaraa E - Strangly Aaraa			

0 - V -Kelly A. Powell-Smith, Ph.D., NCSP & Ruth A. Kaminski, Ph.D./Dynamic Measurement Group

Study 2: DIBELS Deep Phase 1

Participants: • **Students** (n = 245) • **Sites** (n = 11 schools across 4 states) –School size ranged from 182 - 674 -Student/Teacher ratio ranged from 11:1 to 19:1

- –Ethnicity ranged from 0–2% Native American, 0–3% Asian,
- 0–27% Black, 2–11% Hispanic, 56–99% White students
- –Free/reduced price lunch ranged from 11% 53%
- –9 Title 1 schools

Students by Instructional Recommendations:





Descriptive Statistics: DIBELS Deep Means & Standard Deviations (Fall)

Grada			C	BELS Deep Measu	ire		
Grade	PA1	PA2	WRD1	WRD2	WRD3	WRD4	WRD5
Kindergarten	30.40 (13.00) (n = 47)	38.07 (14.22) (n = 44)	20.38 (19.49) (n = 39)	-	-	-	_
First	43 (na) (n = 1)	51.29 (3.80) (n = 45)	91.61 (25.07) (n = 46)	82.34 (66.52) (n = 49)	70.78 (48.43) (n = 9)	-	-
Second	-	-	72.86 (25.12) (n = 7)	79.31 (52.87) (n = 16)	78.81 (48.06) (n = 47)	83.45 (44.69) (n = 42)	64.60 (46.52) (n = 5)
Third	-	-	60.75 (45.63) (n = 4)	66.56 (52.05) (n = 9)	61.83 (36.57) (n =12)	101.11 (39.05) (n = 38)	84.44 (35.50) (n = 41)
Fourth	-	-	-	50.17 (43.18) (n = 6)	32.67 (24.82) (n = 6)	42.38 (46.28) (n = 8)	102.12 (28.50) (n = 42)

Note. Standard deviations are noted in parentheses. PA1 = Phonemic Awareness Probe 1 (maximum possible score = 60), PA2 = Phonemic Awareness Probe 2 (maximum possible score = 55), WRD1 = Word Reading & Decoding Probe 1 (maximum possible score = 119), WRD2 = Word Reading & Decoding Probe 2 (182), WRD3 = Word Reading & Decoding 3 (maximum possible score = 144), WRD4 = Word Reading & Decoding 4 (maximum possible score = 132), and WRD5 = Word Reading & Decoding Probe 5 (maximum possible score = 131). Orange Highlighting = Target grade level & time frame

Research Questions

1. What is the relationship between the various DIBELS Deep measures?

Correlations Between DIBELS Deep Measures (Fall and Winter)

Varia	able	PA1	PA2	WRD1	WRD2	WRD3	١
PA1	Fall	-	.72 (n = 44 KGa)	.41 (n = 38 KGa)	-	-	
PA2	Fall	-	-	.61 (n = 38 KGa) .46 (n = 44 1st)	.63 (n = 44 1st)	-	
	Winter	-	-	.58 (n = 54 KGa)	-	-	
WRD1	Fall	-	-	-	89 (n = 43 1st)	-	
WRD2	Winter	-	-	-	-	.79 (n = 52 1st)	.84 (I
	Fall	-	-	-	-	-	.84 (r
	Winter	-	-	-	-	-	.91 (r
	Fall	-	-	-	-	-	
	Winter	_	_	_	-	-	

Note. All correlations are statistically significant and are based upon participants with pair-wise complete data, p < .05. Data are not reported in cases where n < 20. PA1 = Phonemic Awareness Probe 1, PA2 = Phonemic Awareness Probe 2, WRD1 = Word Reading & Decoding Probe 1, WRD2 = Word Reading & Decoding Probe 2, WRD3 = Word Reading & Decoding Probe 3, WRD4 = Word Reading & Decoding 4, and WRD5 = Word Reading & Decoding Probe 5. aKG = Kindergarten

Development, Validation, and Decision-Making Utility of Reading Survey and Diagnostic Tools Linked To DIBELS®

-Random stratified sample of 15-30 students in each grade K-4 from each

• **Teachers** (n = 31) • **Examiners** (n = 16)

school.





2. What is the relationship between performance on DIBELS Deep and the DIBELS benchmark measures? Correlations with DIBELS Measures

Measure		LNF		ISF		PSF		NWF		ORF	
		Fall	Winter								
PA1	Kindergarten	.20 (47)	-	.23 (47)	-	_	_	-	_	_	-
PA2	Kindergarten	.47* (44)	.36* (57)	.40* (44)	.44* (57)	-	.61* (57)	-	.44* (57)	-	-
	First Grade	.36* (45)	-	-	-	.44* (45)	-	.29 (45)	-	-	-
WRD1	Kindergarten	.61* (39)	.75* (54)	.43* (39)	.49* (54)	-	.24 (54)	-	.76* (54)	-	-
	First Grade	.42* (46)	-	-	-	.18 (46)	-	.50* (46)	-	-	-
WRD2	First Grade	.49* (49)	-	-	-	.32* (49)	.27* (57)	.55* (49)	.66* (57)	-	.62* (57)
	First Grade	-	-	-	-	-	.08 (56)	-	.76* (56)	-	.77* (56)
	Second Grade	-	-	-	-	-	-	.33 (30)	-	.61* (47)	-
WRD4	Second Grade	-	-	-	-	-	-	.47* (27)	-	.70* (42)	.67* (57)
	Third Grade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.48* (38)	-
WRD5	Third Grade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.66* (41)	.64* (57)
	Fourth Grade	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.56* (42)	-

Note. Correlations reflect measures given at the same time of year and are based upon participants with pair-wise complete data. Numbers in parentheses indicate sample size. Data are not reported in cases where n < 20, or where one of the measures was not appropriate for student grade or time of year. PA1 = Phonemic Awareness Probe 1, PA2 = Phonemic Awareness Probe 2, WRD1 = Word Reading & Decoding Probe 1, WRD2 = Word Reading & Decoding Probe 2, WRD3 = Word Reading & Decoding Probe 3, WRD4 = Word Reading & Decoding Probe 4, and WRD5 = Word Reading & Decoding Probe 5. LNF = Letter Naming Fluency, ISF = Initial Sounds Fluency, PSF = Phoneme Segmentation Fluency, NWF = Nonsense Word Fluency, and ORF = Oral Reading Fluency. * p < .05

3. What is the relationship of sections within probes?

Correlations Between DIBELS Deep Phonemic Awareness Probe 2 Sections in Kindergarten (Fall and Winter)

Castion	A2		B1		B2		C1	
Section	Fall	Winter	Fall	Winter	Fall	Winter	Fall	Winter
A1	.72*(44)	.90*(58)	.64*(44)	.27*(58)	.51*(41)	.16(58)	.22(41)	.57*(58)
A2	-	-	.67*(44)	.26*(58)	.37*(41)	.17(58)	.38*(41)	.59*(58)
B1	-	-	-	-	.18(41)	.30*(58)	.30(41)	.34*(58)
B2	-	-	-	-	-	-	.35*(41)	.19(58)
	C2		D1		D2		D3	
	Fall	Winter	Fall	Winter	Fall	Winter	Fall	Winter
A1	.23(41)	.52*(58)	.36*(40)	.65*(57)	.38*(39)	.64*(56)	.26(34)	.18(52)
A2	.45*(41)	.59*(58)	.33*(40)	.68*(57)	.35*(39)	.65*(56)	.41*(34)	.28*(52)
B1	.34*(41)	.38*(58)	.25(40)	.33*(57)	.28(39)	.28*(56)	.22(34)	.19(52)
B2	.34*(41)	.04(58)	.03(40)	.004(57)	.34*(39)	.06(56)	.36*(34)	.23(52)
C1	.71*(41)	.68*(58)	.25(40)	.58*(57)	.45*(39)	.34*(56)	.27(34)	.42*(52)
C2	-	-	.45*(40)	.60*(57)	.64*(39)	.44*(56)	.49*(34)	.26(52)
D1	-	-	-	-	.72*(39)	.82*(56)	.33(34)	.42*(52)
D2	-	-	-	-	-	-	.50*(34)	.34*(52)
D3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note. Correlations are based on participants with pair-wise complete data. The number with pair-wise complete data is reported in parentheses. F = Fall, W = Winter, A1 = Blending Two-Phoneme Words, A2 = Blending Three-Phoneme Words, B1 = Matching Initial Sounds, B2 = Production of Initial Sounds, C1 = Matching Final Sounds, C2 = Production of Final Sounds, D1 = Segmenting Two-Phoneme Words, D2 = Segmenting Three-Phoneme Words, D3 = Segmenting Four-Phoneme Words with Blends. *p < .05

Correlations Between DIBELS Deep Word Reading & Decoding Probe 1 Sections in First Grade (Fall)

Section	B1	B2	C1	C2	D	E
А	.68*(45)	.44*(44)	.29(44)	.31(43)	.21(44)	.34*(44)
B1	-	.63*(45)	.48*(44)	.52*(43)	.54*(44)	.56*(44)
B2	-	-	.63*(44)	.73*(43)	.41*(44)	.58*(44)
C1	-	-	-	.76*(43)	.60*(44)	.81*(44)
C2	-	-	-	-	.51*(43)	.70*(43)
C2	-	-	-	-	.51*(43)	.70*(43)
D	-	-	-	-	-	.74*(44)
E	-	-	-	-	-	-
ote. Correlations are based on participants with pair-wise complete data. The number with pair-wise complete data is reported in parentheses. A = Letter-Sound Correspondences, B1 = VC and						

CVC words beginning with continuous sounds (real), B2 = VC and CVC words beginning with continuous sounds (nonsense), C1 = CVC words beginning with stop sounds (real), C2 = CVC words beginning with stop sounds (nonsense), D = Pre-Primer Sight Words, E = Sentence Reading. *p < .05

4. Are the items and sections sequenced appropriately?

Section-Level Data: Kindergarten and First Grade Fall PA 2



Kindergarten Percent Grade 1 Percent

Section-Level Data: Second and Third Grade Fall WRD 4



5. To what extent do teachers find the measures useful? Selected Teacher Usability Questionnai

I believe the measures would be helpful in plar I believe the measures would be helpful in plan I would suggest the use of the measures to oth I would be willing to use the measures in my cl The measures were a good way to assess stude *Note.* 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Disagree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 5 = Agree, 6 = Strongly Agree

6. To what extent are examiners satisfied with the measures? Selected Examiner Usability Questionnaire Ratings

The administration and scoring rules were easy I believe that the scores obtained from the me I would suggest the use of the measures to othe The measures were a good way to assess stude Overall, the measures would be beneficial for p *Note.* 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Disagree, 4 = Somewhat Agree, 5 = Agree, 6 = Strongly Agree

Summary of Results

- Scope and sequence is generally accurate for grade level
- Strong correlations between measures of the same skill (.7 .9)
- Moderate to strong correlations between Deep measures and DIBELS measures of the same skill (.4 .7)
- Correlation data for sections within probes suggest most sections are related to each other
- Ordering of items is generally accurate
- Overall teachers agree that the measures are useful

Next Steps

- Minor revisions to DIBELS Survey
- Pilot and Phase 1 research for comprehension, fluency and oral language DIBELS Deep measures • Large scale study of Deep PA & WRD to conduct CFA using PDA version
- Further examine linkage between Survey and Deep.

Websites and Contact Information:



Dynamic Measurement Group http://www.dibels.org Kelly A. Powell-Smith DMG kpowellsmith@dibels.org

The authors would like to thank Roland H. Good, III, Ph.D., Rachael Latimer, Maya O'Neil, and Karla Wysocki for their contributions to this poster.



Supporting School Success One Step at a Time



re Ratings		
ltem	Ν	Mean Rating (SD)
ning instruction for phonemic awareness.	19	5.2 (0.63)
ning instruction for phonics (alphabetic principle).	26	5.2 (0.65)
er teachers.	30	4.7 (1.3)
assroom.	31	4.8 (1.3)
nts' reading strengths and weaknesses.	30	4.8 (1.17)

alle hatiligs		
ltem	Ν	Mean Rating (SD)
to follow.	16	3.9 (0.99)
sure accurately reflect students' skill level.	16	4.9 (0.89)
ers.	12	4.7 (0.98)
nts' reading strengths and weaknesses.	14	4.8 (1.1)
lanning reading instruction.	12	4.8 (1.3)

• Moderate to strong correlations between measures of different skills (.4 - .7)

Overall examiners are satisfied with the usability of the measures

Ruth A. Kaminski rkamin@dibels.org