DIBELS 6th Edition Technical Adequacy Information

Dynamic Measurement Group
Technical Report No. 6

Last Revised: December 3, 2008

Suggested Citation: Dynamic Measurement Group (2008). *DIBELS 6th Edition Technical Adequacy Information* (Tech. Rep. No. 6). Eugene, OR: Dynamic Measurement Group. Available: http://dibels.org/pubs.html.

Summary of DIBELS 6th Edition Technical Adequacy Information

DIBELS Measure	Grade	Reliability: Single Probe	Reliability: Multi-Probe	Criterion-Related Validity: Concurrent	Criterion-Related Validity: Predictive	Study
ISF	K			.51 (PSF); .51 (NWF)	.43 .38 (ORF); .32, .44 (TOWRE); .46 (WRMT-R)	Burke, Hagan-Burke, Kwok, & Parker (in press)
		.61	.89**	.47 (PSF); .36 (WJ)	.35 (PSF); .29 (NWF); .37 (WJ); .36 (CBM ORF)	Good, Kaminski, Shinn, Bratten, Shinn, Laimon, et al. (2004)
		.86	.95*	.60, .46 (CTOPP)		Hintze, Ryan, & Stoner (2003)
LNF	K			.47 (PSF)	.61 (NWF); .73 (TOWRE); .64 (ORF)	Burke, Crowder, Hagan-Burke, & Zou (in press)
				.50 (ISF); .46 (PSF); .67 (NWF)	.71, .62 (ORF); .59, .72 (TOWRE); .51 (WRMT-R)	Burke, Hagan-Burke, et al. (in press)
		.89	.96*	.70 (WJ)	.72 (NWF); .66 (WJ); .72 (CBM ORF)	Good et al. (2004)
		.94	.98*	.58, .53, .52 (CTOPP)		Hintze et al. (2003)
				.24 (WUF)		Kaminski, Good, Shinn, Smith, Laimon, Shinn, et al. (2004)
				.62 (DRA); .52, .59, .41, .32 (TERA-3)	.67 (DRA); .48, .63, .57 (TerraNova)	Rouse & Fantuzzo (2006)
	1st				.40, .40, .36 (DIBELS ORF/GMORF); .30,.22 (SAT-10)	Chard, Stoolmiller, Harn, Wanzek, Vaughn, Linan-Thompson, et al. (2008)
		.86	.95*	.53 (WJ)	.68 (NWF); .74 (CBM ORF); .66 (NWF); .62 (WJ)	Good et al. (2004)
				.58 (NWF); .31 (PSF); .31 (WUF); .62, .47 (TOWRE)		Hagan-Burke, Burke, & Crowder (2006)
					.44 (GRA+DE); .40 (TerraNova)	Riedel (2007)
					.57, .52, .54, .52, .56, .30 (ITBS)	Schilling, Carlisle, Scott, & Zeng (2007)
PSF	K				.54 (NWF); .48 (TOWRE); .44 (ORF)	Burke, Crowder, et al. (in press)
				.59 (NWF)	.49, .42 (ORF); .48, .44 (TOWRE); .48 (WRMT-R)	Burke, Hagan-Burke, et al. (in press)
		.74	.90*	.54 (WJ)		Good et al. (2004)
				.53, .39 (CTOPP)		Hintze et al. (2003)
				.48 (DRA); .43, .47, .36, .37 (TERA-3)	.55 (DRA); .49, .50, .53 (TerraNova)	Rouse & Fantuzzo (2006)
	1st	*PSF in first grade is used primarily to identify students who have not reached the end-of-kindergarten goal.*				

DIBELS Measure	Grade	Reliability		Criterion-Related Validity		Study
		Single Probe	Multi-Probe	Concurrent	Predictive	
NWF	K				.73, .58 (ORF); .67, .67 (TOWRE); .56 (WRMT-R)	Burke, Hagan-Burke, et al. (in press)
		.86	.95*	.79 (LSF)	.76, .75, .65, (WRMT-R); .72 (CBM ORF); .72 (LSF); .72 (NWF)	Ritchey (2008)
				.62 (DRA); .53, .56, .44, .35 (TERA-3)	.63 (DRA); .50, .57, .55 (TerraNova)	Rouse & Fantuzzo (2006)
		.94	.98*	.36 (PPVT-R); .65 (CTOPP); .27, .52 (TPRI); .76 (modified LNF); .91 (WJ-R)	.59, .59 (WJ-R); .77 (NWF); .71 (CBM ORF)	Speece, Mills, Ritchey, & Hillman (2003)
	1st			.69 (TOWRE)	.57 (ORF)	Burke, Crowder et al. (in press)
				.68 (ORF); .54 (RTF); .75, .68 (TOWRE)		Burke & Hagan-Burke (2007)
				.66 (DIBELS ORF/GMORF)	.64, .59 (DIBELS ORF/GMORF); .29, .33 (SAT-10)	Chard et al. (2008)
		.83	.94*	.51 (WJ)	.71, .75, .77 (CBM ORF); .67 (WJ)	Good et al. (2004)
				.73, .75 (TOWRE)		Hagan-Burke et al. (2006)
		.94	.98*	.77, .78, .77, .74 (ORF)	.62, .76, .63, .43, .72, (NWF); .82, .73, .74, .73, .56, .72 (ORF)	Harn, Stoolmiller, & Chard (2008)
					.70 (ORF); .60 (SAT-10)	Powell-Smith, Hudson, Castillo, & Dedrick (2008)
				.46 (GRA+DE)	.45, .45 (GRA+DE); .39, .38, .37 (TerraNova)	Riedel (2007)
				.60, .54, .58, .59, .56 (ITBS)	.57, .51, .56, .54, .54, .60, .54, .57, .57, .56 (ITBS)	Schilling et al. (2007)
				.71, .75 (WJ-R); .74 (CBM ORF)		Speece et al. (2003)
				.25 (SAT9)	.86, .69, .72 (NWF); .29, .27 (SAT9); .51, .56, .65 (CBM ORF); .50, .51, .54 (Maze); .39, .38, .39 (CAT6)	Vanderwood, Linklater, & Healy (2008)
	2nd				.63 (ORF); .47 (SAT-10)	Powell-Smith et al. (2008)
WUF	K	.65, .71	.90**, .92**	.48 (TOLD 3:P); .34 (PPVT III); .57 (EVT); .47, .40, .42, .42, (Language Sample)		Kaminski et al. (2004)
	1st			.25 (ORF); .31 (RTF); .28 (TOWRE)		Burke & Hagan-Burke (2007)
				.33 (TOWRE)		Hagan-Burke (2006)
		.65, .52	.90**, .84**	.55 (TOLD 3:P); .26 (PPVT III); .21 (EVT); .39 (ORF); .72, .73, .71, .71 (Language Sample)		Kaminski et al. (2004)
				.34, .30, .28, .35, .37, .33 (ITBS)	.37, .35, .33, .35, .35, .32, .34, .34, .31, .35, .36, .31 (ITBS)	Schilling et al. (2007)
	2nd	.66, .59	.91**, .88**	.44 (TOLD 3:P); .22 (EVT); .47, .41 (WJRMT); .34 (ORF); .44, .33, .16, .15 (Language Sample)		Kaminski et al. (2004)
	3rd			.26 (EVT); .36, .28 (WJRMT); .42 (ORF); .35 (OSAT)		Kaminski et al. (2004)

DIBELS Measure	Grade	Reliability		Criterion-Related Validity		Study
		Single Probe	Multi-Probe	Concurrent	Predictive	
ORF	1st	.94, .98	.98*, .99*	.82 (SAT-10)	.71, .63, .72 (SAT-10)	Baker, Smolkowski, Katz, Fien, Seeley, Kame'enui, et al. (2008)
				.69 (RTF); .77, .92 (TOWRE)		Burke & Hagan-Burke (2007)
				.81, .89 (TOWRE)	.81 (ORF); .61 (WRMT-R)	Burke, Hagan-Burke, et al. (in press)
					.69, .91, .62, .85 (NWF)	Harn et al. (2008)
				.31 (RTF)		Pressley, Hilden, &Shankland
				.67 (GRA+DE)	.59 (GRA+DE); .49, .54 (TerraNova)	Riedel (2007)
		.89	.96*	.74, .76 (WDRB)		Roberts, Good, & Corcoran (2005)
				.75, .61, .74, .69, .71 (ITBS)	.69, .61, .69, .61, .63 (ITBS)	Schilling et al. (2007)
		.95	.98*			Unpublished DMG data (2007)
				.97 (Test of Reading Fluency)		Warrington (2003)
	2nd	.97	.99*	.80 (SAT-10)	.72, .79, .58, .63, .63 (SAT-10)	Baker et al. (2008)
				.69 (WRMT-R)		Burke, Hagan-Burke, et al. (in press)
				.75, .64, .75, .62, .64 (ITBS)	.69, .61, .68, .59, .59, .75, .65, .75, .63, .65 (ITBS)	Schilling et al. (2007)
		.93	.98*			Unpublished DMG data (2007)
				.95 (Test of Reading Fluency)		Warrington (2003)
	3rd			.67 (SAT-10)	.65, .68 (SAT-10)	Baker et al. (2008)
				.73 (NC End of Grade)		Barger (2003)
				.70 (FCAT-SSS); .74 (FCAT-NRT)		Buck & Torgeson (2003)
				.42 (RTF); .69 (OSAT)		McKenna & Good (2003)
				.71, .70 (FCAT-SSS)	.90, .91, .88, .89, .92, .92 (ORF); .66, .67, .68 (FCAT-SSS); .68, .69, .68, .68, .71, .70 (SAT-10)	Roehrig, Pettscher, Nettles, Hudson, & Torgeson (2008)
				.65, .56, .63, .63, .68 (ITBS)	.65, .57, .63, .63, .67, .67, .58, .65, .65, .69 (ITBS)	Schilling et al. (2007)
				.71, .67 (4Sight); .68 (PSSA)	.94 (ORF); .66 (4Sight); .67 (PSSA)	Shapiro, Solari, & Petscher (2008)
				.80 (CSAP)	.91, .89, .93 (ORF); .73, .73 (CSAP)	Shaw & Shaw (2002)
		.92	.97*			Unpublished DMG data (2007)
					.65 (OPT)	Vander Meer, Lentz, & Stollar (2005)
				.94 (Test of Reading Fluency)		Warrington (2003)
				.74 (AIMS)		Wilson (2005)
					.70 (CSAP)	Wood (2006)
	4th			.67, .66 (4Sight); .68 (PSSA)	.93 (ORF); .66 (4Sight); .64 (PSSA)	Shapiro et al. (2008)
		.92	.97*			Unpublished DMG data (2007)
				.65 (OPT)		Vander Meer et al. (2005)
					.67 (CSAP)	Wood (2006)
	5th			.70, .66 (4Sight); .76 (PSSA)	.92 (ORF); .70 (4Sight); .73 (PSSA)	Shapiro et al. (2008)
		.93	.98*			Unpublished DMG data (2007)
					.75 (CSAP)	Wood (2006)
	6th	.93	.98*			Unpublished DMG data (2007)

DIBELS Measure	Grade	Reliability: Single Probe	Reliability: Multi-Probe	Criterion-Related Validity: Concurrent	Criterion-Related Validity: Predictive	Study
RTF	1st			.59, .67 (TOWRE)		Burke & Hagan-Burke (2007)
				.51 (GRA+DE)	.41 (GRA+DE); .39, .46 (TerraNova)	Riedel (2007)
		.57	.87**	.81, .42 (WDRB)		Roberts et al. (2005)
	3rd			.50 (OSAT)		McKenna & Good (2003)

**Multi-probe reliability calculated with the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula (Nunnally, 1978) using the aggregate of three probes.*
***Multi-probe reliability calculated with the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula (Nunnally, 1978) using the aggregate of five probes.*

Additional studies and correlations appear on summary pages for individual studies.

Abbreviations:

ISF = DIBELS Initial Sound Fluency
LNF = DIBELS Letter Naming Fluency
PSF = DIBELS Phoneme Segmentation Fluency
NWF = DIBELS Nonsense Word Fluency
ORF = DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency
RTF = DIBELS Retell Fluency
WUF = DIBELS Word Use Fluency

AIMS = Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards
CAT6 = California Achievement Test, Sixth Ed.
CBM ORF = Curriculum-Based Measurement Oral Reading Fluency
CSAP = Colorado State Assessment Program
CTOPP = Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing
DRA = Developmental Reading Assessment
EVT = Expressive Vocabulary Test
FCAT-NRT = Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test—Norm-Referenced Test
FCAT-SSS = Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test—Sunshine State Standards
GMORF = Growth Monitoring Oral Reading Fluency
GRA+DE = Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation
ITBS = Iowa Tests of Basic Skills
LSF = Letter-Sound Fluency
OPT = Ohio Proficiency Test
OSAT = Oregon State Assessment Test
PPVT III = Peabody-Picture Vocabulary Test III
PPVT-R = Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test—Revised
PSSA = Pennsylvania System of School Assessment
SAT9 = Stanford Achievement Test, 9th Edition
SAT-10 = Stanford Achievement Test, 10th Ed.
TERA-3 = Test of Early Reading Ability
TOWRE = Test of Word-Reading Efficiency
TPRI = Texas Primary Reading Inventory
TOLD3:P = Test of Language Development-3: Primary
WDRB = Woodcock Diagnostic Reading Battery
WJ = Woodcock-Johnson Psycho Educational Battery
WJ-R = Woodcock-Johnson Psycho Educational Battery—Revised
WJRMT = Woodcock-Johnson Reading Mastery Test
WRMT-R = Woodcock Reading Mastery Test—Revised

Baker, S. K., Smolkowski, K., Katz, R., Fien, H, Seeley, J. R., Kame'enui, E. J., et al. (2008). Reading fluency as a predictor of reading proficiency in low-performing, high-poverty schools. School Psychology Review, 37(1), 18-37.

Participants were students at 34 Oregon Reading First schools across 16 independent school districts. The study included 17 schools in large urban areas, eight in midsize cities, and nine in rural areas. Approximately 10% of the students received special education services and 32% were English language learners (of which approximately 68% were Latino).

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Three-week test-retest reliability	ORF	Spring of first	*See note	.98	n/a
Three-Week test-retest reliability	ORF	Spring of first	320	.94	n/a
Three-Week test-retest reliability	ORF	Spring of second	320	.97	n/a
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of first	4973	.72	End of first SAT-10
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of first	4973	.82	End of first SAT-10
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of first	2417	.63	End of second SAT-10
Predictive validity	ORF	Spring of first	2417	.72	End of second SAT-10
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of second	4826	.72	End of second SAT-10
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of second	4826	.79	End of second SAT-10
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of second	4826	.80	End of second SAT-10
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of second	2367	.58	End of third SAT-10
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of second	2367	.63	End of third SAT-10
Predictive validity	ORF	Spring of second	2367	.63	End of third SAT-10
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of third	4696	.65	End of third SAT-10
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of third	4696	.68	End of third SAT-10
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of third	4696	.67	End of third SAT-10

*Note: Retests were given at six schools to 20% of their students.

Barger, J. (2003). Comparing the DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency indicator and the North Carolina end of grade reading assessment. Asheville, NC: North Carolina Teacher Academy.

Participants were 38 third grade students from one school in North Carolina. Twenty-seven of the students scored high enough on the end of grade assessment to be considered at grade level.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of third	38	.73	NC End of Grade reading test

Buck, J., & Torgeson, J. (2003). The relationship between performance on a measure of oral reading fluency and performance on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Center for Reading Research.

Participants were 1102 students at 13 schools in one Florida school district. Only 1% of the students were considered limited English proficient, and 19% were identified as exceptional students under IDEA. In addition, 46% of the students received free or reduced-price lunch.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of third	1102	.70	End of third FCAT-SSS Reading
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of third	1102	.74	End of third FCAT-NRT Reading

All p<.001.

Participants were 289 students at a primary school in rural northeast Georgia. All participants were native speakers of English and the majority received all their education within the regular education program. For those for whom data were available, 34.5% received free meals and 4.8% received reduced-price meals.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Concurrent validity	LNF	Winter of kindergarten	289	.47	DIBELS PSF
Predictive validity	LNF	Winter of kindergarten	289	.61	Middle of first DIBELS NWF
Predictive validity	LNF	Winter of kindergarten	289	.73	Middle of first TOWRE – Sight Word Efficiency
Predictive validity	LNF	Winter of kindergarten	289	.64	Middle of second DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter of kindergarten	289	.54	Middle of first DIBELS NWF
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter of kindergarten	289	.48	Middle of first TOWRE – Sight Word Efficiency
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter of kindergarten	289	.44	Middle of second DIBELS ORF
Concurrent validity	NWF	Winter of first	289	.69	Middle of first TOWRE – Sight Word Efficiency
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of first	289	.57	Middle of second DIBELS ORF

Burke, M. D., & Hagan-Burke, S. (2007). Concurrent criterion related validity of early literacy indicators for middle of first grade. Assessment for Effective Intervention, 32(2), 66-77.

Participants were 213 first-grade students from a public primary school in semirural northeast Georgia. The students came from middle- to lower-middle-class families. Almost one third of the students received free or reduced-price lunch.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Concurrent validity	WUF	Winter of first	213	.25*	DIBELS ORF
Concurrent validity	WUF	Winter of first	213	.31*	DIBELS RTF
Concurrent validity	WUF	Winter of first	213	.28*	TOWRE – Sight Word Efficiency
Concurrent validity	PSF	Winter of first	213	.33*	TOWRE – Phonetic decoding efficiency
Concurrent validity	PSF	Winter of first	213	.40*	DIBELS NWF
Concurrent validity	PSF	Winter of first	213	.30*	DIBELS ORF
Concurrent validity	PSF	Winter of first	213	.26*	DIBELS RTF
Concurrent validity	PSF	Winter of first	213	.26*	TOWRE – Sight Word Efficiency
Concurrent validity	NWF	Winter of first	213	.68*	DIBELS ORF
Concurrent validity	NWF	Winter of first	213	.54*	DIBELS RTF
Concurrent validity	NWF	Winter of first	213	.75*	TOWRE – Phonetic decoding efficiency
Concurrent validity	NWF	Winter of first	213	.68*	TOWRE – Sight Word Efficiency
Concurrent validity	ORF	Winter of first	213	.69*	DIBELS RTF
Concurrent validity	ORF	Winter of first	213	.77*	TOWRE – Phonetic decoding efficiency
Concurrent validity	ORF	Winter of first	213	.92*	TOWRE – Sight Word Efficiency
Concurrent validity	RTF	Winter of first	213	.59*	TOWRE – Phonetic decoding efficiency
Concurrent validity	RTF	Winter of first	213	.67*	TOWRE – Sight Word Efficiency

* denotes $p<.05$

Participants were 218 kindergarteners at a rural primary school in northern Georgia. Of the participants for whom data were available, 42.77% were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Concurrent validity	LNF	Winter of kindergarten	218	.50	DIBELS ISF
Concurrent validity	LNF	Winter of kindergarten	218	.46	DIBELS PSF
Concurrent validity	LNF	Winter of kindergarten	218	.67	DIBELS NWF
Predictive validity	LNF	Winter of kindergarten	179	.71	Middle of first DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	LNF	Winter of kindergarten	180	.59	Middle of first TOWRE – Phonetic decoding efficiency
Predictive validity	LNF	Winter of kindergarten	180	.72	Middle of first TOWRE – Sight Word Efficiency
Predictive validity	LNF	Winter of kindergarten	165	.62	Middle of second DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	LNF	Winter of kindergarten	167	.51	Middle of second WRMT-R (Passage Comprehension)
Concurrent validity	ISF	Winter of kindergarten	218	.51	DIBELS PSF
Concurrent validity	ISF	Winter of kindergarten	218	.51	DIBELS NWF
Predictive validity	ISF	Winter of kindergarten	179	.43	Middle of first DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	ISF	Winter of kindergarten	180	.32	Middle of first TOWRE – Phonetic decoding efficiency
Predictive validity	ISF	Winter of kindergarten	180	.45	Middle of first TOWRE – Sight Word Efficiency
Predictive validity	ISF	Winter of kindergarten	165	.38	Middle of second DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	ISF	Winter of kindergarten	167	.46	Middle of second WRMT-R (Passage Comprehension)
Concurrent validity	PSF	Winter of kindergarten	218	.59	DIBELS NWF
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter of kindergarten	179	.49	Middle of first DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter of kindergarten	180	.48	Middle of first TOWRE – Phonetic decoding efficiency
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter of kindergarten	180	.44	Middle of first TOWRE – Sight Word Efficiency
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter of kindergarten	165	.42	Middle of second DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter of kindergarten	167	.48	Middle of second WRMT-R (Passage Comprehension)
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of kindergarten	179	.73	Middle of first DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of kindergarten	180	.67	Middle of first TOWRE – Phonetic decoding efficiency
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of kindergarten	180	.67	Middle of first TOWRE – Sight Word Efficiency
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of kindergarten	165	.58	Middle of second DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of kindergarten	167	.56	Middle of second WRMT-R (Passage Comprehension)
Concurrent validity	ORF	Winter of first	162	.81	TOWRE – Phonetic decoding efficiency
Concurrent validity	ORF	Winter of first	162	.89	TOWRE – Sight Word Efficiency
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of first	162	.81	Middle of second DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of first	162	.61	Middle of second WRMT-R (Passage Comprehension)
Concurrent validity	ORF	Winter of second	162	.69	WRMT-R (Passage Comprehension)

Chard, D. J., Stoolmiller, M., Harn, B. A., Wanzek, J., Vaughn, S., Linan-Thompson, S., et al. (2008). Predicting reading success in a mulitlevel schoolwide reading model: A retrospective analysis. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 41(2), 174-188.

Participants were 668 students in Oregon and Texas identified as needing strategic or intensive intervention during the winter kindergarten screening period or the fall first-grade screening period. Thirteen percent of the participants were identified for special education services before the end of their first grade year, and an additional 7% were identified for special education services during second or third grade. Nine percent of students were identified with a speech/language disability, and 7% with a learning disability.

Scores on the DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency measure and the Growth Modeling Oral Reading Fluency Passages were combined to make a single spring ORF score, and outliers on NWF scores were trimmed.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Predictive validity	LNF	Fall of first	488	.40	Composite of Grade 1 DIBELS ORF and Grade 1 GMORF
Predictive validity	LNF	Fall of first	419	.40	Composite of Grade 2 DIBELS ORF and Grade 2 GMORF
Predictive validity	LNF	Fall of first	369	.36	Composite of Grade 3 DIBELS ORF and Grade 3 GMORF
Predictive validity	LNF	Fall of first	352	.30	End of Grade 3 SAT-10 Comprehension
Predictive validity	LNF	Fall of first	344	.22	End of Grade 3 SAT-10 Vocabulary
Predictive validity	PSF	Fall of first	488	.15	Composite of Grade 1 DIBELS ORF and Grade 1 GMORF
Predictive validity	PSF	Fall of first	419	.11	Composite of Grade 2 DIBELS ORF and Grade 2 GMORF
Predictive validity	PSF	Fall of first	369	.15	Composite of Grade 3 DIBELS ORF and Grade 3 GMORF
Predictive validity	PSF	Fall of first	352	.21	End of Grade 3 SAT-10 Comprehension
Predictive validity	PSF	Fall of first	344	.33	End of Grade 3 SAT-10 Vocabulary
Predictive validity	PSF	Spring of first	486	.08	Composite of Grade 1 DIBELS ORF and Grade 1 GMORF
Predictive validity	PSF	Spring of first	419	.08	Composite of Grade 2 DIBELS ORF and Grade 2 GMORF
Predictive validity	PSF	Spring of first	369	.10	Composite of Grade 3 DIBELS ORF and Grade 3 GMORF
Predictive validity	PSF	Spring of first	352	.15	End of Grade 3 SAT-10 Comprehension
Predictive validity	PSF	Spring of first	344	.22	End of Grade 3 SAT-10 Vocabulary
Concurrent validity	NWF	Spring of first	486	.66	Composite of Grade 1 DIBELS ORF and Grade 1 GMORF
Predictive validity	NWF	Spring of first	419	.64	Composite of Grade 2 DIBELS ORF and Grade 2 GMORF
Predictive validity	NWF	Spring of first	369	.59	Composite of Grade 3 DIBELS ORF and Grade 3 GMORF
Predictive validity	NWF	Spring of first	352	.29	End of Grade 3 SAT-10 Comprehension
Predictive validity	NWF	Spring of first	344	.33	End of Grade 3 SAT-10 Vocabulary

Good, R., Kaminski, R., Shinn, M., Bratten, J., Shinn, M., Laimon, D., et al. (2004) Technical adequacy of DIBELS: Results of the Early Childhood Research Institute on Measuring Growth and Development (Tech. Rep. No. 7). Eugene: University of Oregon.

Participants were students at two elementary schools near Eugene, Oregon. The first school had a total population of about 490 students, of which 40.7 were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, in a town of around 53,000. The second school had a population of 580, of which 41.9 were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, in a town of around 4,700.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
One-month alternate-form reliability	ISF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	71-135	.51-.72 (median .61)	n/a
One-month alternate-form reliability	PSF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	63-215	.66-.79 (median .74)	n/a
One-month alternate-form reliability	PSF	Fall to spring of first	80-231	.63-.70 (median .67)	n/a
One-month alternate-form reliability	NWF	Fall to spring of first	77-231	.67-.88 (median .83)	n/a
One-month alternate-form reliability	LNF	Fall to spring of kindergarten	71-215	.86-.92 (median .89)	n/a
One-month alternate-form reliability	LNF	Fall to spring of first	80-231	.80-.87 (median .86)	n/a
Concurrent validity	PSF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	54-66	.35-.56 (median .54)	WJ Readiness Cluster Standard Score
Concurrent validity	ISF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	73-243	.45-.61 (median .47)	PSF
Concurrent validity	ISF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	54-61	.34-.45 (median .36)	WJ Readiness Cluster Standard Score
Predictive validity	ISF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	62-75	.34-.46 (median .35)	End of kindergarten PSF
Predictive validity	ISF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	50-60	.22-.33 (median .29)	Middle of first DIBELS NWF
Predictive validity	ISF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	37-44	.28-.51 (median .37)	End of first WJ Total Reading Cluster Standard Score
Predictive validity	ISF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	50-59	.26-.45 (median .36)	End of first CBM ORF
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	63-141	.37-.49 (median .39)	End of kindergarten DIBELS NWF
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	50-60	.33-.68 (median .58)	Middle of first DIBELS NWF
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	37-44	.38-.68 (median .60)	End of first WJ Total Reading Cluster Standard Score
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	50-59	.35-.63 (median .52)	End of first CBM ORF
Concurrent validity	PSF	Fall to spring of first	64-126	.19-.51 (median .28)	WJ Readiness Cluster Standard Score
Predictive validity	PSF	Fall to early winter of first	74-197	.43-.55 (median .49)	Late Winter of first DIBELS NWF
Predictive validity	PSF	Fall to early spring of first	74-231	.17-.56 (median .46)	Late Spring of first CBM ORF
Predictive validity	PSF	Fall to spring of first	58-116	.20-.59 (median .42)	End of second WJ Total Reading Cluster Standard Score
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter to spring of first	51-57	.04-.34 (median .17)	End of second CBM ORF
Concurrent validity	NWF	Fall to spring of first	62-126	.35-.59 (median .51)	WJ Readiness Cluster Standard Score
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall to early spring of first	70-231	.68-.82 (median .71)	Late Spring of first CBM ORF
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter to spring of first	52-58	.63-.85 (median .75)	Middle of second CBM ORF
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall to spring of first	56-116	.52-.77 (median .67)	End of second WJ Total Reading Cluster Standard Score
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter to spring of first	51-57	.60-.85 (median .77)	End of second CBM ORF
Concurrent validity	LNF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	54-66	.64-.76 (median .70)	WJ Readiness Cluster Standard Score
Predictive validity	LNF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	50-60	.61-.77 (median .72)	Middle of first DIBELS NWF
Predictive validity	LNF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	38-44	.44-.69 (median .66)	End of first WJ Total Reading Cluster Standard Score
Predictive validity	LNF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	50-59	.64-.80 (median .72)	End of first CBM ORF
Concurrent validity	LNF	Fall to spring of first	64-126	.41-.72 (median .53)	WJ Readiness Cluster Standard Score
Predictive validity	LNF	Fall to early winter of first	73-198	.63-.78 (median .68)	Late Winter of first DIBELS NWF
Predictive validity	LNF	Fall to early spring of first	73-231	.69-.77 (median .74)	Late Spring of first CBM ORF
Predictive validity	LNF	Winter to spring of first	52-58	.46-.73 (median .66)	Middle of second DIBELS NWF
Predictive validity	LNF	Fall to spring of first	58-116	.57-.71 (median .62)	End of second WJ Total Reading Cluster Standard Score
Predictive validity	LNF	Winter to spring of first	51-57	.48-.83 (median .77)	End of second CBM ORF

Hagan-Burke, S., Burke, M. D., & Crowder, C. (2006). The convergent validity of the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills and the Test of Word Reading Efficiency for the beginning of first grade. Assessment for Effective Intervention, 31(4), 1-15.

Participants were 202 first-grade students from a public primary school in semirural northeast Georgia. The students came from middle to lower-middle class families, and 37.7% of the students received free or reduced-price lunch. The majority of the students were native English language speakers.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Concurrent validity	LNF	Fall of first	202	.578*	DIBELS NWF
Concurrent validity	LNF	Fall of first	202	.305*	DIBELS PSF
Concurrent validity	LNF	Fall of first	202	.307*	DIBELS WUF
Concurrent validity	LNF	Fall of first	202	.622*	TOWRE – Sight Word Efficiency
Concurrent validity	LNF	Fall of first	202	.466*	TOWRE – Phonetic Decoding Efficiency
Concurrent validity	PSF	Fall of first	202	.383*	DIBELS NWF
Concurrent validity	PSF	Fall of first	202	.322*	TOWRE – Sight Word Efficiency
Concurrent validity	PSF	Fall of first	202	.292*	TOWRE – Phonetic Decoding Efficiency
Concurrent validity	NWF	Fall of first	202	.733*	TOWRE – Sight Word Efficiency
Concurrent validity	NWF	Fall of first	202	.748*	TOWRE – Phonetic Decoding Efficiency
Concurrent validity	WUF	Fall of first	202	.329*	TOWRE – Sight Word Efficiency

* denotes p<.01

Harn, B. A., Stoolmiller, M., & Chard, D. J. (2008). Measuring the dimensions of alphabetic principle on the reading development of first graders: The role of automaticity and unitization. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 41(2), 143-157.

Participants were 938 students from two Pacific Northwest school districts. The first district had five participating schools and was rural with 45% of students receiving free or reduced lunch. The second district, with seven participating schools, was a suburban school district in which 24% of students received free or reduced lunch. There was also an additional independent set of 109 students from the first district.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Test-retest reliability	NWF	Fall of first	Not specified	.94	n/a
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	938	.75	Middle of first DIBELS NWF
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	938	.62	End of first DIBELS NWF
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	938	.82	Middle of first DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	938	.73	End of first DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of first	938	.76	End of first DIBELS NWF
Concurrent validity	NWF	Winter of first	938	.77	Middle of first DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of first	938	.74	End of first DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of first	938	.69	End of first DIBELS NWF
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of first	938	.91	End of first DIBELS ORF
Concurrent validity	NWF	Spring of first	938	.78	End of first DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	109	.63	Middle of first DIBELS NWF
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	109	.73	Middle of first DIBELS ORF
Concurrent validity	NWF	Winter of first	109	.77	Middle of first DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	109	.43	End of first DIBELS NWF
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of first	109	.72	End of first DIBELS NWF
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of first	109	.62	End of first DIBELS NWF
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	109	.56	End of first DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of first	109	.72	End of first DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of first	109	.85	End of first DIBELS ORF
Concurrent validity	NWF	Spring of first	109	.74	End of first DIBELS ORF

Hintze, J. M., Ryan, A. L., & Stoner, G. (2003). Concurrent validity and diagnostic accuracy of the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills and the Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing. School Psychology Review, 32(4), 541-556.

Participants were 86 kindergarten students from three elementary schools in a mid-sized city in Massachusetts. In the district as a whole, approximately 39% of students qualified for free or reduced lunch.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Alternate-form reliability	ISF	March of kindergarten	86	.86	n/a
Alternate-form reliability	LNF	March of kindergarten	86	.94	n/a
Alternate-form reliability	PSF	March of kindergarten	86	.97	n/a
Concurrent validity	ISF	March of kindergarten	86	.60	CTOPP Phonological Awareness Composite (individual subtests were .51, .51, .52)
Concurrent validity	ISF	March of kindergarten	86	.46	CTOPP Phonological Memory Composite (individual subtests were .34, .44)
Concurrent validity	LNF	March of kindergarten	86	.58	CTOPP Rapid Naming Composite (individual subtests were both .59)
Concurrent validity	LNF	March of kindergarten	86	.53	CTOPP Phonological Awareness Composite (individual subtests were .38, .45, .53)
Concurrent validity	LNF	March of kindergarten	86	.52	CTOPP Phonological Memory Composite (individual subtests were .43, .44)
Concurrent validity	PSF	March of kindergarten	86	.53	CTOPP Phonological Awareness Composite (individual subtests were .25, .47, .63)
Concurrent validity	PSF	March of kindergarten	86	.39	CTOPP Phonological Memory Composite (individual subtests were .32, .33)
Discriminant validity	ISF	March of kindergarten	86	.20	CTOPP Rapid Naming Composite (individual subtests were .21, .24)
Discriminant validity	PSF	March of kindergarten	86	.09	CTOPP Rapid Naming Composite (individual subtests were .08, .14)

Note: Discriminant validity indicates coefficients for outcome measures not expected to be highly related to the DIBELS measure.

Kaminski, R. A. & Good, R. H. (1996). Toward a technology for assessing basic early literacy skills. School Psychology Review, 25(2), 215-227.

Participants were 37 kindergarten students and 41 first grade students in a rural elementary school in the Pacific Northwest. In the school as a whole, 12% of the students qualify for free milk/free lunch program, and approximately 9% of the students receive special education. Assessments were given twice a week for nine weeks.

Note: These data reference earlier versions of the DIBELS measures studied.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
One-week alternate-form reliability	LNF	Kindergarten	18	.93	n/a
One-week alternate-form reliability	LNF	First grade	20	.83	n/a
One-week alternate-form reliability	PSF	Kindergarten	18	.88	n/a
One-week alternate-form reliability	PSF	First grade	20	.60	n/a
Concurrent validity - Point	LNF	Kindergarten	36	.59	McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities
Concurrent validity - Level	LNF	Kindergarten	18	.58	McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities
Concurrent validity - Point	LNF	Kindergarten	33	.77	Metropolitan Readiness Test
Concurrent validity - Level	LNF	Kindergarten	18	.88	Metropolitan Readiness Test
Concurrent validity - Point	LNF	Kindergarten	36	.67	Rhode Island Pupil Identification Scale
Concurrent validity - Level	LNF	Kindergarten	18	.80	Rhode Island Pupil Identification Scale
Concurrent validity - Point	PSF	Kindergarten	36	.46	McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities
Concurrent validity - Level	PSF	Kindergarten	18	.69	McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities
Concurrent validity - Point	PSF	Kindergarten	33	.65	Metropolitan Readiness Test
Concurrent validity - Level	PSF	Kindergarten	18	.73	Metropolitan Readiness Test
Concurrent validity - Point	PSF	Kindergarten	36	.43	Rhode Island Pupil Identification Scale
Concurrent validity - Level	PSF	Kindergarten	18	.63	Rhode Island Pupil Identification Scale
Concurrent validity - Point	LNF	First grade	37	.13	McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities
Concurrent validity - Level	LNF	First grade	19	.18	McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities
Concurrent validity - Point	LNF	First grade	37	.50	Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test
Concurrent validity - Level	LNF	First grade	19	.77	Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test
Concurrent validity - Point	LNF	First grade	37	.27	Rhode Island Pupil Identification Scale
Concurrent validity - Level	LNF	First grade	19	.47	Rhode Island Pupil Identification Scale
Concurrent validity - Point	LNF	First grade	37	.34	CBM ORF
Concurrent validity - Level	LNF	First grade	19	.47	CBM ORF
Concurrent validity - Point	PSF	First grade	37	.02	McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities
Concurrent validity - Level	PSF	First grade	19	.05	McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities
Concurrent validity - Point	PSF	First grade	37	.29	Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test
Concurrent validity - Level	PSF	First grade	19	.18	Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test
Concurrent validity - Point	PSF	First grade	37	.06	Rhode Island Pupil Identification Scale
Concurrent validity - Level	PSF	First grade	19	.03	Rhode Island Pupil Identification Scale
Concurrent validity - Point	PSF	First grade	37	.09	CBM ORF
Concurrent validity - Level	PSF	First grade	19	-.06	CBM ORF

Kaminski, R. A., Good, R. H., Shinn, M. R., Smith, S. R., Laimon, D., Shinn, M., et al. (2004). DIBELS Word Use Fluency measure for kindergarten through third grades (Tech. Rep. 13). Eugene: University of Oregon.

Participants were from two elementary schools in the Pacific Northwest, one in a low socio-economic suburban town, and one in a small rural town. ESL services were provided to 4% of the students in the first school and 5.5% of the students in the second. In the first school, 51% of students received free or reduced lunch, while in the second, 56% did. Over the years of the project, both schools improved children's reading and achieved results above the level considered satisfactory by a state-wide department of education assessment. All children with parental permission in regular classroom settings in kindergarten through third participated.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
One-week alternate-form reliability	WUF	Kindergarten	140-156	.62-.77 (median .71)	n/a
One-month alternate-form reliability	WUF	Kindergarten	76-274	.50-.72 (median .65)	n/a
One-week alternate-form reliability	WUF	First grade	141-154	.58-.69 (median .65)	n/a
One-month alternate-form reliability	WUF	First grade	95-307	.36-.63 (median .52)	n/a
One-month alternate-form reliability	WUF	Second grade	161-187	.49-.69 (median .66)	n/a
One-month alternate-form reliability	WUF	Second grade	107-255	.50-.75 (median .59)	n/a
Concurrent validity	WUF	Kindergarten	45	.48**	Test of Language Development 3:Primary
Concurrent validity	WUF	Kindergarten	55	.34**	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test III
Concurrent validity	WUF	Kindergarten	44	.57**	Expressive Vocabulary Test
Concurrent validity	WUF	First grade	91	.55**	Test of Language Development 3:Primary
Concurrent validity	WUF	First grade	79	.26*	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test III
Concurrent validity	WUF	First grade	43	.21	Expressive Vocabulary Test
Concurrent validity	WUF	Second grade	59	.44**	Test of Language Development 3:Primary
Concurrent validity	WUF	Second grade	36	.22	Expressive Vocabulary Test
Concurrent validity	WUF	Second grade	53	.47**	Woodcock-Johnson Listening Comprehension
Concurrent validity	WUF	Second grade	53	.41**	Woodcock-Johnson Reading Comprehension
Concurrent validity	WUF	Third grade	39	.26	Expressive Vocabulary Test
Concurrent validity	WUF	Third grade	65	.36**	Woodcock-Johnson Listening Comprehension
Concurrent validity	WUF	Third grade	65	.28*	Woodcock-Johnson Reading Comprehension
Concurrent validity	WUF	Kindergarten	28	.47*	Language Sample: Different Word Roots
Concurrent validity	WUF	Kindergarten	28	.40*	Language Sample: Total Words
Concurrent validity	WUF	Kindergarten	28	.42*	Language Sample: Mean Length of Utterance in Words
Concurrent validity	WUF	Kindergarten	28	.42*	Language Sample: Mean Length of Utterance in Morphemes
Concurrent validity	WUF	First grade	32	.72**	Language Sample: Different Word Roots
Concurrent validity	WUF	First grade	32	.73**	Language Sample: Total Words
Concurrent validity	WUF	First grade	32	.71**	Language Sample: Mean Length of Utterance in Words
Concurrent validity	WUF	First grade	32	.71**	Language Sample: Mean Length of Utterance in Morphemes
Concurrent validity	WUF	Second grade	30	.44*	Language Sample: Different Word Roots
Concurrent validity	WUF	Second grade	30	.33	Language Sample: Total Words
Concurrent validity	WUF	Second grade	30	.16	Language Sample: Mean Length of Utterance in Words

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Concurrent validity	WUF	Second grade	30	.15	Language Sample: Mean Length of Utterance in Morphemes
Concurrent validity	LNF	Kindergarten	N/A	.24**	DIBELS WUF
Concurrent validity	WUF	First grade	N/A	.39**	DIBELS ORF
Concurrent validity	WUF	Second grade	N/A	.34**	DIBELS ORF
Concurrent validity	WUF	Third grade	N/A	.42**	DIBELS ORF
Concurrent validity	WUF	Third grade	N/A	.35*	Oregon State Assessment Test
Discriminant validity	WUF	Kindergarten	28	-.10	Language Sample: Type Token Ratio
Discriminant validity	WUF	First grade	32	-.52**	Language Sample: Type Token Ratio
Discriminant validity	WUF	Second grade	30	-.30	Language Sample: Type Token Ratio

All reliability coefficients significant at p<.01.
For validity:

* p<.05
**p<.01

Note: Discriminant validity indicates coefficients for outcome measures not expected to be highly related to the DIBELS measure.

McKenna, M. K., & Good, R. H., III. (2003). Assessing reading comprehension: The relation between DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency, DIBELS Retell Fluency, and Oregon State Assessment scores. Eugene: University of Oregon.

Participants were 35 third grade students from an urban school district in the Pacific Northwest. This study compared DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency Measures given with and without a retell cue in the directions ("I may ask you to tell me about what you read").

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of third	35	.42	DIBELS RTF
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of third	35	.69	Oregon State Assessment
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of third	35	.97	DIBELS ORF – Directions from previous version
Concurrent validity	RTF	Spring of third	35	.50	Oregon State Assessment
Concurrent validity	RTF	Spring of third	35	.48	DIBELS ORF – Directions from previous version

All $p<.05$

Powell-Smith, K. A., Hudson, R., Castillo, J. M., & Dedrick, R. (2008). Examining the Use of DIBELS Nonsense Word Fluency with First and Second Grade Students in Reading First Schools. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Participants were 25,276 first graders and 23,812 second graders in Florida Reading First schools. Nineteen percent of the first grade sample and 20% of the second grade sample were students with identified disabilities. Seventeen percent of students in each grade were students with Limited English Proficiency. More than 50% of the sample in both first and second grades were from ethnic groups other than Caucasian.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	25276	.70	Spring of first DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	25276	.60	Spring of first SAT-10 Reading Comprehension
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of second	23812	.63	Spring of second DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of second	23812	.47	Spring of second SAT-10 Reading Comprehension

Pressley, M., Hilden, K., & Shankland, R. An evaluation of end-grade-3 Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS): Speed reading without comprehension, predicting little. East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Participants were 191 third grade students in four schools in a small school district in a Midwest urban area. In the district as a whole, 16.6% received free lunch.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of first	191	.16-.32 (median .31)	DIBELS RTF

Riedel, B. W. (2007). The relation between DIBELS, reading comprehension, and vocabulary in urban first-grade students. Reading Research Quarterly, 42(4), 546-567.

Participants were 1518 first grade students in Memphis who attended one of 26 schools with a Reading Excellence Act grant and participated in REA-related assessments. Students receiving special education services were not included, and data from students classified as English language learners were analyzed separately.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Predictive validity	LNF	Fall of first	1274	.44	End of 1st Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation
Predictive validity	LNF	Fall of first	1112	.40	End of 2nd TerraNova
Predictive validity	PSF	Fall of first	1274	.26	End of 1st Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation
Predictive validity	PSF	Fall of first	1112	.26	End of 2nd TerraNova
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	1274	.45	End of 1st Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	1112	.39	End of 2nd TerraNova
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter of first	1027	.16	End of 1st Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter of first	891	.18	End of 2nd TerraNova
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of first	1027	.45	End of 1st Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of first	891	.38	End of 2nd TerraNova
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of first	1027	.59	End of 1st Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of first	891	.49	End of 2nd TerraNova
Predictive validity	RTF	Winter of first	1027	.41	End of 1st Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation
Predictive validity	RTF	Winter of first	891	.39	End of 2nd TerraNova
Concurrent validity	PSF	Spring of first	1224	.15	End of 1st Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation
Predictive validity	PSF	Spring of first	1054	.23	End of 2nd TerraNova
Concurrent validity	NWF	Spring of first	1224	.46	End of 1st Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation
Predictive validity	NWF	Spring of first	1054	.37	End of 2nd TerraNova
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of first	1224	.67	End of 1st Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation
Predictive validity	ORF	Spring of first	1054	.54	End of 2nd TerraNova
Concurrent validity	RTF	Spring of first	1224	.51	End of 1st Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation
Predictive validity	RTF	Spring of first	1054	.46	End of 2nd TerraNova

Ritchey, K. D. (2008). Assessing letter sound knowledge: A comparison of Letter Sound Fluency and Nonsense Word Fluency. Exceptional Children, 74(4), 487-506.

Reporting correlations corrected for attenuation (Table 3, page 494), ranges and medians of five NWF administration points in winter and spring of kindergarten. Participants were 91 kindergarten students at two schools in a mid-Atlantic state with a mean January age of 67.52 months. Later, 82 students (90%) received follow-up testing at the end of first grade.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Three-week alternate-form reliability	NWF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	91	.83 - .87 (median .86)	n/a
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	91	.73 - .81 (median .76)	End of kindergarten WRMT-R Word Identification
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	82	.69 - .75 (median .75)	End of 1st WRMT-R Word Identification
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	82	.62 - .72 (median .65)	End of 1st WRMT-R Word Attack
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	82	.67 - .78 (median .72)	End of 1st CBM ORF
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of kindergarten	91	.72	End of kindergarten LSF
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of kindergarten	91	.72	End of kindergarten DIBELS NWF
Concurrent validity	NWF	Winter to spring of kindergarten	91	.78 - .84 (median .79)	LSF

Roberts, G., Good, R., & Corcoran, S. (2005). Story retell: A fluency-based indicator of reading comprehension. School Psychology Quarterly, 20(3), 304-317.

Participants were 86 first grade students in six schools in an urban, southeastern school district. Participating schools served low-income, Title I populations and all received free or reduced lunches.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Alternate-form reliability (one passage)	RTF	Spring of first	86	.57	n/a
Alternate-form reliability (three passages)	RTF	Spring of first	86	.80	n/a
Alternate-form reliability (seven passages)	RTF	Spring of first	86	.90	n/a
Alternate-form reliability (one passage)	ORF	Spring of first	86	.89	n/a
Alternate-form reliability (three passages)	ORF	Spring of first	86	.96	n/a
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of first	86	.72-.75 (median .74)	Woodcock Diagnostic Reading Battery Broad Reading Cluster (coefficients are for individual passages)
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of first	86	.76	WDRB Broad Reading Cluster (coefficient is for average of two passages)
Concurrent validity	RTF	Spring of first	86	.81	WDRB Broad Reading Cluster (coefficient is for students with consistent retell)
Concurrent validity	RTF	Spring of first	86	.42	WDRB Broad Reading Cluster (coefficient is for students with inconsistent retell)

Roehrig, A. D., Petscher, Y., Nettles, S. M., Hudson, R. F., & Torgeson, J. K. (2008). Accuracy of DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency measure for predicting third grade reading comprehension outcomes. Journal of Psychology, (46), 343-366.

Participants were students enrolled in Florida Reading First schools. Students were divided into two cohorts for cross-validation purposes. Data for each cohort is reported here separately.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of third	Approx. 16000	.90	Early winter DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of third	Approx. 16000	.91	Early winter DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of third	Approx. 16000	.88	Late winter DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of third	Approx. 16000	.89	Late winter DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	ORF	Early winter of third	Approx. 16000	.92	Late winter DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	ORF	Early winter of third	Approx. 16000	.92	Late winter DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of third	Approx. 16000	.66	FCAT-SSS
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of third	Approx. 16000	.67	FCAT-SSS
Predictive validity	ORF	Early winter of third	Approx. 16000	.68	FCAT-SSS
Predictive validity	ORF	Early winter of third	Approx. 16000	.68	FCAT-SSS
Concurrent validity	ORF	Late winter of third	Approx. 16000	.71	FCAT-SSS
Concurrent validity	ORF	Late winter of third	Approx. 16000	.70	FCAT-SSS
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of third	Approx. 16000	.68	SAT-10
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of third	Approx. 16000	.69	SAT-10
Predictive validity	ORF	Early winter of third	Approx. 16000	.68	SAT-10
Predictive validity	ORF	Early winter of third	Approx. 16000	.68	SAT-10
Predictive validity	ORF	Late winter of third	Approx. 16000	.71	SAT-10
Predictive validity	ORF	Late winter of third	Approx. 16000	.70	SAT-10

Rouse, H. L. & Fantuzzo, J. W. (2006). Validity of the Dynamic Indicators for Basic Early Literacy Skills as an indicator of early literacy for urban kindergarten children. School Psychology Review, 35(3), 341-355.

Participants were 330 students stratified to be demographically and geographically representative of the large urban public school district. Thirty-one percent of the students qualified for free or reduced price lunch.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Concurrent validity	LNF	Kindergarten	330	.62**	DRA Instructional Reading
Concurrent validity	LNF	Kindergarten	330	.52**	TERA Reading Quotient
Concurrent validity	LNF	Kindergarten	330	.59**	TERA Alphabet
Concurrent validity	LNF	Kindergarten	330	.41**	TERA Conventions
Concurrent validity	LNF	Kindergarten	330	.32**	TERA Meaning
Concurrent validity	NWF	Kindergarten	330	.62**	DRA Instructional Reading
Concurrent validity	NWF	Kindergarten	330	.53**	TERA Reading Quotient
Concurrent validity	NWF	Kindergarten	330	.56**	TERA Alphabet
Concurrent validity	NWF	Kindergarten	330	.44**	TERA Conventions
Concurrent validity	NWF	Kindergarten	330	.35**	TERA Meaning
Concurrent validity	PSF	Kindergarten	330	.48**	DRA Instructional Reading
Concurrent validity	PSF	Kindergarten	330	.43**	TERA Reading Quotient
Concurrent validity	PSF	Kindergarten	330	.47**	TERA Alphabet
Concurrent validity	PSF	Kindergarten	330	.36**	TERA Conventions
Concurrent validity	PSF	Kindergarten	330	.37**	TERA Meaning
Predictive validity	LNF	Kindergarten	288	.67**	Spring of 1st DRA Instructional Reading
Predictive validity	LNF	Kindergarten	288	.48**	Spring of 1st TerraNova Reading
Predictive validity	LNF	Kindergarten	288	.63**	Spring of 1st TerraNova Vocabulary
Predictive validity	LNF	Kindergarten	288	.57**	Spring of 1st TerraNova Language
Predictive validity	NWF	Kindergarten	288	.63**	Spring of 1st DRA Instructional Reading
Predictive validity	NWF	Kindergarten	288	.50**	Spring of 1st TerraNova Reading
Predictive validity	NWF	Kindergarten	288	.57**	Spring of 1st TerraNova Vocabulary
Predictive validity	NWF	Kindergarten	288	.55**	Spring of 1st TerraNova Language
Predictive validity	PSF	Kindergarten	288	.55**	Spring of 1st DRA Instructional Reading
Predictive validity	PSF	Kindergarten	288	.49**	Spring of 1st TerraNova Reading
Predictive validity	PSF	Kindergarten	288	.50**	Spring of 1st TerraNova Vocabulary
Predictive validity	PSF	Kindergarten	288	.53**	Spring of 1st TerraNova Language

**$p < .0001$

Schilling, S. G., Carlisle, J. F., Scott, S. E., & Zeng, J. (2007). Are fluency measures accurate predictors of reading achievement? The Elementary School Journal, 107(5), 429-448.

Participants were 2,588 first graders, 2,437 second graders, and 2,527 third graders who took the ITBS and a similar number who took DIBELS at each grade level at 49 schools at nine school districts in Michigan. Eighty-one percent of the students were classified as at an economic disadvantage, 16% had limited English proficiency, and 8.5% of students had disabilities.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Predictive validity	LNF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.57	ITBS - Reading Total
Predictive validity	LNF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.52	ITBS - Vocabulary
Predictive validity	LNF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.54	ITBS - Comprehension
Predictive validity	LNF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.52	ITBS – Word analysis
Predictive validity	LNF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.56	ITBS – Language
Predictive validity	LNF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.30	ITBS – Listening
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.57	ITBS - Reading Total
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.51	ITBS - Vocabulary
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.56	ITBS - Comprehension
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.54	ITBS – Word analysis
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.54	ITBS – Language
Predictive validity	WUF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.37	ITBS - Reading Total
Predictive validity	WUF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.35	ITBS - Vocabulary
Predictive validity	WUF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.33	ITBS - Comprehension
Predictive validity	WUF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.35	ITBS – Word analysis
Predictive validity	WUF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.35	ITBS – Language
Predictive validity	WUF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.32	ITBS - Listening
Predictive validity	PSF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.43	ITBS - Reading Total
Predictive validity	PSF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.40	ITBS - Vocabulary
Predictive validity	PSF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.40	ITBS - Comprehension
Predictive validity	PSF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.40	ITBS – Word analysis
Predictive validity	PSF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.40	ITBS – Language
Predictive validity	PSF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.32	ITBS - Listening
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.60	ITBS - Reading Total
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.54	ITBS - Vocabulary
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.57	ITBS - Comprehension
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.57	ITBS – Word analysis
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.56	ITBS – Language
Predictive validity	WUF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.34	ITBS - Reading Total
Predictive validity	WUF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.34	ITBS - Vocabulary
Predictive validity	WUF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.31	ITBS - Comprehension
Predictive validity	WUF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.35	ITBS – Word analysis
Predictive validity	WUF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.36	ITBS – Language
Predictive validity	WUF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.31	ITBS – Listening
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.40	ITBS - Reading Total
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.39	ITBS - Vocabulary
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.35	ITBS - Comprehension

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.41	ITBS – Word analysis
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.39	ITBS – Language
Predictive validity	PSF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.31	ITBS – Listening
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.69	ITBS - Reading Total
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.61	ITBS - Vocabulary
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.69	ITBS - Comprehension
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.61	ITBS – Word analysis
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.63	ITBS – Language
Concurrent validity	NWF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.60	ITBS - Reading Total
Concurrent validity	NWF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.54	ITBS - Vocabulary
Concurrent validity	NWF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.58	ITBS - Comprehension
Concurrent validity	NWF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.59	ITBS – Word analysis
Concurrent validity	NWF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.56	ITBS – Language
Concurrent validity	WUF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.34	ITBS - Reading Total
Concurrent validity	WUF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.30	ITBS - Vocabulary
Concurrent validity	WUF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.28	ITBS - Comprehension
Concurrent validity	WUF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.35	ITBS – Word analysis
Concurrent validity	WUF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.37	ITBS – Language
Concurrent validity	WUF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.33	ITBS – Listening
Concurrent validity	PSF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.32	ITBS - Reading Total
Concurrent validity	PSF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.31	ITBS - Vocabulary
Concurrent validity	PSF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.28	ITBS - Comprehension
Concurrent validity	PSF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.35	ITBS – Word analysis
Concurrent validity	PSF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.33	ITBS – Language
Concurrent validity	PSF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.24	ITBS – Listening
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.75	ITBS - Reading Total
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.61	ITBS - Vocabulary
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.74	ITBS - Comprehension
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.69	ITBS – Word analysis
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.71	ITBS – Language
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of second	Approx. 2400	.69	ITBS - Reading Total
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of second	Approx. 2400	.61	ITBS - Vocabulary
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of second	Approx. 2400	.68	ITBS - Comprehension
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of second	Approx. 2400	.59	ITBS – Word analysis
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of second	Approx. 2400	.59	ITBS – Language
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of second	Approx. 2400	.75	ITBS - Reading Total
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of second	Approx. 2400	.65	ITBS - Vocabulary
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of second	Approx. 2400	.75	ITBS - Comprehension
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of second	Approx. 2400	.63	ITBS – Word analysis
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of second	Approx. 2400	.65	ITBS – Language
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of second	Approx. 2400	.75	ITBS - Reading Total
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of second	Approx. 2400	.64	ITBS - Vocabulary
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of second	Approx. 2400	.75	ITBS - Comprehension

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of second	Approx. 2400	.62	ITBS – Word analysis
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of second	Approx. 2400	.64	ITBS – Language
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of third	Approx. 2500	.65	ITBS - Reading Total
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of third	Approx. 2500	.57	ITBS - Vocabulary
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of third	Approx. 2500	.63	ITBS - Comprehension
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of third	Approx. 2500	.63	ITBS – Word analysis
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of third	Approx. 2500	.67	ITBS – Language
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of third	Approx. 2500	.67	ITBS - Reading Total
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of third	Approx. 2500	.58	ITBS - Vocabulary
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of third	Approx. 2500	.65	ITBS - Comprehension
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of third	Approx. 2500	.65	ITBS – Word analysis
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of third	Approx. 2500	.69	ITBS – Language
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of third	Approx. 2500	.65	ITBS - Reading Total
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of third	Approx. 2500	.56	ITBS - Vocabulary
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of third	Approx. 2500	.63	ITBS - Comprehension
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of third	Approx. 2500	.63	ITBS – Word analysis
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of third	Approx. 2500	.68	ITBS – Language
Discriminant validity	NWF	Fall of first	Approx. 2500	.32	ITBS - Listening
Discriminant validity	NWF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.31	ITBS - Listening
Discriminant validity	ORF	Winter of first	Approx. 2500	.31	ITBS – Listening
Discriminant validity	NWF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.31	ITBS – Listening
Discriminant validity	ORF	Spring of first	Approx. 2500	.34	ITBS – Listening
Discriminant validity	ORF	Fall of second	Approx. 2400	.29	ITBS – Listening
Discriminant validity	ORF	Winter of second	Approx. 2400	.33	ITBS – Listening
Discriminant validity	ORF	Spring of second	Approx. 2400	.33	ITBS – Listening
Discriminant validity	ORF	Fall of third	Approx. 2500	.36	ITBS – Listening
Discriminant validity	ORF	Winter of third	Approx. 2500	.37	ITBS – Listening
Discriminant validity	ORF	Spring of third	Approx. 2500	.37	ITBS – Listening

Note: Discriminant validity indicates coefficients for outcome measures not expected to be highly related to the DIBELS measure.

Shapiro, E. S., Solari, E., & Petscher, Y. (2008). Use of a measure of reading comprehension to enhance prediction on the state high stakes assessment. Learning and Individual Differences, 18, 316-328.

Participants were a total of 1000 students in grades 3, 4, and 5 in six elementary schools in three Pennsylvania districts. The rate of free and reduced lunch across the schools ranged from 22.2% to 61.9% with a mean rate of 38.9%.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of third	401	.94	Middle of third DIBELS ORF
Concurrent validity	ORF	Fall of third	401	.71	4Sight
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of third	401	.66	Middle of third 4Sight
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of third	401	.67	Middle of third Pennsylvania System of School Assessment
Concurrent validity	ORF	Winter of third	401	.67	4Sight
Concurrent validity	ORF	Winter of third	401	.68	Pennsylvania System of School Assessment
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of fourth	394	.93	Middle of fourth DIBELS ORF
Concurrent validity	ORF	Fall of fourth	394	.67	4Sight
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of fourth	394	.66	Middle of fourth 4Sight
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of fourth	394	.64	Pennsylvania System of School Assessment
Concurrent validity	ORF	Winter of fourth	394	.66	4Sight
Concurrent validity	ORF	Winter of fourth	394	.68	Pennsylvania System of School Assessment
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of fifth	205	.92	Middle of fifth DIBELS ORF
Concurrent validity	ORF	Fall of fifth	205	.70	4Sight
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of fifth	205	.70	Middle of fifth DIBELS 4Sight
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of fifth	205	.73	Pennsylvania System of School Assessment
Concurrent validity	ORF	Winter of fifth	205	.66	4Sight
Concurrent validity	ORF	Winter of fifth	205	.76	Pennsylvania System of School Assessment

Shaw, R., & Shaw, D. (2002). DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency-based indicators of third grade reading skills for Colorado State Assessment Program. Eugene: University of Oregon.

Participants were third-grade students at a Colorado elementary school. Fifty-two of the students took all three administrations of DIBELS throughout the year as well as the CSAP in the spring.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of third	52	.91	Middle of third DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of third	52	.89	End of third DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	ORF	Fall of third	52	.73	End of third CSAP reading assessment
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of third	52	.93	End of third DIBELS ORF
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of third	52	.73	End of third CSAP reading assessment
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of third	52	.80	End of third CSAP reading assessment

Speece, D. L., Mills, C., Ritchey, K. D., & Hillman, E. (2003). Initial evidence that letter fluency tasks are valid indicators of early reading skill. The Journal of Special Education, 36(4), 223-233.

Participants were 40 students from five half-day kindergarten classes in a suburban school district in the middle Atlantic states. Later, 39 of these students were assessed in first grade. Students were selected from those believed to have enough English skills to benefit from English instruction. Selections were made after students were ranked by their teachers as having high, average, or low literacy skills to obtain a sampling of skill levels. The average age of the students was 69.7 months, and 25.6% of the students had a primary language other than English.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Alternate-form reliability	NWF	Spring of kindergarten	40	.94	n/a
Concurrent validity	NWF	Spring of kindergarten	40	.36**	PPVT-R
Concurrent validity	NWF	Spring of kindergarten	40	.65***	CTOPP (Blending & Elision)
Concurrent validity	NWF	Spring of kindergarten	40	.27**	Texas Primary Reading Inventory (Letter-name knowledge)
Concurrent validity	NWF	Spring of kindergarten	40	.52***	Texas Primary Reading Inventory (Letter-sound knowledge)
Concurrent validity	NWF	Spring of kindergarten	40	.76***	LNF (modified)
Concurrent validity	NWF	Spring of kindergarten	40	.91***	Kindergarten WJ-R Letter-Word ID
Predictive validity	NWF	Spring of kindergarten	39	.59***	First grade WJ-R Letter-Word ID
Predictive validity	NWF	Spring of kindergarten	39	.59***	First grade WJ-R Word Attack
Predictive validity	NWF	Spring of kindergarten	39	.77***	Spring of first DIBELS NWF
Predictive validity	NWF	Spring of kindergarten	39	.71***	Spring of first CBM ORF (Custom)
Concurrent validity	NWF	Spring of first	39	.71***	First grade WJ-R Letter-Word ID
Concurrent validity	NWF	Spring of first	39	.75***	First grade WJ-R Word Attack
Concurrent validity	NWF	Spring of first	39	.74***	Spring of first CBM ORF (Custom)

** denotes p<.05
*** denotes p<.01

Unpublished DMG Data (2007).

Data is from a large-scale data management service which tracks scores for all three passages in each benchmark triad. Inter-passage correlations were calculated within each triad (Passage 1 to Passage 2, Passage 2 to Passage 3, Passage 1 to Passage 3) for students who received all three standard benchmark passages for that triad. This results in nine correlations per grade in second grade through sixth grade, and six correlations in first grade. The median of each set of grade-level correlations is reported in the table below.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Alternate-form reliability	ORF	First grade	189,167-284,577	.94 - .95 (median .95)	n/a
Alternate-form reliability	ORF	Second grade	194,996-318,038	.92 - .94 (median .93)	n/a
Alternate-form reliability	ORF	Third grade	174,375-289,896	.89 - .94 (median .92)	n/a
Alternate-form reliability	ORF	Fourth grade	21,621-44,223	.80 - .93 (median .92)	n/a
Alternate-form reliability	ORF	Fifth grade	18,121-36,108	.91 - .94 (median .93)	n/a
Alternate-form reliability	ORF	Sixth grade	6293-13,579	.92 - .93 (median .93)	n/a

Vander Meer, C. D., Lentz, F. E., & Stollar, S. (2005). The relationship between oral reading fluency and Ohio proficiency testing in reading. Eugene: University of Oregon.

Participants were 364 third grade students from three elementary schools in a suburban school district in southwest Ohio. All students were included in this study except those identified with significant cognitive disabilities. Students with an Individualized Education Program were provided allowable accommodations. Across the total school populations, approximately 14% of students were identified as economically disadvantaged.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Predictive validity	ORF	Spring of third	318	.650	Beginning of fourth Ohio Proficiency Test
Concurrent validity	ORF	Fall of fourth	355	.646	Beginning of fourth Ohio Proficiency Test

All $p<.01$

Vanderwood, M. L, Linklater, D., & Healy, K. (2008). Predictive accuracy of Nonsense Word Fluency for English language learners. School Psychology Review, 37(1), 5-17.

Participants were 134 ELL students from an urban elementary school in southern California serving a low socioeconomic population in which 100% of the students received free or reduced-cost lunch and 90% were classified as English language learners. Only data from ELL students still in attendance in third grade were used in this study.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	134	.86*	Winter of first NWF
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	134	.69*	Spring of first NWF
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	134	.29*	First grade SAT9
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	134	.51*	Third grade CBM ORF
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	134	.50*	Third grade Maze
Predictive validity	NWF	Fall of first	134	.39*	Third grade CAT6
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of first	134	.72*	Spring of first NWF
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of first	134	.27*	First grade SAT9
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of first	134	.56*	Third grade CBM ORF
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of first	134	.51*	Third grade Maze
Predictive validity	NWF	Winter of first	134	.38*	Third grade CAT6
Concurrent validity	NWF	Spring of first	134	.25*	First grade SAT9
Predictive validity	NWF	Spring of first	134	.65*	Third grade CBM ORF
Predictive validity	NWF	Spring of first	134	.54*	Third grade Maze
Predictive validity	NWF	Spring of first	134	.39*	Third grade CAT6

* denotes p<.01

Warrington, R. D. (2003). The effects of revised directions for Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills Oral Reading Fluency (DIBELS ORF): Oral Retell Fluency. Eugene: University of Oregon.

Participants were 758 students from a school district in Oregon. In the district as a whole, 43% of students are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. On the third grade benchmark reading test, 82% of third graders scored at or above the state performance standards. Approximately half of the students in the study were given an older version of the DIBELS ORF measure. For data on these students, see original paper.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of first	121	.97*	Test of Reading Fluency
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of second	120	.95*	Test of Reading Fluency
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of third	124	.94*	Test of Reading Fluency

* denotes p<.01

Wilson, J. (2005). The relationship of Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) Oral Reading Fluency to performance on Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS). Tempe, AZ: Tempe School District No. 3.

Participants were 241 third-grade students with both AIMS and ORF scores available from three schools that received a Reading First grant. Of these students, 167 were identified as receiving free lunch, and 65 were identified as English language learners.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Concurrent validity	ORF	Spring of third	241	.741	Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards

$p<.01$

Wood, D. E. (2006). Modeling the relationship between oral reading fluency and performance on a statewide reading test. Educational Assessment, 11(2), 85-104.

Participants were 281 students in a public elementary school in a middle-class neighborhood in northern Colorado. All available students whose primary language was English were tested. Seven students received special education services at the third-grade level, 10 students received services at the fourth-grade level, and nine students received services at the fifth-grade level. All these students were in their regular classroom for most of their educational day. Of these students, 82% received support in reading.

Type	DIBELS Measure	Grade and Time	n	Coefficient	Comparison Test
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of third	82	.70	CSAP
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of fourth	101	.67	CSAP
Predictive validity	ORF	Winter of fifth	98	.75	CSAP