



Launching young readers!

Reading Rockets

Fluency Norms Chart (2017 Update)

By: [Jan Hasbrouck](#), [Gerald Tindal](#)



View the results of the updated 2017 study on oral reading fluency (ORF) by Jan Hasbrouck and Gerald Tindal, with compiled ORF norms for grades 1-6. You'll also find an analysis of how the 2017 norms differ from the 2006 norms.

Related

[Understanding and Assessing Fluency](#)

[Developing Fluent Readers](#)

[Screening, Diagnosing, and Progress Monitoring for Fluency: The Details](#)

In 2006, Jan Hasbrouck and Gerald Tindal completed an extensive study of oral reading fluency. The results of their study were published in a technical report entitled *Oral Reading Fluency: 90 Years of Measurement*, archived in The Reading Teacher: [Oral reading fluency norms: A valuable assessment tool for reading teachers](#).

In 2017, Hasbrouck and Tindal published an [Update of Oral Reading Fluency \(ORF\) Norms](#), compiled from three widely-used and commercially available ORF assessments (DIBELS, DIBELS Next, and easy CBM), and representing a far larger number of scores than the previous assessments.

The table below shows the mean oral reading fluency of students in grades 1 through 6, as determined by Hasbrouck's and Tindal's 2017 data. You can also see an analysis of how the 2017 norms differ from the 2006 norms.

Oral reading fluency (ORF)

Of the various CBM measures available in reading, ORF is likely the most widely used. ORF involves having students read aloud from an unpracticed passage for one minute. An examiner notes any errors made (words read or pronounced incorrectly, omitted, read out of order, or words pronounced for the student by the examiner after a 3-second pause) and then calculates the total of words read correctly per minute (WCPM).

This WCPM score has 30 years of validation research conducted over three decades, indicating it is a robust indicator of overall reading development throughout the primary grades.

Interpreting ORF scores

ORF is used for two primary purposes: Screening and progress monitoring. When ORF is used to screen students, the driving questions are, first: "How does this student's performance compare to his/her peers?" and then: "Is this student at-risk of reading failure?"

To answer these questions, the decision-makers rely on ORF norms that identify performance benchmarks at the beginning (fall), middle (winter), and end (spring) of the year. An individual student's WCPM score can be compared to these benchmarks and determined to be either significantly above benchmark, above benchmark, at the expected benchmark, below benchmark, or significantly below benchmark.

Those students below or significantly below benchmark are at possible risk of reading difficulties. They are good candidates for further diagnostic assessments to help teachers determine their skill strengths or weaknesses, and plan appropriately targeted instruction and intervention (Hasbrouck, 2010. *Educators as Physicians: Using RTI Data for Effective Decision-Making*. Austin, TX: Gibson Hasbrouck & Associates.

When using ORF for progress monitoring the questions to be answered are: "Is this student making expected progress?" and "Is the instruction or intervention being provided improving this student's skills?"

When ORF assessments are used to answer these questions, they must be administered frequently (weekly, bimonthly, etc.), the results are placed on a graph for ease of analysis, and a goal determined. The student's goal can be based on established performance benchmarks or information on expected rates of progress. Over a period of weeks, the student's graph can show significant or moderate progress, expected progress, or progress that is below or significantly below expected levels.

Based on these outcomes, teachers can decide whether to (a) make small or major changes to the student's instruction, (b) continue with the current instructional plan, or (c) change the student's goal (Hosp, Hosp, & Howell, 2007. *The ABCs of CBM: A Practical Guide to Curriculum-based Measurement*. NY: Guilford Press).

Using the data

You can use the information in this table to draw conclusions and make decisions about the oral reading fluency of your students.

Students scoring 10 or more words below the 50th percentile using the average score of two unpracticed readings from grade-level materials need a fluency-building program.

In addition, teachers can use the table to set the long-term fluency goals for their struggling readers.

2017 Oral reading fluency (ORF) data

2017 Hasbrouck & Tindal Oral Reading Fluency Data

Grade	%ile	Fall WCPM*	Winter WCPM*	Spring WCPM*
1	90		97	116
	75		59	91
	50		29	60
	25		16	34
	10		9	18
2	90	111	131	148
	75	84	109	124
	50	50	84	100
	25	36	59	72
	10	23	35	43
3	90	134	161	166
	75	104	137	139
	50	83	97	112
	25	59	79	91
	10	40	62	63
4	90	153	168	184
	75	125	143	160
	50	94	120	133
	25	75	95	105
	10	60	71	83
5	90	179	183	195
	75	153	160	169
	50	121	133	146
	25	87	109	119
	10	64	84	102
6	90	185	195	204
	75	159	166	173
	50	132	145	146
	25	112	116	122
	10	89	91	91

* WCPM = Words Correct Per Minute

The 2017 chart is available as a PDF: [2017 Hasbrouck & Tindal Oral Reading Norms](#)

Comparison of ORF norms for 2006 and 2017

%iles	Grade 1	F	W	S	Grade 2	F	W	S
90	2017	97	116		2017	111	131	148
90	2006	81	111		2006	106	125	142
	Difference	16	5		Difference	5	6	6

75	2017	59	91	2017	84	109	124
75	2006	47	82	2006	79	100	117
	Difference	12	9	Difference	5	9	7
50	2017	29	60	2017	50	84	100
50	2006	23	53	2006	51	72	89
	Difference	6	7	Difference	-1	12	11
25	2017	16	34	2017	36	59	72
25	2006	12	28	2006	25	42	61
	Difference	4	6	Difference	11	17	11
10	2017	9	18	2017	23	35	43
10	2006	6	15	2006	11	18	31
	Difference	3	3	Difference	12	17	12

%iles	Grade3	F	W	S	Grade 4	F	W	S
90	2017	134	161	166	2017	153	168	184
90	2006	128	145	162	2006	145	166	180
	Difference	6	15	4	Difference	8	2	4
75	2017	104	137	139	2017	125	143	160
75	2006	99	120	137	2006	119	139	152
	Difference	5	17	2	Difference	6	4	8
50	2017	83	97	112	2017	94	120	133
50	2006	71	92	107	2006	94	112	123
	Difference	12	5	5	Difference	0	8	10
25	2017	59	79	91	2017	75	95	105
25	2006	44	62	78	2006	68	87	98
	Difference	15	17	13	Difference	7	8	7
10	2017	40	62	63	2017	60	71	83
10	2006	21	36	48	2006	45	61	72
	Difference	19	26	15	Difference	15	10	11

%iles	Grade 5	F	W	S	Grade 6	F	W	S
90	2017	179	183	195	2017	185	195	204
90	2006	166	183	194	2006	177	195	204
	Difference	13	1	1	Difference	8	0	0
75	2017	153	160	169	2017	159	166	173
75	2006	139	156	168	2006	153	167	177
	Difference	14	4	1	Difference	6	-1	-4
50	2017	121	133	146	2017	132	145	146
50	2006	110	127	139	2006	127	145	150

	Difference	11	6	7	Difference	5	5	-4
25	2017	87	109	119	2017	112	116	122
25	2006	85	99	109	2006	98	111	122
	Difference	2	10	10	Difference	14	5	0
10	2017	64	84	102	2017	89	91	91
10	2006	61	74	83	2006	68	82	93
	Difference	3	10	19	Difference	21	9	-2

Average differences in ORF for each grade level

Average differences in OPF across percentile ranges for each grade level

Difference				
Grade	Fall	Winter	Spring	Average *
1		41	30	7
2	32	61	47	9
3	57	80	39	12
4	28	30	36	6
5	43	30	38	8
6	54	18	-10	4

* Average across all percentile range values.

Hasbrouck, J. & Tindal, G. (2017). *An update to compiled ORF norms* (Technical Report No. 1702). Eugene, OR, Behavioral Research and Teaching, University of Oregon.

Reprints

You are welcome to print copies for non-commercial use, or a limited number for educational purposes, as long as credit is given to Reading Rockets and the author(s). For commercial use, please contact the author or publisher listed.

Related Topics

[Fluency](#)
[Policy, Politics, Statistics](#)

"I used to walk to school with my nose buried in a book." — Coolio