



TEACHING READING IN BRIEF

UNPACKING READING FLUENCY

VOL. 6, NO. 2

JUNE 15, 2026

In this issue, Charlene Webster interviews Dr. Jan Hasbrouck, renowned reading researcher, consultant, and author of *Climbing the Ladder of Reading and Writing: Meeting the Needs of ALL Learners* (2025), *Conquering Dyslexia: A Guide to Early Detection and Intervention for Teachers and Families* (2020), *Reading Fluency: Understand – Assess – Teach* (2019), and *Student-Focused Coaching: The Instructional Coach's Guide to Supporting Student Success through Teacher Collaboration* (2021), among many other articles, assessments, and teaching guides.

Reading Fluency: Accuracy + Rate + Expression = Understanding Text Meaning

*An Interview with Reading Researcher
Dr. Jan Hasbrouck, PhD*

Charlene Webster: Thank you for giving us this time. We are very excited to meet with you. Your writing is so crystal clear and accessible, clearly written with teachers in mind.

Jan Hasbrouck: That's a goal of mine, to make what I'm thinking as clear as possible to my audience: teachers.

Curious Question:

How can an **infinitive verb** (such as **to run** or **to encode**) become another part of speech, such as a **noun**, **adjective** or **adverb**?

CW: *You have definitely accomplished that. We use your work. I've been following you for at least twenty years now. How did you come to be a reading researcher?*

JH: That takes me back a long way because I've been in this business a long time. My mother used to tell the story from when I was in kindergarten. I announced at the dinner table that I wanted to be a teacher. I do want to put this in context for some younger people. In my generation, there weren't vast options then. Teacher, nurse, librarian, secretary were kind of it, unless you were going to do something creative. I tried other things along the way. The specific thing that got me involved in reading was a pivotal conversation I had when I was in high school with a very tired teacher. I was a senior getting ready to graduate. I told her that I was going to university and my goal was to become a high school English teacher. I was expecting her to say, "Jan, that's wonderful, how exciting. Instead she said, you don't want to do that. I know why you are saying this. You're very good at all of this reading and writing, and you have a passion for it, but, Jan, the world does not need more English teachers. The world needs more people who can teach these kids to read. There are a lot of kids who can't access what I'm trying to teach because they simply don't read or write well enough." That planted a little seed. I didn't at that moment say, "That's what I'm going to," but I did enter elementary education and not secondary. In that process, I was very frustrated in the early 1970s about what I wasn't learning. Then I happened to experience another pivotal, life-

changing moment. I was there at the University of Oregon (Eugene) simply because that's where I grew up and I could ride my bike to class. I mentioned my frustration to a friend of mine, and she said I should go over to [Siegfried] "Zig" Engelmann, because he's recruiting for his Direct Instruction teacher program. So I did. I rode my bike to see Zig, at nineteen years old and entered his program. There, I learned all the stuff that we now call the science of reading. We didn't know everything back in the 1970s, but Zig figured out a lot of this stuff without the research. The research came along afterwards and proved that, oh, he was right – systematically designed instruction delivered explicitly – teaches children to read.

In that program, we went into schools every day, and then came back in the afternoon and studied with Zig. The classrooms were all Direct Instruction classrooms. We were supervised by people who Zig had trained. It wasn't flailing in a classroom where the [mentor] teacher wasn't very well trained. This was a very different experience. We were teaching scripted, Direct Instruction programs. This made a deep imprint on me. I stayed and got a Master's Degree with Zig. I really wanted to go into the schools and teach reading. I became a reading coach for fifteen years.

CW: Then you shifted and went into research.

JH: That was again happenstance. I didn't have this thoughtful plan. After I had been teaching as a reading specialist, it was my boss who had the idea for a change in my role. He thought it would be great to have someone in our district who could go out into all the classrooms, specifically to

help the reading specialists. Now I would understand that would be a coaching role, but I didn't have a title or training. It was just, "Go out and help the teachers." That's what sent me back to the University of Oregon, asking, "Does anybody know how this process works, of educators going into the classrooms of colleagues and helping them be better in what they're doing?" That's what connected me with Jerry Tindall. He was teaching courses in data-informed consultation and using a new set of assessment tools called Curriculum-Based Measurement, which had literally just been invented. He was part of the team from the University of Minnesota. Tindall was a brand-new, young professor, and that's what he wanted to talk about, oral reading fluency, curriculum-based measurement, and data-informed instruction. And I thought that was intriguing enough and stayed on to get my PhD, and then moved to Texas A&M University, and continued to do research. Today I'm involved in three different research projects. I work on my own, not affiliated with any university. One study is about fluency, another is a validation study of a phonics program I developed, and the other is an implementation study on the coaching program I developed in Oregon, taking place at La Trobe University in Melbourne, Australia.

CW: When you started going into the schools as a coach, were you coming up against Balanced Literacy? That was about the time it started.

JH: No, it was a little before that. It had been a Direct Instruction district when I got there. We were using what we would call a Basal program, a core program very weak in phonics. There was

some phonics in there, but it was not yet what we would call the real Balanced Literacy/Whole Language that was creeping in at the time, just not in the districts I worked with directly. Until I went to Texas. There, I saw full-blown implementation of anti-phonics, “phonics-is-bad” Balanced Literacy programs. That was an interesting time, for sure.

CW: I was in the schools in the early 80s and had the Basal experience. That didn’t feel right. For you, as Balanced Literacy took hold, was this impactful on your research?

JH: I think what I was doing at that time was not really implementation research. Working with Jerry was more on assessments. Then I became very interested in the coaching piece, looking at a model of coaching implementation. I conducted research on that in special education and psychology. For a period of quite a few years, I was not involved in researching instruction in schools. I was at Texas A&M [University] teaching and working with Master’s and Doctoral students. The undergrads were in a teacher-training program. When they took courses from me, they learned phonics and how to teach the components of reading. The National Reading Panel (2000) came afterward and emphasized these components. In my classes, I was using Carnine and Kame’enui’s (1997) book *Direct Instruction*. That was our textbook. The undergrads learned from me, and then they’d go out in the schools and say, “That’s not what’s going on in our school.” I would say you now know what to do, and you need to do it. I did not have to fight that [reading] battle in my research.

CW: How did Gerald Tindal and you develop percentile norms for reading fluency? Was that very complicated?

JH: It’s not terribly complicated. We’ve done three studies. Actually, I’m now involved with a fourth study; we are doing another round to create new norms. The original one was a little bit of new news to a lot of people. The original procedure of Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) that I learned from Jerry was simply a protocol for doing these assessments. They had validated the procedure of listening to a student read for one minute using unpracticed materials, the scoring system, and the calculations for one minute. They said, use that information to guide your decisions. Of course you need some norms and benchmarks. At first, the thinking was to use this procedure and create norms for your own school. I said, Jerry, that doesn’t make any sense. At that time, I had been working in schools for about fifteen years, and I said, “In every school I’ve ever worked in, because they were all Title I schools, were low-performing schools. I don’t want to know the benchmarks for my students. I need a bigger picture if this is going to be meaningful to me.” He said that was a good idea; let’s do a national study.

The first national study that we did [in the late 80s] included just a few thousand students from second to fifth grade because no one was doing ORF. We reached out to folks in Minnesota, where ORF was originally used. We had some projects going on in Oregon. We had other people who had heard of this brand-new thing called Oral Reading Fluency who were willing to give their data to us. We had 20,000 or 30,000 scores.

Those were the very first norms. We had a great deal of difficulty getting them published, years actually. We did the study in the late 80s. We didn't get it published until 1992 because no one had heard about it. They were asking, "What in the world are you doing, testing students for one minute?" Nobody was interested. Then it was published. Then, between 1992 and 2006, when we did our second study, the world had discovered Oral Reading Fluency. Good and Kaminski had created DIBELS (1996), the first commercial product with ORF. That was a much larger study with a quarter of a million scores from 1st through 8th grade. Now ORF is just a part of what most elementary schools do around the world. In 2017, our study included six million students. I have no idea how large this new one will be.

But the original included lots of passages. That's the difference between DIBELS, Acadience, Aimsweb, and FastBridge. Those norms are created from specific passages. That's why I always say that if you're using one of these assessment systems, you should use their norms. Ours were created originally because there were no other norms at all. We were talking to people who were creating their own materials. That's why we called it Curriculum-based Measures (CBM), because you use your own curriculum to make these assessments. Nowadays, I think these still have value because people will be using the assessment systems, but they sometimes want their students to read materials outside of those assessments. How well do students do when reading the textbooks actually used in our classroom? Recently, the Aimsweb folks did a re-norming. They went significantly down. I was contacted by many, many people who were saying, "Oh my gosh! Kids who were in intervention are now doing fine, and they're not fine. What should we do?" I said well, our norms, the most recent set was in 2017, was pre-COVID. You could look at our norms, which do represent a real, true average that is passage-agnostic, if you will, because it's compiled. I suggested they use this as a secondary way to judge their own student's performance.

CW: A fellow special educator wanted me to ask you about assessing older students. We don't have norms for high school. We're talking about students who read at a very low elementary level. In special education, we live in the world of norms and percentiles. Can he use these passages and the Hasbrouck norms to get the percentile?

"You're very good at all of this reading and writing, and you have a passion for it, but, Jan, the world does not need more English teachers. The world needs more people who can teach these kids to read. There are a lot of kids who can't access what I'm trying to teach because they simply don't read or write well enough."

- Jan Hasbrouck, quoting her senior English teacher, who encouraged her to major in reading

JH: Yes. Or he can use the materials from his own classroom. The 2006 and 2017 studies are passage agnostic. The 50th percentile starts to level out in the spring of 5th grade at around 150 Words Correct Per Minute. After reaching this, we don't read faster, faster, faster. Skillful readers continue to read more and more difficult text, but they're able to keep up with that 150 to 170 WCPM. That's what our colleagues in middle school and high school should be aiming for on grade-level text. But when we're looking at students in intervention, say a tenth grader who's reading at fifth-grade material, that's a different kind of judgment. If we want to say, "How are they doing?" "What is their fluency, their automaticity?" We're not really measuring their fluency, but their automaticity, which is hugely important. Words Correct Per Minute is automaticity. For the tenth grader reading at the fifth-grade level, the teacher gets some material for fifth grade, and then you can look at the Hasbrouck and Tindall 5th-grade norms. That way, you could say that the student has the level of automaticity for which he reads. Then the teacher's goal is to try to close that gap. For that student, if he can read that [5th-grade] material with sufficient automaticity and fluency, expression, and all that, I would cheer for that, but the focus should not be on rate. The focus should be on the student reading more complex text. That would be the shift in my focus.

CW: That clears up our question. You want to be clear in meetings on student performance. Moving to another question: What did you intend the norms to be used for?



JH: Originally, here's some idea on how to interpret Words Correct Per Minute. Now you can still do that. If you have EasyCBM, Acadience or another assessment system, you can use those passages, norms, and benchmarks. You can still use ours for reading other materials or as a backup or alternative.

CW: I think it's helpful in meetings because we get the percentile. The other fluency that we get is a benchmark or proficient, and this doesn't mean that much to people compared to the 25th or 50th percentile. On another topic: the definition of reading fluency. You did a webinar for The Stern Center here in Vermont and got into the definition then. Would you share this with our readers?

JH: The definition that I use, I had developed with Deb Glaser. She and I had written a book about Oral Reading Fluency. In preparation for the book, we did a lot of exploration on other people's definitions of fluency, and we incorporated what everyone else included – accuracy, rate, and expression – but we were very deliberate in putting accuracy first in our definition. It does not always appear there. We also tried to be careful in saying that the definition is passage fluency, because we can and should use the word **fluency** with word fluency, letter fluency, or sound fluency. We're specifically talking about reading text. We say that what you're looking for are three components with the qualifying standards: reasonable accuracy, appropriate rate, and with suitable expression. But we're not done with our definition. We went on to say that this should lead to deep and accurate comprehension, because

that's the point of fluency. We do not care that you're fluent, reading accurately, and at an appropriate rate if you don't understand. The prosody or expression part of this is interesting. The researchers say that you can't have suitable expression unless you are comprehending. Suitable expression is an outcome of comprehension in many ways. In our definition, we say if you are truly fluent, it leads to, but it doesn't guarantee comprehension.

In our definition, we also included motivation. We did this not because of research that clearly connected fluency and motivation, but in our own clinical practice. We have yet to see a student who struggles with fluency and who is one of those highly motivated readers. We have no idea how to create motivated readers, but helping them be skillful is one necessary part of motivation. Then we define those terms. What do we mean by reasonably accurate? At least 95%. There is some newer research that shows a reader really needs to be closer to 98% accuracy. Accuracy means that you not only correctly identify the word, but you know what it means. There are some kids who can read words, who are "word callers," but they get to the end of the sentence or paragraph, and they really don't know what they've read. As a reader, you have to identify the word correctly, recognize it correctly, and know what it means or its basic function [such as an adjective]. In reasonable accuracy, we cite our study (Hasbrouck and Tindall, 2017) as well as other studies that say reasonable is in the 50th to 75th percentile. For some exceptional comprehenders, they may even be a little bit beyond the 75th percentile, but there's real clear evidence that the

50th percentile minimum needs to be there. There's a range that's reasonable.

Appropriate expression is making the text sound like speech. You're reflecting the understanding, and that's coming out in the fluidity, the tone, the volume, the emphasis, the pausing. Deb and I acknowledge that fluency is a complex outcome. It is not a skill, like to know your ABCs or to blend sounds. It is a complex outcome. If you look at Scarborough's Rope (2001), fluency is visualized as that tightly woven nub right at the end. It is a complex outcome of all those components, all the reading pieces, all the language pieces. All of them need to be strategically implemented, as it says on the Rope, and increasingly automatic. That's how you get passage – reading fluency. That's not practiced by having students read the text fast; that's not fluency.

CW: Slowly in Vermont, we are moving towards evidence-aligned instruction. We pushed a literacy bill through. Students need to be assessed. Parents need to be informed of the results. Students need to have intervention, if that is what's indicated. Here's my question: In a K-1 or K-2 classroom, what would poor reading fluency or strong reading fluency look like? For example, they're not reading passages yet.

JH: No, but in kindergarten, we're laying the foundation. Deb Glaser and I really try to emphasize the accuracy piece. So many people are thinking about the rate piece, which is relevant, but it's not relevant if you don't have a foundation of accuracy. We start with accuracy at all the stages. Our goal is to get every reader to the tightly woven nub on Scarborough's Rope.

We know from Wolf and Katzir-Cohen in 2001, who reminded us that the only way to get to passage reading fluency is to start early and lay down the foundation, which is accuracy and rate, which is automaticity. Wolf and Cohen say this starts at the letter level, the word level, the phrase level. And when we get to sentences, we bring in the semantic and syntactic issues. But we work on accuracy and automaticity all along the way. In the book Deb and I wrote, she came up with the framework to make this applicable in preschool and first grade, and all the way along. Her framework for instruction, when fluency is the goal (and remember this is also comprehension), her framework is called "Triple A." You teach any literacy lesson, which includes three things in this order: Accuracy, Automaticity, Access Meaning. Good fluency instruction in kindergarten would be letter name, letter sound, and the word level. Let's learn accurately, then automatically, and then let's, as soon as we can, put it into something that has meaning. Letter **M**. That's the sound that you hear in **mom** and **McDonalds, monkey**. Triple A. Same with words, then get them into simple sentences as soon as possible. **The dog is big**. Accuracy first. By the end of first grade, we like to see students read one word per second accurately, and know what that means. When I see teachers emphasizing speed, that's a concern. At every level, Triple A. Every letter, word, and sentence, Triple A. We do this at the speed possible. There are some children who are ready to read text more fluently and deserve the chance to do that. They should not be stuck in a group where everyone else is still sounding out the word, though those children need these opportunities to sound out the word.

The biggest mistake I see across the board is the emphasis on speed, and sacrificing accuracy for that, or thinking speed is the goal, when the goal is always accessing meaning.

CW: *There are phases of automaticity that should be guiding us.*

JH: I really think that Tim Shanahan is onto something. He has a new book out, *Leveled Readers, Leveled Lives* (2025), which is just excellent. The point in the book, a point he has been making for a long time, is that once students are established readers, we need to be teaching them in complex text. Teaching them at the instructional level is very appropriate and necessary at the early stages, when they're still trying to figure it out. But once they're established readers, and for the majority of kids this would be at the middle to end of second grade, we need to make a shift and start teaching them. That is the point of his book. What does this look like? It's not saying, "Here, you now can read at a third-grade level, so here's a fifth-grade level book, go read it on your own." No, Shanahan is saying, high five – that's great, you can read at a third-grade level. I'm going to teach you how to read more complex text, sentence-by-sentence, paragraph-by-paragraph. If you break that down, what does that look like? Triple A. We're going to break down that complex sentence together. First is accuracy. Can you read it? Can you recognize all the words? Can you say them? Do you know what they mean? Great. Now let's read it with a little more automaticity. We're going to do this at the sentence level and the paragraph level. We talk about why this sentence is complex. What's that

pronoun referring to? What's being inferred here? We teach that to children and do that early. We really should be doing that for the majority of children starting in third grade.

CW: We were asking about fluency instruction for all students in the Tier I classroom, and whether all students benefit. If we read Shanahan's book, we learn that we move this up a notch.

JH: We move it up a notch in instruction. We have to teach that. His book does a good job. That's the instruction I would be looking for along the way. And once they can read that, Lane and her colleagues (2009) wrote a beautiful statement about teaching fluency – they said that it is sufficient, systematic, explicit instruction, but accompanied by carefully orchestrated practice. You need two things: the instruction and the practice. Working hard in complex text, students build those reading muscles. They should have some time to practice. I am really grateful looking at practice materials. I'm looking at what Freddy Hiebert is doing with her text project. She is churning out books that are free on Textproject.com, churning out texts that are highly engaging, nonfiction pieces that are fascinating to kids, and give them motivation to practice reading. She has written a whole series of books, each one a little different, but they're all using basically the same vocabulary, syntax, and semantic structures. The kids are getting superb practice. They think they're reading different things, which they are, but they're building solid fluency skills during the instruction. They're building their reading muscle by giving them more challenging text. The combination of Lane et al, were really onto something. To truly be fluent,

with carefully orchestrated practice. Carefully orchestrated practice is going to get you to fluency.

CW: How effective are technology-based programs for reading fluency, such as ReadNaturally and ReadLive?

JH: I am a big fan of those two programs and have been so for many decades. Before it was electronic, I did some research on it and found that it was very effective and highly motivating for students. This is meant to be an intervention program, with one teacher and approximately six students at a time, where the students are carefully placed into an appropriate level, and a goal is set for them by the teacher. Then the students are taught the protocol using the materials so they can, in fact, do most of the practice independently. It's not meant to put a student in front of a computer to go through on their own. Once a student is quite skillful in their fluency, they could move forward independently, but these were designed to be an intervention program with careful guidance and administration by the teacher. Monitoring students, the last I had heard, was one teacher for six students. According to the protocol, the student can do all their practice on their own, but cannot go on to the next story until the teacher has checked them out and passed them. One student would be at this stage; another would be at that stage. With six students, the teacher does the checkout with one, "OK, you're good. Go onto the next one," and then moves onto the next student. I get concerned always when I see the endless creativity of teachers who can take programs and use them in various ways.

"The biggest mistake I see across the board is the emphasis on speed, and sacrificing accuracy for that, or thinking speed is the goal, when the goal is always accessing meaning." – Jan Hasbrouck

I can't imagine a student who simply just needs practice. *ReadLive* might be an opportunity for guided practice. It is one of the most widely studied interventions. Students do a significant amount of repeated reading, and it works within that protocol because there are mechanisms to motivate students. Freddy Hebert just did a fabulous webinar for a Washington (State) group. It's available and free on our website, [ReadWa.org](https://www.readwa.org). The webinar is about how she built the materials using AI for a series of stories and other passages for students to read that have so much similarity that students are really doing repeated reading. These are different passages, but so carefully controlled that it gets the same benefit of repeated reading, and perhaps more benefit because it's more motivating. Kids are reading different stories, but the vocabulary, syntax, and semantics are the same. It's brilliant and on our website right now for free.

CW: We started a Literacy Lab in Bennington, VT at Mount Anthony High School 26 years ago, which continues today with the same practice I use with the little ones I'm teaching now. All of these routines are extremely important.

JH: It's the only way to get to that tightly woven rope. It is all the language pieces and all the word-recognition pieces. To read fluently, you need accuracy, first, foremost, and forever. You need automaticity. And you need expression that shows that you've connected the text to meaning. It doesn't matter what the age is. The oldest person I have taught to read was seventy-two. It matters how old they are because you need to be respectful of their age. They're not six years old; they're

older. That's another thing I love about Text Project, because she has many texts at many different levels. But you have to be able to read the words accurately. It starts at the letter level, the word level, the phrase level. We would do that with a seventy-two-year-old, an eighteen-year-old, or a twelve-year-old. We always build on what they already know. Older students already have learned a lot, but the problem is, a lot of what they have learned has been learned incorrectly. They have orthographically mapped a lot of really important words incorrectly. So we work back. We start with decoding to rewire the brain. We do decoding and encoding together. We do it, we see it, we say it, we write it. At the end of the day, we want to get them into the text. We do word work and vocabulary work, but we want to get them as much into the text, hopefully motivating text, as much as possible. The biggest mistake I see across the board is the emphasis on speed, and sacrificing accuracy for that, or thinking speed is the goal, when the goal is always accessing meaning.

CW: What about graphic novels?

JH: Oh, why not? A steady idea of only graphic novels is not going to build up that stamina. But if a student has motivation to engage in text in any way, I say yes. But just like in our nutritious eating diet, there's nothing wrong with cake and ice cream once in a while. But that's our job, making sure we bring in other things to build that stamina, vocabulary, and all the other skills. If they just want to read for pleasure and that's what they want to read, God bless them.

CW: What message would you like to share with educators about reading fluency? Perhaps this is with administrators or higher education faculty.

JH: The teachers of the future are very important. The National Reading Panel was right to include fluency as one of the key components of reading. The challenge for educators across the levels is defining fluency by itself. But it doesn't work by itself. It works in combination with phonemic awareness and phonics and, most important, comprehension. Fluency is only important as a support to comprehension and motivation. The goal is not to be "fluent," but to have sufficient fluency to comprehend the text that is being read. Fluency includes text comprehension and the motivation to read. But our instruction should connect all the components of fluency – accuracy, automaticity, expression – we need to connect this to comprehension all the time. We do this through Triple A. Remember that fluency is very important, but only because of its connection to comprehension.

CW: Is it accurate to say that fluency is an indicator that there might be a problem?

JH: Yes, the newest definition of dyslexia from the International Dyslexia Association highlights the reading speed. People with dyslexia often have difficulty with the speed aspect of reading. I would have preferred they hadn't used the word "speed," but there it is. A slow rate of retrieval (or identification) is a characteristic of dyslexia, but it's also a manifestation of weak reading. Strong reading is accuracy, automaticity, and accessing meaning. Yes, poor fluency is an indicator of concern, and the remediation is pretty straightforward.

CW: It's really not debatable anymore.

JH: It's really not debatable anymore. People who want to debate it may say it's not just fluency,

because they're thinking that fluency is just fast reading. I agree with them; it's not just about fast reading, it's about accuracy, automaticity, and accessing meaning. If we think of that as fluency, then it's not debatable.

Some researchers state that consensus research says the absolute bottom line is 95%. That's a high bottom line. Others have said it needs to be 98% to fully comprehend. I want to thank everybody who does this incredibly valuable, incredibly challenging, hard work of teaching children. It can be joyful, wonderful, exhilarating, motivating, but it's hard, hard work. I'm just so grateful to everyone who works in every aspect of education who sticks with it, because it's life-changing for students.

CW: Your focus on fluency is critical, and yet, I don't know how to fit in everything to teach decoding, vocabulary, and sentence structure.

JH: We need to get students into text as early as possible. We are spending too much time on Word Work. Sometimes we don't even talk about comprehending text until third grade! No, no! If you listen to Maryann Wolf, we start at the letter level and the word level to get to meaning. This thing that we're doing is getting to meaning, and we get there as quickly as we can. I used to think that we can't get there until we get to words, but I have watched really little kids get to meaning. I saw a two-year-old saying, "L – that's Lulu, that's my dog." This student is getting it. The letters on the page are communicating something. That's the only reason. Let's get comprehension in there. Triple A – Accuracy, Automaticity, Access Meaning – is the way to do it. It's a real game changer.

CW: We've got to teach these kids through Triple A, before they get to the minors and majors. Thank you so much!

Answer to this issue's Curious Question

When a verb is used as another part of speech, it becomes a **verbal**. A verbal is a word that combines the characteristics of a verb with those of a noun or adjective. The three verbals are the **infinitive**, **gerund**, and **participle**. These three sentences show an infinitive used as a different part of speech.

1. When it came to showbusiness, to wait seemed unnecessary to Elizabeth Taylor's parents.

To wait is the subject before the verb **seemed**, so the infinitive works as the subject (noun).

2. As a child actress, Taylor learned to act on the job.

To act describes **learned** (a verb), so the infinitive works as an adverb.

3. Taylor did not shy away from controversy and showed the strength to withstand criticism.

To withstand describes **strength** (a noun), so the infinitive works as an adjective.

References

Carmine, B., Silbert, J., & Kameenui, E. J. (1997). *Direct instruction reading* (3rd ed.). Merrill/Prentice Hall.

EasyCBM. (2026). Curriculum Based Measurement. <https://easycbm.com>

Gray, J. S., Warnock, A. N., Good, R. H., III, and Powell-Smith, K. A. (2021). Acadience Reading K–6 national norms (Technical Report No. 32). Acadience Learning Inc.

Hasbrouck, J. & Glaser, D. (2019). *Reading fluency: Understand – Assess – Teach*. Benchmark Education.

Hasbrouck, J. & Tindall, G. (2017). Fluency norms chart (2017 update).

<https://www.readingrockets.org/topics/fluency/articles/fluency-norms-chart-2017-update>

Lane, H. B., Pullen, P. C., Hudson, R. F. & Konold, T. R. (2009). Identifying essential instructional components of literacy tutoring for struggling beginning readers. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 48, 277–297. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ856831>

ReadNaturally. (2026). Read Naturally Live. <https://www.readnaturally.com/product/read-naturally-live>

ReadWashington. (2026). Website. <https://readwa.org>

Scarborough, H. S. (2001). Connecting early language and literacy to later reading (dis)abilities: Evidence, theory, and practice. In S. Neuman & D. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook for research in early literacy* (pp. 97-110). Guilford.

TextProject. (2026). TopicReads™ – Knowledge Building Texts for Middle School
<https://textproject.org/free-texts/middle-school/topicreads>

University of Oregon, Center on Teaching and Learning. (2020). 8th edition of Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS®): Administration and scoring guide.

Wolf, M. & Katzir-Cohen, T. (2001). Reading fluency and its intervention. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 5, 211-239. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1207/S1532799XSSR0503_2



Jan Hasbrouck, Ph.D.

Jan Hasbrouck, Ph.D. is an award-winning researcher, educational consultant, and author who works with schools and agencies in the U.S. and internationally. Dr. Hasbrouck worked as a reading specialist and literacy coach for 15 years and later became a professor. Her research in reading fluency, academic assessment and interventions, and instructional coaching has been widely published. She is the author, coauthor, and co-editor of several books along with some assessment tools. She continues to collaborate with researchers and school colleagues on projects related to reading interventions, assessment, and instructional coaching. She enjoys volunteering at her grandson's K-8 school in Seattle.

Meet the Writer and Editors

Arlington resident **Charlene Webster** has taught grades 3-6, special education, and structured literacy in southwestern Vermont over her 40-year career. In 2004, Charlene earned her M.S.Ed in Language and Literacy from Simmons College, a program grounded in the science of reading. At Mount Anthony Union High School in Bennington, she and two fellow graduates of Simmons College created a Literacy Lab to assess, diagnose, and provide intervention for struggling readers. Since retiring in 2020, Charlene now provides literacy consultation and advocacy, and continues to teach people of all ages to read.



Dorinne Dorfman, Ed.S., Ed.D., A/OGA, has served as a teacher and principal for nearly 30 years in Vermont schools. After completing her undergraduate studies at Goddard College, she earned her Master's and Doctorate in Educational Leadership at the University of Vermont. As a postdoctoral Fulbright Scholar, she taught at the Technical University of Berlin and conducted research on democratic education in Germany. Since completing an Education Specialist Degree in Reading and Literacy Instruction at Bay Path University, Dr. Dorfman teaches evidence-aligned literacy at Barre Town Middle School.

Dr. Brenda Warren has been studying and evaluating reading instruction for the past 20 years through three different lenses: as a pediatrician, school board member, and parent of a now-adult son with dyslexia. Her main interest has been examining how districts can overcome barriers preventing scientific reading research from fully impacting classroom practice, with a goal of ensuring that academic equity is present in our schools. In 2010, her work led her to pursue a doctorate in Education Leadership to study this topic in more depth. She graduated with her PhD in 2018. Her dissertation title is: *Closing the Science-to-Practice Gap for Reading Instruction: A Case Study of Two Schools Transitioning from Balanced Literacy to Scientifically Based Reading Instruction*.

