



## Curriculum-Based Measurement: Written-Expression Fluency Norms

CBM-Written Expression measures assess the mechanics and conventions of writing and can yield numeric indicators such as total words written, correctly spelled words, and correct writing sequences (Gansle et al., 2006). CBM-Written Expression probes are group-administered writing samples with an administration time of about 4 minutes.

**Total Words Written (TWW):** This measure is a count of the total words written during the CBM-WE assessment.

Grade	Fall TWW (Malecki & Jewell, 2003)	Fall: +/- 1 SD (≈16th%ile to 84th%ile)	Spring TWW (Malecki & Jewell, 2003)	Spring: +/- 1 SD (≈16th%ile to 84th%ile)	Weekly Growth (Tadatada, 2011)
1	8	3↔13	14	7↔21	0.45
2	24	14↔34	31	19↔43	0.43
3	36	23↔49	36	24↔48	0.35
4	41	30↔52	46	30↔62	0.25
5	51	34↔68	67	43↔91	--
6	44	31↔57	58	44↔72	--

**Correctly Spelled Words (CSW):** This measure is a count of correctly spelled words written during the CBM-WE assessment.

Grade	Fall CSW (Malecki & Jewell, 2003)	Fall: +/- 1 SD (≈16th%ile to 84th%ile)	Spring CSW (Malecki & Jewell, 2003)	Spring: +/- 1 SD (≈16th%ile to 84th%ile)	Weekly Growth (Tadatada, 2011)
1	5	1↔9	10	3↔17	0.45
2	20	10↔30	27	15↔39	0.46
3	32	19↔45	33	21↔45	0.37
4	38	26↔50	44	29↔59	0.26
5	48	31↔65	65	42↔88	--
6	42	29↔55	56	41↔71	--

**Correct Writing Sequences (CWS):** This measure is a tabulation of correct 'writing sequences' written during the CBM-WE assessment. One Correct Writing Sequence is scored whenever two adjacent units of writing (e.g., two words appearing next to each other) are found to be correct in their punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and syntactical and semantic usage.

Grade	Fall CWS (Malecki & Jewell, 2003)	Fall: +/- 1 SD (≈16th%ile to 84th%ile)	Spring CWS (Malecki & Jewell, 2003)	Spring: +/- 1 SD (≈16th%ile to 84th%ile)	Weekly Growth (Tadatada, 2011)
1	2	0↔4	7	1↔13	0.36
2	15	5↔25	24	11↔37	0.44
3	28	14↔42	31	18↔44	0.35
4	38	25↔51	42	26↔58	0.22
5	46	28↔64	63	40↔86	--
6	41	27↔55	54	37↔71	--



**References:**

- Gansle, K. A., VanDerHeyden, A. M., Noell, G. H., Resetar, J. L., & Williams, K. L. (2006). The technical adequacy of curriculum-based and rating-based measures of written expression for elementary school students. *School Psychology Review, 35*, 435-450.
- Malecki, C. K., & Jewell, J. (2003). Developmental, gender, and practical considerations in scoring curriculum-based measurement writing probes. *Psychology in the Schools, 40*, 379-390.
- Tadatada, A. (2011). *Growth rates of curriculum-based measurement-written expression at the elementary school level*. Unpublished master's thesis, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green.

**Reported Characteristics of Student Sample(s) Used to Compile These Norms:**

**Malecki & Jewell, 2003:** *Number of Students Assessed:* 946 Total; Grade 1: Fall:133 -Spring:123; Grade 2: Fall:200 -Spring:156; Grade 3: Fall:168 -Spring:109; Grade 4: Fall:192 -Spring:182; Grade 5: Fall:127 -Spring:120; Grade 6: Fall:57 -Spring:54/*Geographical Location:* Northern Illinois: Sample drawn from 5 suburban and rural schools across three districts/*Socioeconomic Status:* Not reported/*Ethnicity of Sample:* Not reported/*English Language Learners in Sample:* Not reported.

**Tadatada, 2011:** *Number of Students Assessed:* 1,004 Total; Grade 1: 207; Grade 2: 208; Grade 3: 204; Grade 4: 220; Grade 5: 165/*Geographical Location:* Bowling Green, KY: Sample drawn from 5 elementary schools in single district/*Socioeconomic Status:* Not reported/*Ethnicity of Sample:* 64% White; 18% African-American; 13% Hispanic; 3% Asian; 3% Other/*Limited English Proficiency in Sample:* 19%.

**Where to Find Materials:** Schools can create their own CBM Written Expression Fluency assessment materials at no cost, using the Written Expression Probe Generator, a free online application:

<http://www.interventioncentral.org/tools/writing-probe-generator>

This program allows the user to customize and to generate printable story-starter worksheets in PDF format.

**Limitations of These Research Norms:** Norms generated from small-scale research studies--like those used here--provide estimates of student academic performance based on a sampling from only one or two points in time, rather than a more comprehensive sampling across separate fall, winter, and spring screenings. These norms also have been compiled from a relatively small student sample that is not fully representative of a diverse 'national' population.

Nonetheless, norms such as these are often the best information that is publically available for basic academic skills and therefore do have a definite place in classroom instruction decision-making.

These norms can be useful in general education for setting student performance outcome goals for core instruction and/or any level of academic intervention. Similarly, these norms can be used to set performance goals for students with special needs. In both cases, however, single-sample norms would be used only if more comprehensive fall/winter/spring academic performance norms are not available.