







		Bei	nchmarks	& Norms		
fast tools	Benchmarks and Norms					
Welcome page My password Training Student Passwords Student Login Access Downloads	Download Use & Interpretation Guid Benchmarks [-] Norm I. Solect Assessment: aReading AUTOreading	, (+)	CBMeComp - Question 🦓	© earlyReading Spanish ⊙ aMath	© CBMMath CAP ^{↓⊄} © earlyMath	Generate PDF
Benchmarks & Norms Contact Us Progress monitoring	CBMreading English CBMeComp - Recall SAEBRS MySAEBRS MySAEBRS LXSEC Grade Level:		COMPefficiency earlyReading English	CBMmath Automaticity CBMmath Process	DEVMilestones REACT	
Switch view to District Manager Teacher	BKG BONE INTERENT BONE INTERENT	FOUR	FIVE SIX SEVEN EIGHT	BMR-English		Submit
Report Selection Certification Compliance	Grade	Metric	Risk Level	Fall	Winter	Spring
	тwo	Rate	College Pathway Some Risk High Risk	>= 85.0 < 58.0 < 30.0	>= 115.0 < 87.0 < 61.0	>= 130.0 < 106.0 < 79.0
Tip box			Print this out for you	grade level team.		



Benchmarks & Norms

Print this out for your grade level team.

(G 🔲	ONE TWO	THREE FOU		X SEVEN	EIGHT							
												Submit
					Norms - C	BMR-English	: TWO					
		Screening Scores		Seasonal	Score Differences by	Percentile		Aggregate		Stu	dent Growth Percen	tiles
		Rate			Weekly Growth			Weekly Growth			Weekly Growth	
%	Fall	Winter	Spring	Fall-Winter	Winter-Spring	Fall-Spring	Fall-Winter	Winter-Spring	Fall-Spring	F-W Mean	W-S Mean	F-S Mean
95th	123	147	163	1.39	0.93	1.16	2.66	2.19	2.02	1.32	0.76	0.85
90th	112	139	152	1.56	0.76	1.16	2.44	1.98	1.89	1.48	0.79	0.91
85th	104	132	146	1.62	0.82	1.22	2.28	1.81	1.79	1.59	0.82	0.95
80th	97	126	140	1.68	0.82	1.25	2.14	1.67	1.70	1.67	0.87	0.99
75th	90	120	135	1.74	0.88	1.31	2.02	1.55	1.63	1.76	0.93	1.02
70th	85	115	130	1.74	0.88	1.31	1.90	1.44	1.56	1.81	0.98	1.05
65th	80	110	126	1.74	0.93	1.34	1.80	1.34	1.49	1.85	1.04	1.08
60th	75	105	122	1.74	0.99	1.37	1.70	1.24	1.43	1.88	1.09	1.11
55th	70	100	118	1.74	1.05	1.39	1.61	1.15	1.37	1.90	1.14	1.14
50th	67	96	114	1.68	1.05	1.37	1.51	1.06	1.31	1.91	1.17	1.17
45th	63	92	109	1.68	0.99	1.34	1.42	0.97	1.25	1.91	1.18	1.22
40th	58	87	106	1.68	1.11	1.39	1.33	0.88	1.19	1.93	1.20	1.24
35th	53	84	101	1.79	0.99	1.39	1.24	0.78	1.12	1.96	1.20	1.29
30th	47	79	96	1.85	0.99	1.42	1.14	0.68	1.06	2.02	1.19	1.33
25th	42	73	91	1.79	1.05	1.42	1.03	0.58	0.99	2.06	1.18	1.38
20th	36	67	86	1.79	1.11	1.45	0.91	0.47	0.92	2.08	1.17	1.43
15th	30	61	79	1.79	1.05	1.42	0.78	0.35	0.83	2.03	1.18	1.49
10th	23	52	69	1.68	0.99	1.34	0.62	0.20	0.73	1.83	1.24	1.55
5th	17	40	59	1.33	1.11	1.22	0.43	0.00	0.60	1.52	1.32	1.57
M	67.16	95.85	112.49	1.68	0.97	1.33	1.53	1.08	1.31			
SD	31.98	31.76	30.73	0.13	0.10	0.09	0.67	0.65	0.43			
N	91125	93232	91738	19	19	19	36970	38592	35486			



Tier 1: Core	In what way did the % of students IN NEED OF HELP in the area of reading (% of "high risk" students + % of "some risk" students) change from Fall to Winter? Depending on your grade level, you will be examining earlyReading. OR both CBMR-English and aReading to make this determination. Remember, if greater than 20% - 30% of students are in need of an intervention, there may be a need for a grade-level or classrom-level (Tier 1) intervention.
Tier 1 Plan Evaluation	"high risk" decreased! More of our students were at or above benchmark! HOORAY!
Using reports within FastBridge (Impact Report), we will now review our Winter Screening data and evaluate the success of our plan.	K-1: In the area of earlyReading, the overall % of students at "some risk" + "high risk' remained stable, but a smaller % of students were at "high risk".
Review Impact Report Data (earlyReading or CBMR and	K-1: In the area of earlyReading, the overall % of students at "some risk" + "high risk" increased. Fewer students met the expected benchmark.
aReading)	2-5: In the area of CBMR, the overall % of students at 'some risk' + 'high risk' decreased! More of our students were at or above benchmark! HOORAY!
Impact Report	2-5: In the area of CBMR, the overall % of students at "some risk" + "high risk" remained stable, but a smaller % of students were at "high risk".
Excludes by rais bands (1) R M W W B (1) (2) (3) (4) (4) (4) (5) (5) (5) (5) (5) (5) (5) (5	2-5: In the area of CBMR, the overall % of students at "some risk" + "high risk" increased. Fewer students met the expected benchmark.
Fail Late Fail Writer	2-5: In the area of aReading, the overall % of students at "some risk" + "high risk" decreased! More of our students were at or above benchmark!
N Patty Jensen Patty Jensen Patty Jensen N Karl Murray Karl Murray	HOORAY!
N Ananta Kimon - Ananta Kimon - Ananta Kimon N Jama Maanta - Santa Kilanzan - Jaria Kalanza	2-5: In the area of aReading, the overall % of students at "some risk" + "high risk" remained stable, but a smaller % of students were at "high risk".
	2-5: In the area of aReading, the overall % of students at "some risk" + "high





	Imp	oact Re	port				
Know you goals. Know your impact.	Desegupts (spices Beind to take a Ar Board Beind Tabert to real way to Barrie a second Barrie a second		Bemographic Options Bellich t Al Students Selected	to graphical view		Sont Aspacemently	
 Current Achievement Figure Table 	ante ta siubidi		Dudet Narw	Fait 40.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0	Wither 80.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0 40.0	5xrrg	



Group Screening		Demographic Options Henrik All Doalers Seasord Henrik						
	Student Name	101	Composite Score	toring	Cost :	Weter Per	centile Rank District a	Nationality is
		58	87		99	92		
Know your population.		45	15		я		87	
		37	67		•	۰	n	
		51	67					ч
Benchmarks		40	04					
		40	50		71 65	63	62	4
 Decisions about core 		27 1	a !		3			20
✓ % below BM		27 1	at 1		53	47	4	31
		32 1	ao !		ø	45	4	29
		35	a !		41	37	44	27
Norms		35	41		ю	31	a	25
		28.1	a !		а	34	a	25
 Local: School) 		30 1	41 11		н	n	я	
Tier assignments		20 1	40 II		12	12	25	
Tier 1, Tier 1+, Tier 2		24 []	40 11		12	12	25	
✓ Local: Class/Group)		25 11	35 II		1	2	16	5
Differentiated instruction	Group Average	20 11	55 II 54.28			,	16	,
	Group Median	33.50	50.50					
 ✓ National ♦ Similar to benchmark 	Group Standard Deviation	8.40	15.21					
Similar to benchmark	Group Min	24.00	35.00					
*	Group Max	58.00	87.00					







Growth Report					
Know you goals.	el Ocale D1				
Know your impact.	Newsy Orserved Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand, Brand,				
 Monthly or Weekly Merely a difference in scale 12 inches vs. 1 foot 30 days vs 1 month 	1.60 1.61 9.64 1.61 9.50 9.50 9.70 9.70 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.				
 Percentiles are unchanged 	1.44 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4				



		Winter Tier 1 Pro	blem Analys	is - Universal In	struction
Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) Data-Based Decision-Making Tool for Elementary Grade-Level Teams Wint Ter 1 - Public Analysis The Time Develop data all to forme assimilate planning frame is a seaf for Development of the seaf and the third well well be the plant in the seaf and the Development of the seaf and the seaf and the seaf of the seaf and the seaf and the seaf and the seaf and the seaf of the seaf and the Development of the seaf and the seaf and the seaf of the seaf and the Development of the seaf and the seaf and the seaf of the seaf and the Seaf and Analysis of the impact Report Data (seaf)Reading or	The suspected reason for the problem (in terms of instructional strategies and needs) based on Winter Screening data: Based on the Screening to Intervention report, what area of need seems to be the greases concern in your classroom/grade level? (The report can be sorted by intervention need by clicking on that column header). Accuracy (students are still acquiring the skill, and are making many mistakes) Automaticity (students are working on fluency; they are making fewer mistakes, but responses are not automatic) Accuracy + Automaticity (students are still making some mistakes and are not fast in their responses)	the problem may be occ Remember to use data t Teacher and Learning te district leadership better Based on your te	urring that are rela support your ide an at the District understand your am's discuss lems at the le n that may re This is not a problem for our team. We are	ted to some aspect un as. Your responses wi doucation Center in or needs and the needs or ion this Winter, evel of universal quire system-le This is a problem for or team that we can address through our	II be shared with the der to help the school and if the students you serve. to what extent did reading instruction
CBMR and sheading)	Broad Reading/Generalization (students are working on generalization of their reading skills; are fairly accurate and fluent) Other:	Curriculum Our curriculum does not seem to match the reading needs of our students, and does not focus on the necessary content in the way that we would prefer.	area!	process.	area.
Comparing a second		Instruction We are not consistently using startegies that have been proven to be effective based on the students, we may need to adjust the time spent on aspects of reading instruction, and we may need to reaxamine our fiexible grouping practices.	0	۲	0
Year answer Review Screening to Intervention Data - Reading Screening To		Assessment We are not consistently using universal screening data and formative assessment data to inform our instruction.	۲	0	0
		If you identified o for your team this Your answer BACK NE	s Winter, plea		s an area of need lout your concerns: Page 16 of 25

	Scre	enin	ig-to-	In	iter	νe	en	Itl	on				and the second	
			<u> </u>										and the second sec	Par Service
		(Demographic Opt	iona)										-	La mai a
~	Destfile	At Students: Selecter	1										1	La sera di
	Profile	Add to group			erer PM Group			Interne	E D Winter	12105/2018 - U10	sussit/ a	Ga ×		ta mara a
~	Curriculum Level	Studient Name DAG	C AUTO BRO Lettle L		Interventing the	vention		indution PW	Measure (Co.	Ourrent PN	V Groups Macomm	and and	1	1. e e e.
	Curriculum Level	1	L H (31) (462) 87-237 L M	Grade 2	ACC	- [7]	Det.	-171	CBMweling	12 :		1.44		and the second
\geq	Inst. Need	0	4%) (27) (437) ¹³⁷⁴ H M ma	Prime Gradu 2	ACC	- [7]	The T	- [7]	CSWeetry					1 88 Sec 218 - 18
	Inst. Need	L	L M BR (51) (51) (400)	Prime	ACC	-171			[7] CSWeatry	18 19106 (4.0			1	Lower of
	Local Intervention	5	L M BR (5) (20) (440)	Grade 1	ACC	- 191	Tie 1	- [9]	Cliffording	171120 (4.1)	97 - 17	144		1
	Local Intervention	L	L M BH	Grada 1	ACC	- 171	18e2	Wiekly	COVeeday	(H1) (4.0	η	10		a bit set the re-
	Tier	1. (#	L M (417) (417)	Paner.	ACC	- [7]	The 2	Winddy	CSI/heathy	(*11)) (4.1)	0	-	Territoria Constanti Francisco da	i a terra
	TICI .	(H (B	H H 105-345 H H	Grade 2	ONLINK	-13	Tier 1	-171	17) 17]	8 :	5			
	Monitoring	0	L M DR	Grade 1	ON-THE ACC	-171	Det.		affeeding [7]	H	-	10	17	Brakel of the same
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	н	9%) (20) (408) 9% H H 9%1 (20) (477) 240-338		ON-THR.	-171	Tiet.		CSWeeding .	0 -	-			
	 Assessment 	L	L M (21) (477) (25) (28) (428)	Prime	ACC	-19	The 14	Martilly	CSMwatru .	ui i	2			and Relation and the second
	✓ Goal	14 (3	L M (81 4%) (01) (445)	Grade 1	ACC	- [9]	Ter 1	-19	CSW-entry			1.00	100	A Role of Street Street Street
		0	L M (2%) (16) (441) (2% M M	Grade 1	ACC ACC-	-131			CSMweling .		-		-	A annual () and the state of th
	 Current 	n (B	1%) (42) (443) ⁽²⁾⁴ H H 199-333	Grade 1 Grade 2	AUTO ON-THK	-17	The 1		Collineating .	14	-			
	Instructional Match	H	201 (M) (404		ON-THM	- 171	Ter.1		111 interesting	12 -		1.00		244
		H	H H 1/7-327 (25) (25) (4/1)	Grade 2	09-198	-13	Ter.1	- [2]	albeeting [7]	8 35	-			. Interna
~	Matched Goals	Add to group	4	Edit (New 1981 Group			Interval:	D Witter S	uevin - anteren	2017 a	Gia e)		e ante las est tan las i an a mignission









Scie	ening-to-Intervention	Teach Teac Training
		And A Contract of the Second S
	Denographic Optione	
N Due file	At Studets Selded	A Law sector and a
Profile	Add to group Edit New PM Group Intervet: Weiser: State: Weiser: State: Core Core Core	
	Sources allesting / CBWreating Studies Ners BLCC AUTO (SRD Lesie L Gee Intervention Ter IPM Measure Cold Other Recommendations	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1
Curriculum Level	L L H S1227 Grade 2 4CC - [7] Ter 1 - [7] C23/Weshing 3.5 0	a sector and an an art
	L L M and David and the last the contraction of	A Second Second
	H H M and Annual and	and the second s
Inst. Need	(475) (59) (450) [7]	Lin we want
	(05) (5) (40)	Lan will a w
	(and (a) (40)	CANADA AND A AND AND AND AND AND AND AND
Local Intervention	(1276) (22) (441) BM Grada 1 ACC - (7) Tar 2 Weekly C2/Weeklys 1.5 (11) - II	2. State American and
	L L M BH Phme ACC -17 Ter 2 Weeky CBM-matrix 15 (*101.(4.0) - 0	WING OF A CONTRACT OF A CONTRA
	(H H H H 185-345 Grade 2 016-1146 - [7] Ter 1 - [7] stbading 0 0 (08%) (48) (4/2) 125-345 Grade 2 016-1146 - [7] Ter 1 - [7] 12]	
Tier	H H H H 287-417 Grade 3 ON-1795 - (7) Ter 1 - (7) effecting g 0	and the second s
	L L M DR Phree ACC -(7) Ter 2 Weekly CD/Weekling 1.0 (*108 (440) - II)	-
S 8.8 16 1	нин н н н 346-338 Grade 3 Off-THR [7] Tar 1 - [7] / /// гр и 1975 (100) (477) 346-338 Grade 3 Off-THR [7] Tar 1 - [7] ///////////////////////////////////	Andia har sharf a sa da ana ang kata Banda ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang
Monitoring	b M and these areas of the the theory of the second sec	Annual Statement of the Annual Statement of the
,	L L M top August and the task the containing and P108(440)	start min.
 Assessment 	(1995) (21) (40) L L M (197 Dank 1 477 - 170 Dark 7 Works (200 barra 1 4 (200 420) - 17	No. 54 Concentration of the second se
Assessment	(d75) (76) (441)	a because in the second second
✓ Goal	H H H share dut to the test of shares at	Proc. 20 Nov A concrete particular of the second
Guai	(02%) (/4) (483)	and Dist.
(Current	(mm) (40) (40)	tent in the second
 Current 	(22%) (25) (4(1) 1//-32/ Grade 2 (3()-1195 - (2) The 1 - (2) (27) 1 10	W 10 Manager 1
	Add to grap	the second such that of the two second second

Tier 2 at the Grade-Level - Strategic/Intensive Interventions ARE in Place	
t you know what your students need, let's talk about what supports you have in place.	
2 Problem Analysis	Tier 2: Supplement
2 (Strategic/Intensive) Intervention Review	Tier 2 (Strategic/Intensive) Intervention Match
eam should take a moment to review the available Tier 2 options in the area of reading, he purposes of the analysis, these are strategic or intensive reading interventions that ents receive in addition to the core reading instruction. Ideally, three should be options able that focus on each of the domains identified by the National Reading Panel (2000): emic Avareness Phonois (e.a., Recognizing Letter Sounds, Decoding), Fluency,	At this time, your team should briefly review the names of all of the students at this grade level who were identified as shourge a Ter? reading intervention need by the Screening to intervention report, and discuss whether their current supports are targeting their idea of need.
ocabulary, and Comprehension. addition, these interventions should follow the instructional Hierarchy for reading, starting tith Acquisition (learning the skill and building accuracy), Fluency (being able to use the skill utomatically), and then Generalization (using the skills in new contexts and for	Upon review, were the current strategic/intensive intervention groups created with students' specific intervention needs in mind?
omprehension).	Yes No
t your grade-level, please indicate whether there are reading	O Don't know
nterventions available for students that target the intervention needs identified in the Screening to Intervention Report. hoose all of the interventions that are available to students at your grade level.	Next Steps - Review Data Now or Later? * How are we going to reorganize our strategic/intensive groups (if needed), with our school's
ACCURACY - There is at least one intervention available to help students acquire and practice reading skills. These interventions should include a high level of demonstration, modeling and feedback.	resources in mind? We are confident that our current strategic/intensive groups are structured in such a way that students are receiving supplemental instruction in their area of meed. Yavi Now will review their progress.
AUTOMATICITY - There is at least one intervention available to help students' reading skills become more automatic once they have acquired the basic reading skills needed. These interventions should include opportunities for independent practice, incentives for speed, and demonstration of the grade-level skills expected.	We are going to take a moment to review our current progress monitoring data and ensure that our strategic/intensive groups are organized to meet students' needs. We will analyze our progress monitoring data and reorganize our
BROAD READING - There is at least one intervention available to help students generalize their acquired reading skills, once those skills are	strategic/intensive groups at another time. Right now, this team will focus on Tier 1 core instruction in the classroom.
automatic. These interventions should include the use of reading in order to gain information.	BACK NEXT Page 20 of 25





Tier 2: Supplemental	Make sure that your team has a plant sensure that progress monitoring data is collected on a regular basis, how is a basis of the sure of the sure for the sure internation environment of the sure of the sure of the sure ways of the the data of the sure of the sure of the sure instruction. We are confident that progress monitoring data will be collected on a regular basis for students receiving strategic/intensive interventions.
	1 2 3 4 No. We need to spend more time time
Tier 2 Plan Development - Reorganizing and Planning Strategic/Intensive Group Interventions	discussing collecting how to collect data, and how data as a collect and how data as a collect data team. collected and relevend.
Discuss the trends you observed in the data, and make an action plan to follow up on areas of concern.	We are confident that all students in strategic/intensive interventions have realistic goals for growth in reading.
Remember that regular review of progress monitoring data can be very useful for grade-level team discussions!	1 2 3 4 No. We need to spend more O • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Our team has a plan for ensuring that all students identified as having a Tier 2 need in reading will receive an appropriately targeted intervention in addition to instruction in the classroom. Remember that these discussions can be an ongoing part of grade-level team meetings.	time progress discussing monitoring how to set groups have realistic posis for students in for growth, our progress monitoring groups. We have a way to check the fidelity of implementation of our
⊖ Yes!	strategic/intensive interventions.
 No. We need to spend more time discussing our classroom instruction and small group interventions. 	No. We need Vest We have a clear plan to seen finite () () () () () () () () () () () () ()
	BACK NDXT Prop 22 of 23

Tier 2: Supplemental	Summary and Feedback - Winter Thank you for completing this MTSS Decision-Making Form! At this time, we would like to gather a bit of information from you to make sure that this process was helpful for your team! How long did this Decision-Making process take today (Winter)? For ever than 10 minutes
Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) Data-Based Decision-Making Tool for Elementary Grade-Level Teams	 11-20 minutes 21-30 minutes 31-45 minutes 46-60 minutes More than 60 minutes How did the length of time required feel for your team (Winter)? Too short Just right
Ongoing evaluation of instruction and interventions	○ Too long
When will our team check back to review our plans and progress towards our goals? Six Weeks-sooner if any one needs help	In order to improve this process the next time around, please provide any additional feedback from your team (Winter). Were there are jace in this your team (Winter). Were there are used in the process heplating Your answer What (if any) additional questions does your team have (Winter)? Your answer
BACK NEXT Page 24 of 25	Send me a copy of my responses.















District and School Reports

Report Element: Percentage of Students At-Risk

Report Element: Percentile of Growth

pring Fall-Spring

Her Spring Falls ioning Fall-V



Things to Remember	
 Multi-Tiered Problem Solving Form Downloadable as pdf & Google form Developed at the U of Minnesota Not supported by FBL Knowledge-Based: "MTSS Form" Planned as part of FBL future functionality 	
 Coming Soon (March) Enhanced Group Report Enhanced Growth Report District and School Reports Disaggregated, Demographics Submit a request: reports @fastbridge.org 	43