

OPS Board Agenda

Q & A

October 2025

(II.A)- Policy AAA-FYI:On the cover sheet, the summary is cut off, and we are not able to read the last line.
Thank you! I have fixed that and hopefully you can read it now?

(II.A)- Policy AAA-On the Goal Benchmarks document, Goal 2 annual target years are incorrect. It has baseline 2025, then it goes to 2024 through 2028. I believe it should be 2026 through 2030.

Thank you, again! That is now fixed.

(II.C)-Summative Report-Goal #1-What metrics will be used to determine whether MTSS interventions are improving proficiency rates?

We would still be using STAR as our progress monitoring tool. The data that we garner from it four times a year as a universal screener allows us to compare, measure proficiency, and also measure growth. In between progress monitoring events, we would be using classroom assessments, observations, and a whole host of other assessments, both formal and informal to help us track and predict progress.

(II.C)-Summative Report-Goal #1--How are students identified for the different tiers for MTSS supports, and how quickly are interventions implemented?

Our elementary and high school teams are in the early stages of developing our MTSS pathways. As part of that work, we are establishing clear procedures for identifying students and determining appropriate interventions at each tier.

Currently, teachers use classroom data to implement immediate, targeted supports as needs arise. In addition, building-level teams review student performance using our universal screener, STAR, along with classroom-based assessments, to identify students who may require more intensive interventions. Teachers monitor progress closely and refer students to the building teams when data indicates additional support may be needed.

(II.D)-GPM Goal #1--How are students with incomplete STAR testing data (e.g...absences, new enrollees) included in the aggregate results?

We do not separate out those students. When we report on our STAR testing, we include every child that is in our school at the time of the testing AND we perform the assessment universally without accommodations or modifications to ensure that the data is reliable and valid.

(II.D)- GPM Goal #1--As proficiency targets increase, how will we sustain morale and engagement for both students and teachers?

We've heard feedback from our teachers expressing concern that our previous proficiency target of 80% may not be fully attainable at this time. After reviewing multiple years of STAR data, we consistently see that approximately 10% of our students perform below the 20th percentile—many of whom are students with IEPs or significant reading challenges. Based on that data and teacher input, I am recommending that we adjust our target to 75% to better reflect a realistic and attainable benchmark while still maintaining high expectations.

It's important to emphasize that our performance goals are not intended as a "gotcha," but rather as a shared roadmap toward continuous improvement. We try to lead conversations with staff by reinforcing that these numbers represent collective aspirations, not individual teacher accountability measures. As you know, our commitment to a growth mindset is nurtured at every level—modeling resilience, celebrating progress, and viewing challenges as opportunities for learning. We communicate often that we are in this work together, united in our mission to help every student grow and succeed, and hopefully we will continue to sustain morale and engagement.

(II.D)- GPM Goal #1-- Are the deep dives aligned with the new 65% proficiency target or are they aligned with the previous target of 50%?

They are aligned with the previous 50%...but if you approve the change in the student outcome goals...we will adjust those deeper dives for the next PM event. From the deeper dives, you can see where the 50% puts us versus the 65% and why the need for elevating that benchmark.

(III.D)-September Financial Reports- What was the asset sales/insurance recovery of \$17,332.36?

That is the buyback for our ipads and laptops that we sold to Apple.

(V.B)-Recommendation from Facilities Committee- If a \$6,250,000 referendum is passed, will any of our current building fund income be used towards the new project?

The building fund dollars would NOT be used to pay for the bonds..those two funds are totally separate from each other.

My recommendation would be to use the money in our building fund to deal with the multitude of remaining deferred maintenance items not included in the referendum. This would be a board decision, however.

I realize the funds are separate, I thought it had been suggested that the referendum could be paid down sooner if other funds were used towards it. I ask this question for reasons of clarity for all.

Under North Dakota law, funds generated through the district's building fund levy are separate from bond proceeds and must be used for purposes permitted within that fund, such as building repairs, maintenance, and improvements. Those dollars cannot legally be used to retire or "pay down" bonded debt.

For that reason, Shannon and I do not recommend using any portion of our building fund to pay toward a bond issue. Our long-term facilities plan calls for maintaining and strengthening the building fund so we can responsibly address deferred maintenance and respond to emergency facility needs as they arise. A \$6.25 million referendum would allow us to complete only a portion of the projects outlined in our long-term plan. Preserving the building fund for its intended purpose ensures the district can meet ongoing facility needs and remain financially stable in the future.

(V.B)-Recommendation from Facilities Committee--Currently, how much of the Building Fund income is left over to pay for upkeep and other expenses?

As of September 30, 2025, we have \$381,991.17 in our Building Fund.

I realize how much there is now, I meant on an annual basis going forward, how much of the building fund income is available to cover all the deferred maintenance items that the Facilities committee did not address. You had mentioned that some had previously been transferred to the General fund. The ultimate question, is it even possible to address the other maintenance issues with the building fund dollars, on an annual basis?

This fund is supported through the district's 20-mill Building Fund levy, which currently generates approximately \$460,000 per year. All of the \$460,000 can be used towards ongoing maintenance, repairs, and necessary facility upkeep.

Several years ago, the district transferred dollars from the General Fund into the Building Fund to cover expenses related to the science floor construction project, as the Building Fund had a temporary shortfall. Under North Dakota law, transfers cannot be made from the Building Fund back into the General Fund.

Our long-term goal has been to strengthen the Building Fund so we can systematically address deferred maintenance projects and respond to facility needs as they arise. In recent years, we have supplemented this effort by directing a portion of our 12-mill Miscellaneous Fund levy (approximately \$275,000 annually) toward building fund support.

However, due to anticipated reductions of roughly \$200,000 in state funding next year caused by declining enrollment, those Miscellaneous Fund dollars will likely need to be redirected to support salaries and benefits, which are allowable General Fund expenditures.

Given these realities, it is not currently feasible to address the full list of deferred maintenance needs through the Building Fund alone on an annual basis. The Building Fund will continue to be used as intended—for ongoing maintenance, repairs, and necessary facility upkeep—but emergency capital projects would require additional funding sources if they occur.