

OPS Board Agenda

Q & A

November 2025

(II.A)-Goal 2 Summative Report--What, if any, early positive outcomes have the teachers seen due to the implementation of the MTSS developments in this school year?

K-6--The early MTSS and BLST work this year has already produced several meaningful outcomes. Our processes are more consistent, streamlined, and transparent. Teachers have commented that the revised referral and documentation system has reduced confusion and helped ensure that nothing “falls through the cracks.” We are also seeing stronger communication loops between classroom teachers, interventionists, special education, and administration. We are starting to make more informed decisions that are guided by timely data from STAR, A+, Spring Math, and classroom evidence pieces. We expect that our focus and ability to identify needs earlier and match learners with the right supports will continue to grow. Another positive shift has been our improved tracking of intervention fidelity and progress monitoring. Teachers are using the BLST notes, screening dates, and documented decisions more intentionally, and we are beginning to see the benefits of having real-time data available when designing or adjusting interventions. While still early in the year, the structure we’ve put in place is helping teachers feel more supported and confident in the decision-making process.

7-12—We are just beginning our process of building our MTSS structure. The core team involved in this process is being introduced to the necessary components that must be in place for MTSS to truly be effective. Communication with all of the staff is just in the early stages, but we fully expect to see positive effects on both learners and educators in the future.

So far, learners have been leveraging Freckle to progress monitor and work toward a benchmark score of 50. They complete targeted practice on specific skills before retaking the assessment, which reinforces standards and tracks growth. This process also allows staff to regularly check in with learners, monitor progress, and provide timely support where it’s needed.

(II.B)-Goal 2 Progress Monitoring-- Have you identified the reason for the majority of first graders being at intervention or on watch? If so, what is the plan moving forward to help those students?

At this time, we have not identified a single root cause driving the higher number of first-grade learners in the intervention or watch categories. However, we are closely monitoring the cohort and their progress across STAR, classroom performance, and early numeracy skills. One clear factor is the timing of Spring Math implementation. First grade began Spring Math approximately two weeks ago, which is typical developmentally—many learners at this age are still establishing foundational number sense routines early in the year. For example, during initial screenings one student asked how to write the number “5,” demonstrating how early in the developmental continuum some of these learners still are. Beginning Spring Math later allowed teachers to build classroom routines and readiness first, but it naturally delayed the dataset we rely on to make confident decisions.

Our plan moving forward includes:

- Full implementation of Spring Math now that foundational routines are established. This will provide structured daily practice and evidence-based intervention cycles.
- Close collaboration between BLST, interventionists, and the grade-level team to review data, identify patterns, and respond early when learners accelerate or stagnate.

- Reinforcing early numeracy skills (number formation, counting, comparing, composing/decomposing) through whole-group instruction and targeted small-group work.
- Continued attention to screening windows so that STAR and A+ provide consistent, comparable data throughout the year.

While we cannot attribute first grade's early numbers to one cause, we do have a clear structure in place. We expect, based on our historical data trends, the data will improve as Spring Math cycles and core instruction continue to build automaticity and confidence for all of our 1st grade learners.

(II.B) - Goal #2 Progress Monitoring-Goal 2.1 & 2.2--With the spring math implementation across the entire elementary, what training have our teachers received and what coaching will continue throughout the year?

All teachers received the standard Spring Math onboarding training that accompanies implementation. This provided a solid foundation on core components, daily routines, intervention cycles, and progress-monitoring expectations. In addition, we partnered with Ryan Lyson from SEEC, who delivered targeted professional learning and conducted classroom observations to help teachers strengthen fidelity and instructional routines. His feedback has been practical and well-received.

Moving forward, we will continue leveraging our partnership with SEEC. Ryan will support us with ongoing data coaching, help staff interpret cycle-based results, and guide grade-level teams as they make instructional adjustments. We expect coaching support to increase in value as teachers move deeper into intervention cycles and as our building develops more comfort with Spring Math as a system.

(II.B) - Goal #2 Progress Monitoring-Goal 2.1 & 2.2-- What changes are being made to MTSS pathways and how will teachers know which interventions to use at each tier?

In the elementary, we have not made major changes to our MTSS pathways. Instead, we have focused first on tightening the processes that support the system—consistent documentation, regular data monitoring, and clearer communication across BLST, interventionists, and classroom teachers. These improvements have already strengthened how we identify needs, assign interventions, and track learner progress.

Teachers will know which interventions to use through ongoing MTSS meetings, clearer guidance within BLST documentation, and the data coaching we are developing with SEEC. We are also actively reviewing resources for math intervention beyond Spring Math and Saxon, as we can see a need for additional tools for certain learners and skill areas. As these decisions are finalized, teachers will receive explicit guidance and training so that interventions at each tier remain consistent and evidence-based.

(II.B) - Goal #2 Progress Monitoring-Goal 2.1 & 2.2-- Which specific math standards or skill areas are the most common gaps identified in K-6 STAR data?

We are not ready to report specific building-wide skill gaps at this time. Grade-level teams are still working through STAR data in their PLCs, and we want that analysis to be thorough and accurate before drawing conclusions. In addition, we are reviewing last year's NDSA A+ results to identify patterns in performance that may signal broader areas of instructional need.

Our intention is to bring forward a clear set of findings after PLCs complete their review of STAR domains and after we triangulate that information with NDSA/A+ trends. This will ensure that any instructional adjustments we make are tied to validated data rather than assumptions or early, incomplete snapshots.

(II.B) - Goal #2 Progress Monitoring-Goal 2.3-- What specific interventions are being considered for Grades 7–10 within the new MTSS pathways?

The JH/HS will use Freckle during MTSS time so learners can work on specific standards identified through diagnostics and data. Freckle automatically adjusts to each learner's level, providing targeted

practice in math and ELA. This ensures MTSS time is focused, personalized, and aligned to standards while giving us clear data to track growth and identify next steps.

(II.B) - Goal #2 Progress Monitoring-Goal 2.3-- Are there particular math domains (e.g., algebraic thinking, geometry) where 7–10 STAR data shows persistent gaps? How are we coordinating math instruction across middle school and high school so that these gaps do not compound over time?

The data from last year indicates that functions and algebraic reasoning are a common area of need across grades. However, it's super challenging to pinpoint one persistent gap because the key math concepts shift between grade bands. These transitions make it difficult to track one continuous area of weakness, though functions consistently appear as a domain that needs reinforced alignment and focus across middle and high school instruction.

Staff are utilizing Get More Math, IXL, Freckle, and assessment data to identify and target specific standards where learners need additional support. These tools provide ongoing data that help teachers focus instruction, reinforce essential skills, and close gaps across grade levels.

(III.F)- Can you explain these ADM numbers? I thought these were much lower?

August, September, and October State Aid Payments are based on predicted enrollment from the previous year. November payment is then adjusted for on-time payment. Our predicted ADM was 465.96 but our actual ADM of 458.59 required an adjustment.

Our fall enrollment this year is below 440...so our payment next year (2026-2027) will be based on this enrollment number. ☹️ Unfortunately, our state aid payment will reflect this drop of almost 20 students. If we gain more students (or lose for that matter) our payment will be again adjusted in November 2026 for that on-time payment portion.

In the supporting document for III. F, it says ADM was estimated at 534.23 and the final count was 520.25. These are the numbers that I'm confused about. I see the 458.59 on the worksheet.

Schools are paid "extra" for other student groups that may require specialized programming over and above general education. Ie...ELL, special ed, at-risk, summer school. A weighting factor is applied to our ADM resulting in the higher number. Lines 8-29 on the State Aid to Schools Worksheet contains the numbers relating to this higher number. These students numbers are also drawn from our fall enrollment report.

(IV.A)-Business Manager's Report-- Attached are the special meeting minutes, do you have Shannon's report?

This correction has been made and Shannon's report is in the board packet.