

# OPS Board Agenda

## Q & A

### January 2026

(II.A) Goal #2 GPM Report-- What is the professional-development return-on-investment metric?

We look at three major areas: 1. Implementation...are teachers actually using the strategies???...principals are on the front line of this and gather evidence including, but certainly not limited, to, observation during classroom visits, monitoring Empower inputs, and conversations during PLC work, 2. Student data..changes in engagement survey results, classroom performance, and monitoring our assessment result trends working to ferret out specific results relating to the PD focus, and 3. Fiscal impact...cost, alignment to district priorities (one of our superintendent guardrails), and whether the learning builds internal capacity rather than one-time events. We consider PL time to be a positive ROI when it results in observable changes in instructional practices with gains in student engagement or achievement without requiring ongoing unsustainable costs.

(II.A) Goal #2 GPM Report—How is impact on student outcomes being measured for PD focused on standards alignment and Tier I instruction?

Impact on student outcomes is measured by connecting instructional practices to classroom-level evidence (observations, conversations, etc...) and student performance data. Our principals look first at instructional alignment evidence, including lesson plans, common assessments (if available), and observation data to confirm that Tier I instruction reflects the intended standards and rigor. Next step would be to then compare student outcome measures tied to standards, such as performance on common formative assessments, growth on district and state assessments, and progress for learners within Tier I. We would also monitor engagement, including student engagement survey results, to ensure high-quality Tier I instruction is reaching all learners. Impact is demonstrated when stronger alignment and Tier I practices correspond with improved learner performance and reduced numbers needing Tier II and Tier III interventions over time.

(II.A) Goal #2 GPM Report --Looking at cohort growth (K through 6 over multiple years), which grade levels show the greatest gains year-to-year, and how does that align with PD or curriculum changes?

When examining cohort growth across grades K–6 over multiple years, we see steady year-to-year gains across most grade levels, with particularly strong improvement in recent years. OES has outperformed the state in math proficiency on the NDSA for three consecutive years, and our most recent result (54% Proficient/Advanced) represents our highest performance in the past three years.

Internal STAR benchmark data shows consistent upward movement within cohorts across benchmarking windows, reinforcing that growth is occurring not only on the summative assessment but throughout the year.

We have maintained the same core curriculum resource (Saxon Math). Because the core resource has remained stable, our gains cannot be attributed to a new textbook adoption. Instead, improvement aligns more closely with strengthened instructional systems and targeted professional learning.

Over the past three years, we have:

- Sent instructional teams to be trained in the Science of Math Instruction
- Had those trained staff return and lead professional learning for the rest of our K–6 staff

- Focused on strengthening conceptual understanding, number sense development, explicit instruction, and mathematical discourse
- Brought in instructional experts from SEEC for targeted, on-site professional learning in mathematics
- Increased vertical alignment conversations and PLC data analysis cycles
- Strengthened MTSS systems and progress monitoring practices
- Implemented Spring Math (initially in grades 4–6 and now K–6) to reinforce fluency and numeracy development

The alignment between these instructional shifts and our upward trend in both benchmark and state assessment data suggests that improved instructional practices, not simply materials, are driving student growth.

While growth is evident across grades, upper elementary grades show particularly notable improvement following the initial Spring Math implementation in grades 4–6. As Spring Math expanded K–6 this year, we anticipate continued strengthening of early numeracy foundations, which should positively impact cohort growth as students move through the system.

(II.A) Goal #2 GPM Report --Are certain teachers or grade levels consistently producing strong green-zone outcomes — and what practices from those teams can be replicated?

Elementary--When we analyze green-zone performance across K–6, we see strong results across all grade levels. We feel confident in the strength of our instructional teams and the systems supporting them. Our success is not isolated to one classroom or one grade; it reflects a collective K–6 commitment to high-quality math instruction.

That said, there are structural elements within our 4–6 model that provide distinct advantages and are worth highlighting.

In grades 4–6, we are departmentalized and operate with a dedicated two-hour math block that includes:

- Core instruction
- Guided practice
- Intervention or extension
- Fluency and application work

This structure allows our teachers to:

- Develop deep expertise in mathematics standards and progression
- Refine instructional practices aligned specifically to math
- Spend significantly more instructional minutes in math than many elementary schools across the state
- Provide both remediation and enrichment within the same block

While we do not have statewide comparison data in front of us, we believe our instructional minutes for math in grades 4–6 is among the highest in North Dakota. Time on task matters, and that consistency is a major contributing factor to green-zone performance.

Several practices from our strongest-performing teams are intentionally replicated schoolwide:

- Clear alignment to priority standards
- Strong use of formative assessment within lessons
- Structured math discourse and student explanation
- Targeted intervention within the instructional block

- Vertical collaboration between grade levels
- Integration of Spring Math to strengthen fluency and number sense

Importantly, the success we see is not dependent on individual teachers but on systems. Our professional learning in the Science of Math Instruction and ongoing coaching support from SEEC has helped align practices across classrooms.

HS--We're starting to see some really strong "green-zones" or 65% marks, in math. One big reason is that our math teachers have a clear sense of where students are at and which kids need extra support. The combination of Get More Math, regular standard checks, and tools like STAR gives staff better, more timely information about learner skills. Some vary depending on cohorts but the average score for all grade levels in the JH/HS is about 60% of learners at the 65%+ mark.

That clarity helps teachers adjust instruction, target support, and catch gaps earlier and see which learners are hitting the 65%+ mark.

(II.A) Goal #2 GPM Report --For grades 7-10, are we seeing high-performing students stagnating?

It's normal for learners in that range to fluctuate a bit from one testing window to the next. Percentile rankings can move up or down based on a lot of factors that aren't always about learning or effort with different question types, testing windows, time of day, sickness, stress, and even the time of year can all play a role.

When we zoom out and look at trend lines over multiple data points, we still see an overall uphill pattern for most of these learners. So, while there may be some short-term ups and downs, the longer-term growth picture is still moving in the right direction.

(III.D) Guardrail #3 PM Report--GPM 3.1 states that the baseline % was established in February 2024 but that percentage is not in the description.

Thank you for the catch! I fixed the error and it is updated in the Board Packet.

(III.D) Guardrail #3 PM Report--GPM 3.2 states that the baseline number was established in May 2024, but that number is not in the description.

Thank you for the catch! I fixed the error and it is updated in the Board Packet

(III. P )Policy FAAD Tuition Agreements - does this change anything from how we handle open enrollment now?

It really doesn't change anything for us. We have only had a couple of Tuition Agreements in the last few years and because we did not have a policy, we just followed NDCC. This policy used to be a Member Requested policy, but NDSBA realized the need for it to become a Recommended policy to outline correct procedures so that districts would be aligned with NDCC.`

(IV.A) Business Manager's Report--How do we determine when an account is moved to collections? Our policy simply states that "the District may rollover debt or refer the debt to collections."

Once the family balance is (\$200.00) , a first notice is sent out that they are overdue. If after 15 days they are still (\$200.00) a final notice will go out telling them if they do not pay in full, or make arrangements with me, they will be sent to collections. This also carries a 15-day grace period. I usually try to contact them via parent square. If I hear nothing I then send them to collections.