

# OPS Board Agenda

## Q & A

### May 2026

---

(II.A) Goal #1 GPM Report: These results reflect all the hard work our administration and teaching staff have put into attaining our district goals. I appreciate the dedication of our staff & their commitment to the learners of OPS. Top notch!

We are looking forward to seeing our A+ scores, as our data from our progress monitoring is positive and exciting!

(II.A) On 1.3, you state that testing irregularities were identified in spring testing among some grade 9 & 10 students. How was it determined that the STAR results were inflated, and what new testing protocols have been put into place to ensure validity & reliability going forward?

(II.A) GPM 1.3 What were the testing irregularities that were found? What has been done to correct them?

The testing irregularities we identified during spring testing with some 9th and 10th grade students were connected to student use of an AI feature built into the browser students were using during the assessment. In some cases, the tool was able to provide or suggest correct answers, which impacted the accuracy of certain STAR results and led to inflated scores.

Once we became aware of the issue, we reviewed testing conditions and student data to help determine the cause. Moving forward, we have changed the browser used for STAR testing. We have also added additional testing expectations during administration to help ensure results are valid and reliable going forward.

(II.A) Have you been able to identify why K-6 results are exceeding targets while 7-10 remain below pace?

One of the biggest reasons we see stronger results in K-6 compared to grades 7-10 is the difference between “learning to read” and “reading to learn.” In the elementary, there is a major focus on building foundational reading skills every day. Students have two dedicated 50-minute reading blocks built into their schedule, which gives teachers a lot of time for direct instruction, small groups, interventions, and extra support.

Once students get into junior high and high school, reading shifts more into the content areas. Students are expected to use reading skills in science, social studies, math, and other classes to learn more complex material. At that point, we are not spending the same amount of dedicated time on reading instruction that happens at the elementary level.

At the secondary level, we continue working on ways to strengthen literacy support and interventions while balancing student schedules, graduation requirements, and course offerings.

(II.A) Are secondary students receiving enough dedicated reading intervention time within the schedule?

We are continuing to look at ways to build more dedicated intervention time into the secondary schedule. One step we’ve already taken is breaking our 7th grade math and ELA classes into three groups. This has helped lower class sizes and allows teachers to provide more targeted instruction, support, and intervention based on student needs.

We are also adding a dedicated intervention time for our junior high students focused on ELA support. The goal is to create additional opportunities for students who need extra help in reading and literacy skills without taking away from their core classes.

At the high school level, we work to balance interventions and supports with graduation requirements and student schedules. We offer a variety of elective courses and support opportunities that help target different student needs and skill levels while still keeping students on track for graduation.

(II.A) Is technology helping or hindering literacy growth in secondary grades?

Technology is really just a tool, and like any tool, its impact depends on how it is used. In many ways, technology can help support literacy growth by giving students access to reading materials, intervention programs, writing supports, and immediate feedback. It also allows teachers to differentiate instruction and better meet students where they are.

At the same time, technology can become a hindrance if it replaces productive reading and writing practice or if students become overly reliant on shortcuts and supports. That's why it is important that we continue teaching students how to use technology appropriately while still building strong foundational reading, writing, and critical thinking skills. Our focus at the secondary level is on using technology to enhance instruction and provide support.

(II.B) Principals' Presentations--On the HS Reading Proficiency graph, 9<sup>th</sup> grade dropped 19% from the late winter to the spring testing. Is this a result of the testing irregularities you mentioned in the GPM report?

Yes, we believe the drop in 9<sup>th</sup> grade reading proficiency from late winter to spring was tied to the testing irregularities mentioned earlier. There was an AI feature built into the browser students were using that, in some cases, could provide or suggest answers during testing. That impacted the accuracy of some results and likely led to inflated scores in earlier testing windows.

Once we identified the issue, we switched to a different browser environment that blocks those AI-supported features and added additional monitoring during testing. We believe the spring data is a more accurate picture of where students currently are and will give us more reliable information moving forward.

(II.B) Principals' Presentations--On the OES Reading Proficiency graph, should we be concerned that there hasn't been movement either up or down in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade results?

We are not overly concerned at this point, because when we break the data down further, we are seeing positive movement within the performance bands. Specifically, we have learners moving from the Urgent Intervention range into Intervention, and from Intervention into the On Watch range. Those shifts represent real academic growth, even if they have not yet crossed the 65<sup>th</sup> percentile threshold to count as "At/Above" proficiency on the overall graph.

In many cases, movement within the lower and middle ranges happens before you see a noticeable increase in overall proficiency percentages. From our perspective, this suggests that our programming, interventions, and MTSS/BLST systems are working to support learner growth. Maintaining the "At/Above" percentage while reducing the number of learners in the Urgent and Intervention categories is generally a healthier trend than it may initially appear, because it suggests we are strengthening the floor of the grade level, not just maintaining our highest performers. We also currently have six learners scoring above the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile and very close to our 65<sup>th</sup> percentile proficiency benchmark, which gives us confidence that this grade level has the potential to show growth in the "At/Above" category moving forward.