Board Monitoring Questions & Superintendent Responses

Strategic Plan 2030 | September 14, 2026 | Interim Goal 3B & Guardrail 3

	Board Member	Agenda Item	Questions	Superintendent Response | Student Outcomes Focus
1	Vice Chair Lori Bowman	3.01 Interim Goal 3B	NWEA math scores went up at every single high school this year, but fewer of them actually passed the course. How do we make sense of two measures of the same thing pointing in opposite directions?	The two measures are telling us different parts of the story. The increase in NWEA Math scores tells us that students are making academic growth, but the decline in course-passing rates suggests that this growth is not yet consistently translating into mastery of grade-level standards and successful completion of the course. It prompts us to examine the alignment between instruction, grading, course expectations, attendance, and student mastery. We use the data as a signal to identify where students are making growth, where gaps remain, and what adult actions are needed to turn growth we are seeing in NWEA into course success.
2	Vice Chair Lori Bowman	3.01 Interim Goal 3B	The report states the district "did not have a standardized, centralized process for regular data reviews" in 2025-26, and that schools built their own tracking approaches. How confident can we be in the comparability of the 76.2% figure across schools if the underlying monitoring practices weren't standardized?	We are confident in the 76.2% district outcome because it is based on a consistent measure of students successfully completing both Algebra I and English I. School-level monitoring systems were not standardized in 2025–26, so we are cautious when comparing how schools monitored and responded to student progress and how they responded to students that were off-track. We have addressed this gap for 2026–27 through tighter monitoring expectations and student responses when students are identified as off track. We now expect of bi-weekly data reviews and reporting to create greater consistency and accountability across schools that are reviewed by Principals Supervisors.

3	Vice Chair Lori Bowman	3.01 Interim Goal 3B	The strategic adjustments name "bi-weekly reviews of course progress data" and "individualized recovery paths" as new commitments for 26-27.	We are moving from school-specific approaches to a more consistent, centralized system for monitoring student progress. Previously, schools had varying processes for regularly reviewing course progress, identifying students who were off track, creating timely recovery pathways, and monitoring student progress. For 2026–27, we have estalbished a common expectation across all schools: every two weeks at minimum, schools will review course progress, identify students who are off track, establish a specific recovery plan, and monitor whether that plan is working. This creates greater consistency in how we identify and respond to students who need additional support.
3b	Vice Chair Lori Bowman	3.01 Interim Goal 3B	What did recovery support look like in 25-26?	Recovery support existed in 2025-26, but it was not systemic. Schools developed their own tracking and support approaches, so the timing, intensity, and follow-through varied by campus. FY27 is designed to replace that variability with a more consistent system.

Oklahoma City Public Schools
2500 NE 30th Street, Oklahoma City, OK 73111
Phone: 405-587-1000 | web: okcps.org

3c	Vice Chair Lori Bowman	3.01 Interim Goal 3B	Were struggling students identified late or not identified at all?	All schools were looking at the data and students were being identified as off-track; however, once identified, students did not always access the full range of recovery options available to them beyond classroom reteaching and in class intervention, such as credit recovery and Night School. For 2026–27, the district is establishing a more consistent process: identify students who are off track, determine the appropriate recovery pathway, connect students to that support, and monitor whether the intervention is working. This shifts the focus from simply identifying students to ensuring that identified students actually access the support they need to successfully recover credit and stay on track.

4	Vice Chair Lori Bowman	3.01 Interim Goal 3B	The equitable grading work is still at the "cross-district focus group" stage. What is the timeline for that group to produce district-wide grading expectations, and how will the board know if grading variance (scope, weighting, retake policy) was a meaningful driver of the school-to-school gap in Appendix A versus instruction itself?	Our timeline for this work breaks down into two main steps for this school year: 1. Checking current practices: We are starting by auditing classroom gradebooks to ensure all campuses are following District Regulation I-17-03. Ensuring gradebooks are established within existing standards gives us a reliable starting point. 2. Updating district expectations (This School Year): The focus group meets this fall to review what is working and recommend ways to make grading more consistent across all high schools. We plan to update the regulation this school year alongside the Board's broader policy reviews. As for the differences in 9th-grade success rates between schools, we are looking at grading practices as a potential contributing factor. Updating the regulation is the quick part of this process. The deeper work involves shifting mindsets and traditional grading habits which may not be in line with best practice, which takes more time. The focus group will start those broader conversations this year to build lasting consistency in our classrooms. We will complete our initial analysis during the first semester and share our conclusions, along with any necessary adjustments, during the next 3B monitoring report.
5	Vice Chair Lori	3.01 Interim	Appendix A shows big variance: Northwest Classen improved 8.6 points while Star Spencer declined 13.0	Northwest Classen's process focused on a few clear habits:

	Bowman	Goal 3B	points and Capitol Hill declined 7.2 points. What is Northwest Classen doing differently, and is any part of it transferable, versus what is specific to that campus's context?	• Weekly Tracking: Every Friday, teacher teams updated a shared student progress tracker during their planning meetings. • Administrative Involvement: Assistant principals joined team meetings where teachers identified specific supports for individual students. • Regular Accountability: Assistant principals reviewed these numbers with the principal in weekly one-on-one meetings, keeping a shared scoreboard to track pass rates week over week. This systematic focus on early intervention is the part of Northwest Classen's success that can be shared across the district. While each high school has its own unique context, every school can benefit from a reliable weekly routine that catches failing grades early instead of waiting until the end of the term. Our goal is to help other campuses adopt this same level of consistent progress monitoring, while allowing school leaders the flexibility to adapt the specific interventions to fit their students' needs.
6	Board Member Vernona Dismuke	3.01 Interim Goal 3B	There are some terms I believe I may be confusing. It is possible this has been shared before. My apologies if I missed it. I can guess and come to my own conclusions but I think I need to confirm. a. technical/tactical questions	Board monitoring reports are written from a high-level strategic perspective. Questions about these reports often fall into one of two categories: 1. Technical Questions: "Help me understand how this works." These often focus on measurement, data definition, and design. They seek clarity on how a system or metric is

				constructed. 2. Tactical Questions: "Help me understand what is being done." These focus on specific action, execution, and operational steps. They ask about the practical work happening on the ground to achieve the strategic goal.
6b	Board Member Vernona Dismuke	3.01 Interim Goal 3B	b. achievement vs course success vs course completion vs pass rates. These terms are in the Current Reality slides.	1. Achievement: Achievement measures how well students perform on the NWEA academic assessment. It reflects a level of understanding and academic preparedness, separate from classroom grades. 2. Pass Rates, Course Completion, and Course Success (The Course Metrics). These three terms all refer to whether a student successfully earns credit for a class: • Pass Rate: The overall percentage of students who earn a passing grade in a specific class. • Course Completion: Confirmation that a student stayed in the class and earned a passing final grade. • Course Success: For our Goal 3B report, this has a specific definition: a 9th grader who successfully passed both Algebra I and English I
6c	Board Member Vernona Dismuke	3.01 Interim Goal 3B	c. Star Spencer had a huge decline but they also had an emotionally draining year. Is it possible that this might account for some of the decline? If so, is there a plan to reinspire for this year.	While the losses experienced by the Star Spencer community last year were very difficult, it is hard to draw a direct line between those events and the drop in 9th grade course success. Star Spencer actually saw significant growth in other areas last year, including 11th-grade ACT

				scores and College and Career Readiness assessments. School leadership is actively working with staff to examine local data, identify what contributed to the drop in Algebra I and English I, and put targeted solutions in place for this school year. Moving forward, our focus is on supporting both the school culture and academic systems together.
6d	Board Member Vernona Dismuke	3.01 Interim Goal 3B	Interim Goal 3b: When I see "pass", I'm assuming this is indicative of teacher grades. Later it appears to include other factors. Can you explain?	For Interim Goal 3B, “pass” means the student earned a passing final reported grade in both Algebra I and English I, measured after summer school. Assignment completion, recovery opportunities, and grading practices are not additional components of the measure; they are factors that may help explain why a student did or did not earn a passing grade.
6[e]	Board Member Vernona Dismuke	3.01 Interim Goal 3B	Are the strategic adjustments in place now?	Implementation is underway, but not every element is yet systemic. Reporting tools have been built, coaching and ongoing monitoring is taking place.
GUARDRAIL				
8	Board Member Vernona Dismuke	10.02 Guardrail 3	3A - are ICAP plans shared with parents so they can be a part of the planning?	ICAP is designed to be developed with families, not simply completed by students. OKCPS’s public Academic Planning Guide describes ICAP as a collaborative process involving the student, family, and educators, providing opportunities

				for self-reflection, goal setting, and pathway planning to inform course selections during pre-enrollment. We are currently developing a system for students to identify their pathway selection aligned to ICAP, with parent/guardian acknowledgment integrated into the process. Through the OK Career Guide, students can email invitations to parents and guardians to view their ICAP progress. To support this engagement, staff professional development emphasizes lessons that direct students to invite parents/guardians to review their ICAP progress. As students progress, work-based learning (WBL) experiences offer authentic opportunities to explore and apply classroom learning. These experiences align with the student's ICAP and pathway, helping students see clear connections between their goals, coursework, and postsecondary options. Our expectation is consistent across all schools: families must have clear visibility into their student's ICAP, pathway course selections, and WBL experiences, with meaningful opportunities to participate in academic and career planning. This should serve as an ongoing partnership rather than a one-time compliance exercise.

9	Board Member Vernona Dismuke	10.02 Guardrail 3	3B - I understand the need for this guardrail, however, all students can benefit from rigor. How are we helping those who are ready for more rigor without hurting those who are not by not exposing them to the same rigor?	Guardrail 3 is a protection, not a ceiling. It ensures that students who are ready for advanced learning do not lose access to those opportunities as the district works to improve outcomes for all students. At the same time, every student should experience rigorous grade-level learning with appropriate support, while students ready for acceleration have access to advanced pathways. The Guardrail language is to provide protection around both.
N/A	N/A	10.02	Guardrail 3 (Advanced Learning Access): The superintendent shall not diminish or restrict access to advanced learning opportunities for advanced learners as a means of addressing or narrowing the achievement gap.	Given the monitoring schedule, this guardrail and its interim guardrail will need to be addressed again in April.
OTHER BOARD AGENDA ITEMS				
N/A	N/A	N/A	None were received during this reporting period.	N/A

End of Report

Oklahoma City Public Schools
2500 NE 30th Street, Oklahoma City, OK 73111
Phone: 405-587-1000 | web: okcps.org