

OPS Board Agenda

Q & A

May 2024

(II.A)1. On GPM 1.3, I am guessing that all 36 students are not choice ready in the same indicator but do you feel that having the center courses is helping us reach this goal easier than if we did not have those courses?

It is the center courses that they take that allows them to be completely done with an indicator by the end of their sophomore year.

(II.A)2. GPM 3.1 ASVAB I realized that I wasn't really familiar with the ASVAB test so I searched it and found it to be very different than I expected. Here is a link to topics and sample questions that board members and the public might find interesting: <https://www.officialasvab.com/applicants/sample-questions/>

I was surprised, as I did not expect this to be quite as "academic" as an ACT test, for example. What areas of the ASVAB tests do we find to our strengths? Weaknesses? Does this align with your expectations of our other progress measures? What is being done for students that scored lower than 31 to prepare them for a better result next fall? Is there any data available to show how our students compare to other students statewide or nationwide? (Info from Mr. Wentworth) There really isn't an easy composite of the ASVAB data across the state of North Dakota. The ASVAB score does compare the individual test taker to all of the students that take the test. They do this by giving a percentile of comparison. So, on the individual student's ASVAB sheet you get percentile compared to same sex and opposite sex test takers along with a percentile compared to the entire group that takes the ASVAB. The Arithmetic Reasoning is a little lower than the Math Knowledge subtest, so having a math goal should be helpful in seeing these percentages move up. We have a few students score one standard deviation below the mean, but there were only three kids that were near the two standard deviations below. With the three, they were all closer to the one standard deviation than two standard deviations in Arithmetic Reasoning. In order to prepare better for the fall, we are using test gear prep to have students be able to study for the ASVAB rather than have one class period of looking at the material before taking the test. This should be a way to help students score higher on the ASVAB. The test material will be available to the students at the beginning of the school year next fall. (As a side note) The National Guard Representative for the past two years has mentioned that the school has some of the higher scores on the ASVAB of the area schools. It is antidotal evidence, but no numbers to check to see if that idea is correct or just a perception. ASVAB - Re: Mr. Wentworth's reference to using "test gear prep" to help students score higher next fall, I think this is good and may be effective in helping us to achieve our goal of increasing our math scores. However, we should never lose sight of the fact that we are not just trying to increase scores, we are trying to increase learning and the ability to apply this knowledge to real-world situations, not just get a better score on a test. It may seem a subtle difference, but when publicizing our goals and performance, I think we should be conscientious of this subtle difference, lest it look like we are "teaching

to the test." I would hope that effective test prep materials have both the desired effects of increasing test scores AND real-world application. I hope this makes sense.

(II.A)3. GPM 3.2 Choice Ready (1 Indicator Grade 10) When we say "one indicator area" are we referring to a **Choice Ready component** (ie Military Ready)? Or do we mean a **specific indicator within** a Choice Ready component (ie Physically Fit within Military Ready). I may have misunderstood this GPM, as the deeper dive information says that only 39 of 47 juniors scored a 31 or better on the ASVAB, yet for GPM 3.2 100% of the sophomores have at least one indicator complete. Can all of the sophomores cannot be Choice Ready in one indicator area if they haven't even taken the ASVAB yet? Are we tracking any other single indicators by which a sophomore could achieve one indicator, for example, under Essential Skills - Successfully Complete an Online Learning Course, or Career Exploration Experience? If the goal is for sophomores to have achieved at least one indicator, can't these also be considered? (Info from Mr. Wentworth) When looking at "one indicator area" I am referring to a Choice Ready component (Academic/Workplace/Military). I look to see if they have two or more indicators within the component. If the student is waiting to take the ASVAB but has two indicators of the Military Component I will mark them as being meeting the Military component. The reason for getting so many Sophomores is through the Workplace Component as many take three CTE courses by the end of their Sophomore year. With completion on a CTE course they are automatically completing the Choice Ready Practices as the Center has the teachers fill one out for every student that takes a course at the center. This is how we are able to meet that requirement. (From Anna) From this information shared by Mr. Wentworth, I will change the wording for GPM 3.2. to "one Choice Ready component" from the current "one indicator area" to ensure we are on the same page! 😊 Choice Ready - Of note, the Choice Ready chart does refer to Post-Secondary, Workforce, and Military Ready as "components" so I think this language change is appropriate. Also, in looking at the chart again, I see the top section Essential Skills. I wonder if it would be helpful to include a GPM (or guardrail pm?) related to Essential Skills? If they don't qualify in Essential Skills, they could meet the requirements of all three of the others and still not be considered Choice Ready. From Anna: Mr. Lynch, Mr. Wentworth, and I have talked about adding another GPM. We'll have more time to meet to discuss this once school is out. There are so many different working pieces in Choice Ready, that we could have several more goals...the tough part is nailing down the "right ones" to actually help us predict our progress.

(II.B)4. GPM 3.1 Educator Communication Events-- Give us some examples of what you consider to be effective communication events by our educators and the positive results. Some examples...1. A phone call was made home to a family to discuss where the child is to go after school. This ended in a NEUTRAL result. 2. A SeeSaw message was sent to a family concerning a child's frequent absences. The parent then called to discuss the situation with the teacher, which in turn resulted in further helps from the school. That was marked as a POSITIVE result due to decreased absences with better understanding between the teacher and home. 3. A phone call was made to a home and the parent was angry with the message, so they kept their child home. That would be a NEGATIVE effect on learning. How can we replicate these events and results by other educators? Honestly, right now, my goal is to simply get our educators to communicate more with parents. As stated in my PM report, 19 of our educators made on average only 1 contact per week with parents. This an area that we need to grow in because we need our parents engaged! I believe that the more contact we have, the more positive effect there will be on our learning outcomes. I will be sharing my report with all of our staff and now that our baseline is established, we will be able to identify ways to improve and target areas of need. Educator Communication - Thank you for the examples. What is the resistance of educators to communicating more with parents? Is it possible that they ARE communicating, but not keeping an accurate log because the log itself is too much extra time/effort? Is it possible to automate some of this? Like you mentioned SeeSaw, so can they generate a list of two-way communication from that app? Phone calls and their result obviously have to be written down somewhere, but a simple fill-in-the-blank log sheet with a place to mark POSITIVE, NEUTRAL, or NEGATIVE, and a space for a comment to briefly describe the result doesn't seem too overwhelming. I hope

lack of communication is not just because some of those are hard calls to make. Communications about positive behavior and performance are good, too. Great questions...and I believe it could be a combination of missed opportunities to log communication events and also avoidance of the “tough conversations”. Both of these are hurdles that we need to get over and not go around in order to ensure that we move forward and improve in this Guardrail. As admin we will be addressing both pieces moving forward. Having to present evidence brings what we do to the surface so we can deal with areas that need improvement in communication.

(II.B)5. GPM 3.2 Student-Led Activities-- What other opportunities do you see for student-led activities besides Parent-Teacher Conferences, particularly for JH/HS students (art or music displays? CTSO events? athletics?) **As an admin team we have this conversation almost weekly at our meetings. We KNOW that we really need to focus on continuing to provide opportunities and events, both whole school and small groups, that are truly STUDENT-LED to ensure that parents attend and are engaged....the data doesn't lie! An example coming up is the Elementary Habits of Mind Museum on Friday, May 10th....STUDENT projects that are STUDENT presented...parents along with the community have been invited. We will be keeping our data from all of these events to provide further evidence of the importance of this piece. Student-Led Activities - Are there possibilities of student-led activities in extra-curriculars? Coach Skoglund described to me that he had his athletes complete some kind of a research project on a college team and create a presentation of some kind. I wonder if a student-led team/family gathering after a game in which student athletes present these would improve family support of the coaching staff. Great suggestions! I will share these as ideas to continue to grow engagement.**

(II.B)6. On Guardrail PM 3.1, what is the criteria that has to be met in a conversation for the educator to indicate that it had a positive outcome or a negative outcome? **I haven't formally defined this for the teachers beyond the general statement in the PM of “having a positive learning outcome”, as it really is up to individual interpretation based on each communication event.**

(II.C)7. Board Theory Of Action - Should we hold our teachers accountable for effective **teaching** or effective **learning**? Or is it the same thing? Just some food for thought....? **BOARD MEMBERS.....what are your thoughts? As the superintendent, I believe teachers should be held accountable to effective teaching...learning has a student component in it and teachers can't control all parts of the learning; However, if they are effective at their teaching they will set the students up for the highest level of learning possible to accompany the learner input. ** Our teachers should be held accountable for effective teaching not learning. They can control the teaching but not all aspects of the learning. I asked the question and I 100% agree that teachers should be held accountable for effective teaching. Effective teaching should lead to effective learning. However, there are so many things that a teacher cannot control, that, despite best efforts, effective teaching may NOT lead to the results we want. I'm glad to have had a little more time to think about and consider this. I agree that we can only hold teachers accountable for effective TEACHING.**

(III.A)8. Jordan is listed as High School Jordan Lynch, probably should add principal. **I updated the minutes and those are in the board packet.**

(III.A)9. It is noted that, "principals are under the responsibility of Superintendent"(agreed). However, the board approved all teacher contracts. Should we not also approve the principal contracts? Was the motion to approve superintendent and business manager compensation inclusive of approve principal compensation? **The agenda item reads as: “Approve 2024-2025 Administration Contracts”. During the discussion, the motion was made to approve the committee's recommendation for the business manager and superintendent's contract along with the superintendent's recommendation for the principals' contract. The minutes in the board packet have been adjusted to reflect the language from the meeting.**

(III.B)10. What is the Misc Levy Revenue of almost \$250,000 for the year? The Misc Levy Revenue of \$249,901.32 is the 12 mills of the Misc Levy. It is to be included inside the general fund monies. Shannon will also correct the budget entry to show what was budgeted for income and expenditures.

(III.C)11. March Bills –

1. ND Atty Gen C Ptacek records check? Why did we do a records check on her? It had been longer than 6 months in lapse of employment.
2. Jordan Lynch \$769 "leading standards based workshop" - What is this for? Leading standards-based workshop. Jordan registered and paid for this with his personal credit card. This was a reimbursement. It was for a conference for implementing standards-based grading.
3. I really like the level of detail in the Description line, clear, but pretty easy to understand. Thanks, Shannon! Thank you. I'm limited to the number of characters in each field, so hopefully my abbreviations make sense.

(IV.A)12. BM Reports –

1. Working with Anna on the budget. When will the board see a draft? We are expecting to have a first draft in June.
2. We will be under the single year audit threshold of \$750,000 - does that mean we will only need to complete a two-year audit? Our audits are usually a 2-year audit, however, if one year receives more than \$750,000 in federal monies, that single year income gets extra auditing. For 2023-2024 It appears that we will be below that amount.
3. By "contracts" do you mean "intents to rehire" for classified staff? Yes, It should read "Intents to ReHire"

(IV.E)13. Jordan is listed as Elementary Principal. I updated the minutes and those are in the board packet.

(IV.F)14. Tech Report - Mentions that a required board-approved policy should be ready for us to review in May; I don't see it. Will that be in June? Are you referring to the required "plan"? That will be coming in June. Tech Report - I might have written "policy" instead of "plan." You answered my question. Thanks.

(IV.H)15. Who is on the curriculum committee? Anna Sell, Greg Dobitz, Jordan Lynch, Larry Engel, Emily Petersen, Kayla Meierotto, Monica Heimbuch, and Brian Seyer. Those in attendance are not listed. I updated the minutes with the attendees' names and those are in the board packet.