

**PORTAGE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
BOARD OF EDUCATION
POLICY GOVERNANCE RETREAT
CONFERENCE RM #1, PORTAGE PUBLIC SCHOOLS' ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, 8107 MUSTANG
DRIVE, PORTAGE, MI 49002
JANUARY 27, 2025, 4:00 PM
AGENDA**

VISION STATEMENT

An exceptional, continuously improving learning culture with high expectations, committed to all!

MISSION STATEMENT

Portage Public Schools will educate all students to achieve their potential.

I. CALL TO ORDER	
II. REVISIONS/APPROVAL OF AGENDA	2
III. COMMENTS OR COMMUNICATIONS	3
1. BY CITIZENS	
IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS	
1. OVERVIEW OF POLICY GOVERNANCE	4
2. REVIEW OF POLICY GOVERNANCE POLICIES	5
3. ENDS POLICY 1.1	6
V. ADJOURN	

**PORTAGE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
BOARD OF EDUCATION – POLICY GOVERNANCE RETREAT
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, CONFERENCE ROOM #1
JANUARY 27, 2025, 4:00 P.M.**

Note Page

II. Revisions/Approval of Agenda

Recommended Motion:

Motion offered by _____, seconded by _____, that the Board of Education approve the Agenda as printed (or as amended).

**PORTAGE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
BOARD OF EDUCATION – POLICY GOVERNANCE RETREAT
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, CONFERENCE ROOM #1
JANUARY 27, 2025, 4:00 P.M.**

Note Page

IV. Discussion Items

1. Overview of Policy Governance

**PORTAGE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
BOARD OF EDUCATION – POLICY GOVERNANCE RETREAT
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, CONFERENCE ROOM #1
JANUARY 27, 2025, 4:00 P.M.**

Note Page

IV. Discussion Items

2. Review of Policy Governance Policies

**PORTAGE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
BOARD OF EDUCATION – POLICY GOVERNANCE RETREAT
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, CONFERENCE ROOM #1
JANUARY 27, 2025, 4:00 P.M.**

Note Page

IV. Discussion Items

3. Ends Policy 1.1

**Portage Public Schools
Monitoring Report**

Policy Type: Ends
Policy Title: (1.1) Global Ends

As requested by the Board during the 2016/2017 school year, the Monitoring Report on Ends Policy 1.1 continues to be divided into smaller segments so that adequate time can be spent presenting and discussing this key Ends Statement.

1.1 Policy Language

Students demonstrate progress toward mastery in English language arts and math with evidence of annual academic growth and proficiency.

The report is divided into two segments and has been reported on as follows:

- High / Middle School Measures – November
- Elementary School Measures – December

This is the final, overall summary report for 1.1. The Board will be asked to accept Monitoring Report 1.1 after we've had a chance to have further discussion at our upcoming PG Retreat.

Certification

I hereby present my Monitoring Report on Ends Policy 1.1 (overall) in accordance with the monitoring schedule established by the Board. I certify that the information provided in this report is true as of 1/8/2025.



Signature

1.9.2025

Date

Monitoring Report

Page -2-

Policy Type: Ends

Policy Title: Ends Policy 1.1

Summary Dashboards

Percent Proficient Summary:

Each PPS school was ranked among its 10 Similar Schools in percent of students proficient on the Spring 2024 State Assessments. The following grades and assessments were used for rankings:

- Elementary Schools: 5th grade M-STEP
- Middle Schools: 8th grade PSAT 8
- High Schools: 11th grade SAT

KRESA schools are included for reference, but do not have defined expectations. The number of KRESA schools will vary in this report due to CEPI's data suppression rules that protect the privacy of individual students; which means data is not always publicly available.

Rank	Status
1 - 3	Above Expectations
4 - 6	At Expectations
7 - 10	Below Expectations

	Rank among 10 Similar Schools		Rank among KRESA Schools	
	ELA Rank	Math Rank	ELA Rank	Math Rank
AMB	7	8	6 / 28	6 / 26
ANG	5	5	11	7
CEL	8	9	14	11
HAV	8	9	17	13
LCE	3	6	2	3
MBE	5	9	1	4
TWL	5	10	4	16
WOD	2	7	7	12
CMS	7	5	2 / 14	2 / 14
NMS	9	8	7	5
WMS	5	3	1	1
CHS	1	4	1 / 11	1 / 11
NHS	2	4	3	5

Number of Schools At or Above Expectations

	ELA	Math
5th grade (8 schools)	5	2
8th grade (3 schools)	1	2
11th grade (2 schools)	2	2
Overall (13 schools)	8	6

Monitoring Report

Page -3-

Policy Type: Ends

Policy Title: Ends Policy 1.1

Percent Proficient Improvement Summary:

Each PPS school was ranked among its 10 Similar Schools on the difference between its 2024 Percent Proficient and its 3 year average of 2019, 2022, 2023 Percent Proficient. The following grades and assessments were used for rankings:

- Elementary Schools: 5th grade M-STEP
- Middle Schools: 8th grade PSAT 8
- High Schools: 11th grade SAT

KRESA schools are included for reference, but do not have defined expectations. The number of KRESA schools will vary in this report due to CEPI’s data suppression rules that protect the privacy of individual students; which means data is not always publicly available.

Rank	Status
1 - 3	Above Expectations
4 - 6	At Expectations
7 - 10	Below Expectations

	Rank among 10 Similar Schools		Rank among KRESA Schools	
	ELA Rank	Math Rank	ELA Rank	Math Rank
AMB	2	1	6 / 27	6 / 25
ANG	4	7	11	11
CEL	5	6	12	15
HAV	5	6	18	8
LCE	2	2	9	13
MBE	9	10	21	25
TWL	8	10	17	23
WOD	2	2	3	5
CMS	8	4	8 / 14	2 / 14
NMS	10	10	13	11
WMS	9	5	9	4
CHS	2	2	3 / 11	3 / 11
NHS	8	8	7	9

Number of Schools At or Above Expectations

	ELA	Math
5th grade (8 schools)	6	5
8th grade (3 schools)	0	2
11th grade (2 schools)	1	1
Overall (13 schools)	7	8

Monitoring Report

Page -4-

Policy Type: Ends

Policy Title: Ends Policy 1.1

Growth Summary:

The percent of students with Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs) of 30 or above on the Spring 2024 State Assessments was calculated for each school. The following grades and assessments were used for rankings:

- Elementary Schools: 5th grade M-STEP
- Middle Schools: 8th grade PSAT 8
- High Schools: 11th grade SAT

MISchoolData defines Average Growth as SGPs from 30-69 and Above Average Growth as SGPs from 70-99.

% of students with SGPs >30	Status
70 - 100%	At Expectations
0 - 70%	Below Expectations

	% Student with Average or Above Average Growth	
	ELA	Math
AMB	69%	69%
ANG	84%	68%
CEL	81%	82%
HAV	68%	85%
LCE	77%	72%
MBE	83%	90%
TWL	80%	62%
WOD	79%	45%
CMS	74%	71%
NMS	71%	64%
WMS	76%	76%
CHS	75%	77%
NHS	76%	79%

Number of Schools At or Above Expectations

	ELA	Math
5th grade (8 schools)	6	4
8th grade (3 schools)	3	2
11th grade (2 schools)	2	2
Overall (13 schools)	11	8

Further Analysis

In reviewing the data, the Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Office, along with the Educational Supports and Intervention Office, take seriously both positive and negative moves relative to our Proficiency comparisons with Similar Schools and to our Student Growth. These key measures of our overall performance are critical to our mission and vision. We analyze these measures carefully over time, even though the data is a snapshot.

COVID has impacted our data, just like every other industry and institution worldwide. Specifically to this report and the data herein, COVID presents some confounding metrics that have potentially impacted our data in both positive and negative ways. Shifting modalities impacted students throughout the start of the pandemic and the 2020-2021 school year.

Evidence of annual Academic Proficiency is interpreted by a PPS school's ranking of the percentage of students proficient relative to its Similar Schools. Evidence of improvement in results over time is interpreted by a PPS school's change in the percentage of students proficient compared to its three-year average relative to similar schools' change over their three-year average. The three-year average has gaps due to no data being available in the spring of 2020 and incomplete data in the spring of 2021 (due to low participation). "Above Expectations" means that the PPS school is ranked first, second, or third relative to its Similar Schools. "At Expectations" means that the PPS school is ranked fourth, fifth, or sixth. "Below Expectations" means that the PPS school is ranked below sixth relative to its Similar Schools.

Evidence of annual Academic Growth is interpreted by the percent of PPS students who have a Student Growth Percentile (SGP) in the "Average Growth" range (30th to 69th percentile) or the "Above Average Growth" range (70th to 99th percentile), as defined by MISchoolData Student Growth report. For academic growth, the statistical norm for the percent of students with "Average Growth" or "Above Average Growth" is 70%. Therefore, any PPS school with at least 70% of students in these ranges is considered to be "At Expectations." Any PPS school with less than 70% of students in these ranges is considered to be "Below Expectations."

Reviewing our performance on the "Percent Proficient Summary," we have 8 of our 13 schools "At or Above Expectations" in ELA and 6 of our 13 schools "At or Above Expectations" in Math. Our high school results are our most positive, with both high schools having "At or Above Expectations" in both subjects. Fifth grade Math (2 of 8 schools "At or Above Expectations") and 8th grade ELA (1 of 3 schools "At or Above Expectations") are our largest concerns.

Reviewing our performance on the "Percent Proficient Improvement Summary," we have 7 of our 13 schools "At or Above Expectations" in ELA and 8 of our 13 schools "At or Above Expectations" in Math. Our 5th grade ELA results are the most positive, with 6 of 8 schools "At or Above Expectations." Eighth grade ELA (0 of 3 schools "At or Above Expectations") is our largest concern.

Monitoring Report

Page -6-

Policy Type: Ends

Policy Title: Ends Policy 1.1

Reviewing our performance on the “Growth Summary,” we have 11 of our 13 schools “At or Above Expectations” in ELA and 8 of our 13 schools “At or Above Expectations” in Math. Our most positive results are our 11th grade ELA and Math (2 of 2 schools “At or Above Expectations”) and 8th grade ELA (3 of 3 schools “At or Above Expectations”). Fifth grade Math (4 of 8 schools “At or Above Expectations”) is our largest concern.

Response

We recognize the urgency of addressing the overall decline in math proficiency while maintaining and building on gains in ELA. Our multifaceted approach, rooted in curriculum alignment, professional development, and targeted instructional strategies, will be critical in achieving these gains district-wide. We remain committed to empowering our educators and administrators to help all students reach their full potential.

Our goal is to increase the trajectory of student performance in both ELA and Math, ensuring all students have the opportunity to achieve proficiency and beyond by:

1. Focusing on sustaining and accelerating gains in ELA while intensifying efforts to address declining performance in math.
2. Leveraging ongoing initiatives such as coaching, training, and professional development to empower teachers and drive improved student outcomes.

Our strategic actions in the 24-25 school year and into the 25-26 school year are as follows:

English Language Arts (ELA):

- **Curriculum Implementation:**
 - The ELA curriculum is being implemented district-wide for grades K-9.
 - Grades 10-12 are in phase 3 and preparing for initial implementation.
 - Significant improvements in student outcomes are anticipated within the next 3–5 years.
- **Consistency in Instruction:**
 - All K-8 students are now engaged in daily, integrated reading and writing lessons, ensuring uniform and robust instruction district-wide.
- **Instructional Coaching:**
 - Coaching strategies help students tackle complex texts, guiding their thinking and skill development.
- **LETRS Training:**
 - Every K-5 teacher and administrator is engaging in LETRS training, equipping them with foundational expertise in teaching reading and writing.

Mathematics:

- **Instructional Framework Development:**
 - We refine instructional practices through the Curriculum Review Cycle, focusing on accessibility, actionable resources, and alignment with standards.
- **Learning Walks:**
 - Learning Walks enhance professional development by providing real-time data on instructional practices. These walks help administrators and teachers identify areas for growth, focusing on student engagement, questioning, and formative assessments.
- **Engagement and Discourse:**
 - K-5 Math Learning Labs are emphasizing student discussions and collaborative problem-solving.
 - Teachers in grades 6-8 participate in cooperative learning professional development, which integrates discourse-driven approaches and fosters deeper conceptual understanding.
- **Administrator Support:**
 - Targeted efforts are underway to build administrators' confidence and capacity in evaluating and supporting rigorous math instruction.

As Monitoring Report 1.1 has deep ties to the other global ends 1.0 elements, we understand the importance of our academic progress. This report and the other Ends 1.0 reports serve as guideposts for us to improve and build our students for success and as a touchstone on our performance as a district. We continue to believe and invest in our research and evidence-based systems and processes. We believe in our staff as world-class instructors. Finally, as we submit this Monitoring Report, we continue to believe in our students and the potential they offer to the Portage community and beyond.

Monitoring Report Evaluation Form

Policy: _____

Is the Superintendent's interpretation reasonable? Yes No

Comments:

Is evidence of compliance reasonable? Yes No

Comments:

For Ends Policies: Comments about long-term achievement of Ends Policy

Comments Regarding Further Policy Development

1. Do you have a concern that is not addressed in this policy?

2. What policy language would address your concern?

Evaluation submitted to Board President By: _____

Adopted: 9/22/08

Revised: 5/25/09, 3/22/10, 2/26/18, 11/20/23