Montague Area Public Schools, MI

Math Performance, Grades 3-8, 2016-2023

Average Math Scores and Trends in Scores
in Grade Level Equivalents Relative to the 2019 National Average

- 2019 Average: -0.43
- 2022 Average: -0.13
- 2023 Average: 0.06
- 2019-2022 Change: +0.30
- 2022-2023 Change: +0.19
- Since 2019: +0.49

Reading Performance, Grades 3-8, 2016-2023

Average Reading Scores and Trends in Scores
in Grade Level Equivalents Relative to the 2019 National Average

- 2019 Average: -0.52
- 2022 Average: -0.59
- 2023 Average: -0.59
- 2019-2022 Change: -0.07
- 2022-2023 Change: +0.01
- Since 2019: -0.06
Montague Area Public Schools, MI

Math Performance in Montague Area Public Schools vs. Michigan and Similar Districts, Grades 3-8, 2019-2023

Average Math Scores and Trends in Scores
in Grade Level Equivalents Relative to the 2019 National Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Montague Area Public Schools, MI</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>Similar Districts* in Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019 Average</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 Average</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023 Average</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2022 Change</td>
<td>+0.30</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-2023 Change</td>
<td>+0.19</td>
<td>+0.07</td>
<td>+0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2023 Change</td>
<td>+0.49</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comparison districts are the nearest matches within the same state based on socioeconomic status, demographics, and size.

Reading Performance in Montague Area Public Schools vs. Michigan and Similar Districts, Grades 3-8, 2019-2023

Average Reading Scores and Trends in Scores
in Grade Level Equivalents Relative to the 2019 National Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Montague Area Public Schools, MI</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>Similar Districts* in Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019 Average</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 Average</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023 Average</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2022 Change</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-2023 Change</td>
<td>+0.01</td>
<td>+0.01</td>
<td>+0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2023 Change</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comparison districts are the nearest matches within the same state based on socioeconomic status, demographics, and size.
Math Performance by Subgroup, Grades 3-8, 2019-2023

Average Math Scores and Trends in Scores
in Grade Level Equivalents Relative to the 2019 National Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Non-Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019 Average</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 Average</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023 Average</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019–2022 Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+0.25</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
<td>+0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022–2023 Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+0.18</td>
<td>+0.16</td>
<td>+0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019–2023 Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>+0.43</td>
<td>+0.37</td>
<td>+0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reading Performance by Subgroup, Grades 3-8, 2019-2023

Average Reading Scores and Trends in Scores
in Grade Level Equivalents Relative to the 2019 National Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Non-Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019 Average</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 Average</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023 Average</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019–2022 Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022–2023 Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>+0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019–2023 Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>+0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEARN MORE ABOUT THIS AND OTHER DISTRICTS AT EDOPPORTUNITY.ORG/RECOVERY
FOR MORE INFORMATION ON RECOVERY EFFORTS AND INDIVIDUAL STATE PRESS RELEASES, PLEASE VISIT EDUCATIONRECOVERYSCORECARD.ORG
Michigan Report on Covid Recovery

Change in Math Achievement 2019-2022
by proportion FRPL in Michigan districts

Change in Reading Achievement 2019-2022
by proportion FRPL in Michigan districts

Source: Education Recovery Scorecard, by Harvard CEPR and Stanford SEDA.
Notes: All estimates are based on published state assessment results, which have been rescaled to grade equivalents using state scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress.
For historical comparability, the proportion of students receiving free or reduced price lunch reflects the estimated number of students in households with incomes below 185% of the federal poverty level in Census data. Some districts may have higher rates of federally subsidized lunch recipients due to the community eligibility provision. The sample of districts shown have been limited to districts with reliable estimates.
Labeled points represent districts with at least 600 tested students per grade. The regression line displays the overall trend within the state.
For details on the methodology see https://edopportunity.org/methods.
Change in Math Achievement 2022-2023
by proportion FRPL in Michigan districts

![Graph](image)

Source: Education Recovery Scorecard, by Harvard CEPR and Stanford SEDA.
Notes: All estimates are based on published state assessment results, which have been rescaled to grade equivalents using state scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. For historical comparability, the proportion of students receiving free or reduced price lunch reflects the estimated number of students in households with incomes below 185% of the federal poverty level in Census data. Some districts may have higher rates of federally subsidized lunch recipients due to the community eligibility provision. The sample of districts shown have been limited to districts with reliable estimates. Labeled points represent districts with at least 600 tested students per grade. The regression line displays the overall trend within the state.

For details on the methodology see https://edopportunity.org/methods.

Change in Reading Achievement 2022-2023
by proportion FRPL in Michigan districts
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Source: Education Recovery Scorecard, by Harvard CEPR and Stanford SEDA.
Notes: All estimates are based on published state assessment results, which have been rescaled to grade equivalents using state scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. For historical comparability, the proportion of students receiving free or reduced price lunch reflects the estimated number of students in households with incomes below 185% of the federal poverty level in Census data. Some districts may have higher rates of federally subsidized lunch recipients due to the community eligibility provision. The sample of districts shown have been limited to districts with reliable estimates. Labeled points represent districts with at least 600 tested students per grade. The regression line displays the overall trend within the state.

For details on the methodology see https://edopportunity.org/methods.
Change in Math Achievement 2019-2023
by proportion FRPL in Michigan districts

Change in math achievement in grade equivalents

Proportion free or reduced lunch (2019)

Forest Hills  South Lyon  Livonia
Farmington Public  Traverse City Area  Utica
L’anse Creuse  Warren Consolidated  Dearborn City
Plymouth-Canton  Walled Lake Consolidated  Grand Rapids
Rochester  Portage  Wayne-Westland
Chippewa Valley  Lansing Public
Ann Arbor

Source: Education Recovery Scorecard, by Harvard CEPR and Stanford SEDA.
Notes: All estimates are based on published state assessment results, which have been rescaled to grade equivalents using state scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. For historical comparability, the proportion of students receiving free or reduced price lunch reflects the estimated number of students in households with incomes below 185% of the federal poverty level in Census data. Some districts may have higher rates of federally subsidized lunch recipients due to the community eligibility provision. The sample of districts shown have been limited to districts with reliable estimates. Labeled points represent districts with at least 600 tested students per grade. The regression line displays the overall trend within the state.
For details on the methodology see https://opportunity.org/methods.

Change in Reading Achievement 2019-2023
by proportion FRPL in Michigan districts

Change in reading achievement in grade equivalents

Proportion free or reduced lunch (2019)

Plymouth-Canton  Livonia
Walled Lake Consolidated  Utica
Chippewa Valley  Warren Consolidated
Troy  Kalamazoo
Ann Arbor  Detroit

Source: Education Recovery Scorecard, by Harvard CEPR and Stanford SEDA.
Notes: All estimates are based on published state assessment results, which have been rescaled to grade equivalents using state scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. For historical comparability, the proportion of students receiving free or reduced price lunch reflects the estimated number of students in households with incomes below 185% of the federal poverty level in Census data. Some districts may have higher rates of federally subsidized lunch recipients due to the community eligibility provision. The sample of districts shown have been limited to districts with reliable estimates. Labeled points represent districts with at least 600 tested students per grade. The regression line displays the overall trend within the state.
For details on the methodology see https://opportunity.org/methods.
### Change in Math Achievement
by proportion FRPL in Michigan districts

**2019-2022**  
![Scatter plot for 2019-2022]  
Change in math achievement in grade equivalents vs. Proportion free or reduced lunch (2019)

**2022-2023**  
![Scatter plot for 2022-2023]  
Change in math achievement in grade equivalents vs. Proportion free or reduced lunch (2019)

**2019-2023**  
![Scatter plot for 2019-2023]  
Change in math achievement in grade equivalents vs. Proportion free or reduced lunch (2019)

Source: Education Recovery Scorecard, by Harvard CEPR and Stanford SEDA.
Notes: All estimates are based on published state assessment results, which have been rescaled to grade equivalents using state scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. Some districts may have higher rates of federally subsidized lunch recipients due to the community eligibility provision. The sample of districts shown have been limited to districts with reliable estimates. Blue points represent districts with at least 600 tested students per grade. The regression line displays the overall trend within the state.
For details on the methodology see https://edopportunity.org/methods.

---

### Change in Reading Achievement
by proportion FRPL in Michigan districts

**2019-2022**  
![Scatter plot for 2019-2022]  
Change in reading achievement in grade equivalents vs. Proportion free or reduced lunch (2019)

**2022-2023**  
![Scatter plot for 2022-2023]  
Change in reading achievement in grade equivalents vs. Proportion free or reduced lunch (2019)

**2019-2023**  
![Scatter plot for 2019-2023]  
Change in reading achievement in grade equivalents vs. Proportion free or reduced lunch (2019)

Source: Education Recovery Scorecard, by Harvard CEPR and Stanford SEDA.
Notes: All estimates are based on published state assessment results, which have been rescaled to grade equivalents using state scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. Some districts may have higher rates of federally subsidized lunch recipients due to the community eligibility provision. The sample of districts shown have been limited to districts with reliable estimates. Orange points represent districts with at least 800 tested students per grade. The regression line displays the overall trend within the state.
For details on the methodology see https://edopportunity.org/methods.
Michigan Math Achievement
By Race and Economic Status

Change in Achievement

Change in Achievement Gaps
2019-2023

Source: Education Recovery Scorecard, by Harvard CEPR and Stanford SEDA.
Notes: All estimates are based on published state assessment results, which have been rescaled to grade equivalents using state scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. For details on the methodology, see https://edopportunity.org/methods/.

Michigan Reading Achievement
By Race and Economic Status

Change in Achievement

Change in Achievement Gaps
2019-2023

Source: Education Recovery Scorecard, by Harvard CEPR and Stanford SEDA.
Notes: All estimates are based on published state assessment results, which have been rescaled to grade equivalents using state scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress. For details on the methodology, see https://edopportunity.org/methods/.