

Colorado Charter School Institute
Annual Review of Schools (CARS) Report
2016-2017

Animas High School



CSI HISTORY

In response to the growing desire for charter schools, the lack of school options for at-risk students, and the interest in an alternate mode of authorizing charter schools that could assist districts in implementing authorizing best practices, the State Legislature created the Charter School Institute (CSI) in 2004.

OUR MISSION

The mission of the Charter School Institute is to foster high-quality public school choices offered through Institute charter schools, including particularly schools that are focused on closing the achievement gap for at-risk students.

OUR VISION

The vision of the Charter School Institute is to be a national leader as a highly effective charter school authorizer by building a portfolio of high performing public charter schools through authorizing practices that promote a variety of successful and innovative educational designs, including an emphasis on schools that serve at-risk youth.

Colorado Charter School Institute
1580 Logan Street Suite 210 | Denver, CO 80203
P: (303) 866-3299 | www.csi.state.co.us

Table of Contents

CSI Annual Review of Schools (CARS) Summary.....	4
How to Use the CARS Report.....	5
CSI Performance Frameworks.....	6
CSI Annual Review of Schools (CARS) Rating.....	8
Participation.....	9
Academic Performance	
CMAS English Language Arts.....	11
CMAS Math.....	15
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness.....	19
School Observations.....	31
Financial Performance.....	32
Organizational Performance.....	34

CSI Annual Review of Schools (CARS) Summary

CARS was developed to fulfill statutory requirements and to align with best practice. CARS builds upon the evaluation lens utilized by the State—which evaluates academic achievement, academic growth, and postsecondary and workforce readiness—by including additional measures related to academic, financial, and organizational performance to provide a more comprehensive and robust evaluation that includes strong indicators of charter viability and sustainability. CARS will accomplish three primary objectives:

1. Add to the *body of evidence* that is used to make authorization decisions
2. Determine the school *accreditation rating* that is primarily used to inform authorization pathways
3. Determine the *level of support/intervention* to provide to the school

CSI Performance Framework

The CSI Performance Framework provides the basis for the CSI Annual Review of Schools. The Performance Framework explicitly defines the measures by which CSI holds schools accountable with regards to academic, financial, and organizational performance. The three areas of performance covered by the frameworks—academic, financial, and organizational— correspond directly with the three components of a strong charter school application, the three key areas of responsibility outlined in strong state charter laws and strong charter school contracts, and are the three areas on which a charter school’s performance should be evaluated.

CARS Accreditation Ratings

Pursuant to the Colorado Revised Statutes and rules applicable to Colorado school districts and authorizers, CSI is responsible for accrediting its schools in a manner that emphasizes attainment on the four statewide performance indicators, and may, at CSI’s discretion, include additional accreditation indicators and measures. CSI prioritizes academic performance in determining accreditation ratings. Specifically, a base accreditation rating is determined by academic performance on a subset of measures within the Academic Framework. Then, if a subset of measures on the Finance or Organizational Framework are missed, the accreditation rating is lowered



Upon issuance of accreditation ratings, each school enters into an accreditation contract with CSI as required by state law. The accreditation contract describes the school’s CARS accreditation rating, the school’s performance plan type, assures compliance with the provisions of Title 22 and other applicable laws, and describes the consequences for noncompliance and Priority Improvement and Turnaround accreditation plan types. The accreditation contract is distinct from the charter contract, and may change from year-to-year or more frequently depending on the school’s plan type and individual circumstances.

In accordance with the CSI Accreditation Policy, CSI schools accredited with a rating of Improvement, Priority Improvement, or Turnaround must re-execute the accreditation contract annually. For schools accredited Distinction or Performance, the accreditation contract will renew automatically, except all schools, regardless of plan type, will re-execute the accreditation contract upon renewal.

How to Use the CSI Annual Review of Schools (CARS) Report

This **CARS Report** summarizes the school's cumulative performance and compliance data from required and agreed-upon sources, as collected by CSI over the term of the school's charter. The data collected and presented within this report reflect outcomes along the academic, financial, and organizational measures outlined with the CSI Performance Framework.

In order to summarize each section, CSI will include a *brief* narrative providing feedback on the school's progress within the indicators and/or metrics where applicable. Schools have the opportunity to provide a brief narrative for each section as well. Any additional claims within the school narrative must be substantiated with supplemental evidence that can be verified by CSI. The school narrative should focus on outputs and outcomes. Factors such as culture, curriculum, and PD, for example are important in your internal evaluations and root cause analysis, but are not considered by CSI as a part of your annual evaluation.

Schools should look at trends in the data and use the feedback provided within the report as evidence of success, as well as to identify areas that may need the allocation of additional resources and attention. This can be a useful tool to use in conjunction with the **Unified Improvement Plan (UIP)**.

A majority of the metrics within this report will be collected by CSI on a yearly basis and presented to each school in **November**. As this is the preliminary draft, please review all data collected for accuracy. Should you find any incorrect or inaccurate data (as opposed to findings or conclusions you simply disagree with), please contact the appropriate director:

Academic Performance: Ryan Marks

Financial Performance: Amanda Karger

Organizational Performance: Clare Vickland - State/Federal Programs | Trish Krajniak - Compliance Monitoring

If you wish to supplement any area of your report with additional evidence, these proposed changes or additions must be returned to CSI (ryanmarks@csi.state.co.us) **no later than November 27th**.

Once all data have been reviewed (and where applicable incorporated into the report), CSI will send each school a final report in **December**. This final version will also contain financial information that is unavailable during the preliminary drafting process. You may use the tables, graphs and narrative of this final report in your UIP.

Please note: Interim and formative assessment data submitted by schools as supplemental evidence should be presented in the form of official reports generated by the test vendor, or in the case of locally developed assessments, generated through the official reporting system (e.g., Edusoft). Where this is not possible, exported flat files must be provided. Criteria for submitting additional assessment data include:

- Testing administration date(s), total number of test takers, and total number of enrolled students at the time of administration should be noted with each report.
- Growth data should reflect gains made using the beginning of the year as baseline and the end of the academic year as compared to national, state or pre-approved norms. If seasonal gains are submitted, these must also be accompanied with norms recognized by the nation, state or pre-approved by CSI.
- Regarding other supplemental evidence you wish to submit, any outputs or outcomes submitted that are not calculated and reported by CSI or the State must be accompanied by a Mission-Specific Measures Form, specifying how you quantify the measure (including methodology used to determine, document and calculate your measure).

CSI Performance Framework

Academic Performance Framework*

1. Academic Achievement

- a. How are students achieving on state assessments?
- b. How are students achieving on state assessments over time?
- c. How are students achieving on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?
- d. Have students demonstrated readiness for the next grade level/course, and, ultimately, are they on track for college and careers?
- e. How are students achieving in comparison to similar schools statewide?

2. Academic Growth

- a. Are students making sufficient growth on state assessments?
- b. Are students making sufficient growth on state assessments over time?
- c. How are students growing on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?
- d. How is student growth distributed across growth levels?
- e. How are students growing in comparison to similar schools statewide?

3. Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

- a. How are students achieving on state assessments for postsecondary readiness?
- b. Are students graduating high school?
- c. Are students dropping out of high school?
- d. Are high school graduates adequately prepared for post-secondary academic success?
- e. What is the school's post-completion success rate?

*Data Notes:

- Data sources include achievement, growth, and postsecondary and workforce readiness state files from 2010 to 2017. To protect student privacy, achievement data N counts less than 16 and growth data N counts less than 20 have been hidden. For more information regarding data privacy, please consult: <https://www.cde.state.co.us/dataprivacyandsecurity>

- Data symbols:

Symbol	Meaning
NA	Used when data is not reported by the state.
*	Used when data is not available due to student counts of 0.
n<16	Used for achievement measures. Indicates that student counts were too low to show the data publicly.
n<20	Used for growth measures. Indicates that student counts were too low to show the data publicly.
--	Used when data is not reportable due to low student counts.

- Traditionally underserved populations include minority, special education, free or reduced price lunch, non-English proficient/limited English proficient (English learners), and gifted & talented students.
- The Math section of this report includes student math scores disaggregated by grade level. Students in the 7th, 8th, and 9th grades reflect all students in those grades who took any type of CMAS math test. State reporting does not disaggregate by grade for the high school level math tests. Therefore, students in 8th grade who opt to take either Algebra I, II, or Geometry are not included in the 8th grade level results. CSI will release an additional report containing disaggregated math results by test at a later date.
- Dropout rates contain 7th and 8th grade dropouts. The state files contain all students who dropped out of school from 7th to 12th grade. Schools have an option of requesting an additional report containing only dropout rates for 9th-12th grade.

CSI Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework

1. Near Term

- a. Has the school met the statutory TABOR emergency reserve requirement?
- b. What is the school's current ratio?
- c. What is the school's months of cash on hand?
- d. Is the school in default with any financial covenants they have with loan agreements?
- e. What is the school's funded pupil count variance?

2. Sustainability

- a. What is the school's aggregate 3-year total margin?
- b. What is the school's net asset position?
- c. What is the school's debt?
- d. What is the school's unassigned fund balance on hand?

Organizational Performance Framework

1. Education Program

- a. Is the school complying with applicable education requirements?

2. Diversity, Equity of Access, and Inclusion

- a. Is the school protecting the rights of all students?

3. Governance and Financial Management

- a. Is the school complying with governance requirements?
- b. Is the school satisfying financial reporting and compliance requirements?

4. School Operations and Environment

- a. Is the school complying with health and safety requirements?
- b. Is the school complying with facilities and transportation requirements?
- c. Is the school complying with employee credentialing and background check requirements?

5. Additional Obligations

- a. Is the school complying with all other obligations?

CSI Annual Review of Schools (CARS) Rating

The CSI School Performance Framework serves to hold schools accountable for performance on the same, single set of indicators. The CSI Framework builds upon the evaluation lens by the State to include measures that may provide a more detailed and comprehensive summary of charter school performance. CSI's frameworks align with the state frameworks in that they also evaluate schools across the four key performance indicators of academic achievement, academic growth, academic growth gaps, and postsecondary and workforce readiness. The distinguishing feature between the CDE School Performance Framework (SPF) and CSI's Academic Framework is the incorporation of trend data and a comparison to the geographic district, as it is important to ask how a school is performing over time as well as whether the school is better serving the needs of students than area schools. Additionally, the CSI frameworks also include measures outside of the academic realm that are strong predictors of charter viability such as financial health and organizational sustainability.

Framework	Rating
Academic	Performance: Low Participation
Financial	Financial performance does not impact the school accreditation rating
Organizational	Organizational performance does not impact the school accreditation rating
Overall Rating	Performance with Distinction: Low Participation

Participation Rate Analysis

Participation

The School Performance Framework now includes participation descriptors for school plan types that have low participation rates. These descriptors include:

- **Low Participation** is for schools with test participation rates below 95 percent in two or more content areas. The participation rate used for this descriptor includes students as non-participants if their parents formally excused them from taking the tests. Because low participation can impact how well the results reflect the school as a whole, it is important to consider low participation in reviewing the results on the frameworks. Participation rates are also reported on the first page of the frameworks, along with the achievement results on the subsequent pages.
- **Decreased Due to Participation** indicates the plan type, or rating, was lowered one level because assessment participation rates fell below 95 percent in two or more content areas. Parent refusals are excluded from the calculations for this descriptor. According to the State Board of Education motion, schools and districts will not be held liable for parental excusals.

The tables below contain participation rates as shown on your school's Performance Framework, as well as test participation rates disaggregated by test.

Assurance

	Rating
Accountability Participation Rate	Meets 95%

Test Participation Rates (Ratings are based on Accountability Participation Rate)

Subject	Total Records	Valid Scores	Participation Rate	Parent Excuses	Accountability Participation Rate	Rating
English Language Arts	202	188	93.1%	10	97.9%	Meets 95%
Math	202	189	93.6%	10	98.4%	Meets 95%
Science	60	45	75.0%	15	100.0%	Meets 95%

Test Participation Rates - Disaggregated by Test

Subject	Total Records	Valid Scores	Participation Rate	Parent Excuses	Accountability Participation Rate	Rating
CMAS English Language Arts	67	59	88.1%	7	98.3%	Meets 95%
CMAS Math	67	60	89.6%	7	100.0%	Meets 95%
CMAS Science	60	45	75.0%	15	100.0%	Meets 95%
PSAT/SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing	135	129	95.6%	3	97.7%	Meets 95%
PSAT/SAT Math	135	129	95.6%	3	97.7%	Meets 95%


Participation Rate Analysis

Participation Rate Comparison


-Are the different subgroups in the school being represented appropriately in the participation rate?

Participation Rate						
	ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS		MATH		SCIENCE	
	% Tested Population	% of Assessed Population (Oct. Count)	% Tested Population	% of Assessed Population (Oct. Count)	% Tested Population	% of Assessed Population (Oct. Count)
F/R Lunch	15.4%	13.3%	14.8%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%
Minority	14.4%	18.7%	13.8%	18.7%	15.6%	18.7%
IEP	8.5%	10.7%	8.5%	10.7%	6.7%	10.7%
EL	1.6%	1.3%	1.6%	1.3%	4.4%	1.3%
GT	11.7%	9.3%	11.1%	9.3%	0.0%	9.3%


English Language Arts



Math



Science




Academic Performance

English Language Arts Achievement

CMAS ELA: School Status and Trends

-How are students achieving on state assessments in English Language Arts over time?

Achievement over Time in ELA						
CMAS ELA	2015		2016		2017	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Elementary	0	*	0	*	0	*
6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Middle	0	*	0	*	0	*
9	28	752	65	740	58	742
High	28	752	65	740	58	742
Overall	28	752	65	740	58	742



The high school level has seen decreases in performance over the last three years, with a slight increase in performance from 2016 to 2017.


CMAS ELA: Local Comparison

-How are students achieving on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?

School Proficiency over Time in ELA						
CMAS ELA	2015		2016		2017	
Grade/Level	N	%M/E	N	%M/E	N	%M/E
3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Elementary	0	*	0	*	0	*
6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Middle	0	*	0	*	0	*
9	28	53.6%	65	44.6%	58	46.6%
High	28	53.6%	65	44.6%	58	46.6%
Overall	28	53.6%	65	44.6%	58	46.6%

Geographic District Proficiency over Time in ELA						
CMAS ELA	2015		2016		2017	
Grade/Level	N	%M/E	N	%M/E	N	%M/E
3	335	42.7%	390	39.5%	376	33.5%
4	368	52.7%	340	58.5%	411	54.5%
5	305	55.7%	358	60.3%	354	56.2%
Elementary	1008	50.3%	1088	52.3%	1141	48.1%
6	336	39.6%	264	49.2%	325	52.3%
7	279	46.2%	334	47.3%	296	53.4%
8	274	47.8%	269	54.6%	350	44.3%
Middle	889	44.2%	867	50.2%	971	49.7%
9	255	58.8%	253	58.5%	303	53.8%
High	255	58.8%	253	58.5%	303	53.8%
Overall	2152	48.8%	2208	52.2%	2415	49.5%

ELA Achievement Comparison



The School outperforms their geographic district in the percent of students meeting/exceeding state expectations in English Language Arts overall in 2015. In 2016 and 2017, the School performs below the geographic district.

NA	Not reported by the state.
*	Not available due to student counts of 0.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet


English Language Arts Subgroup Achievement

CMAS ELA: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends

- How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments in English Language Arts over time?
- How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments compared to their peers over time?

Subgroup Achievement Gap Trends over Time			
CMAS ELA	2015	2016	2017
Student Subgroup	%M/E	%M/E	%M/E
F/R Lunch	Y	n<16	n<16
	N	53.8%	47.4%
Minority	Y	n<16	n<16
	N	62.5%	46.6%
IEP	Y	n<16	n<16
	N	57.7%	46.8%
EL	Y	n<16	*
	N	55.6%	44.6%
GT	Y	n<16	n<16
	N	40.9%	43.9%
Schoolwide	53.6%	44.6%	46.6%
Geographic District	48.8%	52.2%	49.5%

Traditionally underserved student performance comparisons on the CMAS English Language Arts section cannot be publicly reported in 2016 and 2017 due to low student counts (n<16).




CMAS ELA: Subgroup Local Comparison

- How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?

School Subgroup ELA Proficiency over Time						
CMAS ELA	2015		2016		2017	
Subgroup	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
Minority	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
IEP	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
EL	n<16	--	0	*	n<16	--
GT	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
Schoolwide	28	752	65	740	58	742

Geographic District Subgroup ELA Proficiency over Time						
CMAS ELA	2015		2016		2017	
Subgroup	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	623	730	678	731	779	730
Minority	587	733	629	739	705	736
IEP	217	706	209	705	231	706
EL	130	719	139	723	155	721
GT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Geo. District	2093	747	2148	751	2297	748

ELA Subgroup Achievement Comparison



Traditionally underserved student performance comparisons on the CMAS English Language Arts section cannot be publicly reported in 2016 and 2017 due to low student counts (n<16).

NA	Not reported by the state.
*	Not available due to student counts of 0.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.


Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

English Language Arts Growth

CMAS ELA: School Status and Trends

-Are students making sufficient growth on state assessments over time?

Growth over Time in ELA				
CMAS ELA	2016		2017	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	0	*	0	*
5	0	*	0	*
Elementary	0	*	0	*
6	0	*	0	*
7	0	*	0	*
8	0	*	0	*
Middle	0	*	0	*
9	47	60.0	45	56.0
High	47	60.0	45	56.0
Overall	47	60.0	45	56.0





Overall, the School is meeting state expectations for growth and growth scores have decreased over time.

CMAS ELA: Levels of Growth

-How is student growth distributed across growth levels over time?

ELA Levels of Growth		
CMAS ELA	%Students	
Category	2016	2017
Low (below 35)	36%	18%
Typical (35-65)	17%	44%
High (above 65)	47%	38%




ELA At/Below 50th %ile		
CMAS ELA	%Students	
Category	2016	2017
At or Above 50	57%	62%
Below 50	43%	38%

Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 18% of students with growth scores while students with high growth rates, categorized as students with a MGP above 65, account for 38% of students. The percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased from 57% in 2016 to 62% in 2017.

CMAS ELA: Local Comparison

-How are students growing on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?

Geographic District Growth over Time in ELA				
CMAS ELA	2016		2017	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	303	60.0	361	59.0
5	323	66.0	310	52.5
Elementary	626	NA	671	57.0
6	228	51.0	281	52.0
7	298	61.5	253	44.0
8	238	65.0	307	44.0
Middle	764	NA	841	45.0
9	203	69.0	213	69.0
High	203	NA	213	69.0
Overall	1593	62.0	1725	53.0



The School demonstrates higher growth scores than their geographic district overall. At the high school level, the School falls below the geographic district. Both the geographic district and the School's growth scores have decreased over time.

NA	Not reported by the state.
*	Not available due to student counts of 0.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet


English Language Arts Subgroup Growth

CMAS ELA: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends

- How are traditionally underserved students growing on state assessments in English Language Arts over time?
- How are traditionally underserved students growing on state assessments compared to their peers over time?

Subgroup Growth Gap Trends over Time			
CMAS ELA		2016	2017
Student Subgroup		MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	n<20	n<20
	N	57.0	56.0
Minority	Y	n<20	n<20
	N	57.0	55.0
IEP	Y	n<20	n<20
	N	62.0	56.0
EL	Y	n<20	n<20
	N	60.0	56.0
GT	Y	n<20	n<20
	N	54.0	54.0
Schoolwide		60.0	56.0
Geographic District		62.0	53.0

Traditionally underserved student performance on the CMAS English Language Arts section cannot be publicly reported in 2016 and 2017 due to low student counts (n<20).



CMAS ELA: Subgroup Local Comparison


- How are traditionally underserved students growing on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their

Subgroup ELA Growth over Time				
CMAS ELA	2016		2017	
Subgroup	N	MGP	N	MGP
F/R Lunch	n<20	--	n < 20	--
Minority	n<20	--	n < 20	--
IEP	n<20	--	n < 20	--
EL	n<20	--	n < 20	--
GT	n<20	--	n < 20	--
Schoolwide	47	60.0	45	56.0

Traditionally underserved student performance on the CMAS English Language Arts section cannot be publicly reported in 2016 and 2017 due to low student counts (n<20).

Geographic District Subgroup ELA Growth				
CMAS ELA	2016		2017	
Subgroup	N	MGP	N	MGP
F/R Lunch	488	54.0	549	45.0
Minority	465	62.0	518	46.0
IEP	157	49.0	161	40.0
EL	104	51.0	114	48.5
GT	156	75.0	47	65.0
Geo. District	1593	62.0	1725	53.0

ELA Subgroup Growth Comparison



NA	Not reported by the state.
*	Not available due to student counts of 0.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet


Academic Performance

Math Achievement

CMAS Math: School Status and Trends

-How are students achieving on state assessments in math over time?

Achievement over Time in Math						
CMAS Math	2015		2016		2017	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Elementary	0	*	0	*	0	*
6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Middle	0	*	0	*	0	*
9	26	730	67	721	58	732
High	26	730	67	721	58	732
Overall	26	730	67	721	58	732



*7th, 8th, and 9th grade math includes ALL students who took a math test in those grades. Please consult the data notes for more information.

Overall and at the high school level the School has inconsistent performance over the past three years, with decreases in performance from 2015 to 2016 and slight increases in performance from 2016 to 2017.


CMAS Math: Local Comparison

-How are students achieving on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?

School Proficiency over Time in Math						
CMAS Math	2015		2016		2017	
Grade/Level	N	%M/E	N	%M/E	N	%M/E
3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Elementary	0	*	0	*	0	*
6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Middle	0	*	0	*	0	*
9	26	23.1%	67	11.9%	58	24.1%
High	26	23.1%	67	11.9%	58	24.1%
Overall	26	23.1%	67	11.9%	58	24.1%

Geographic District Proficiency over Time in Math						
CMAS Math	2015		2016		2017	
Grade/Level	N	%M/E	N	%M/E	N	%M/E
3	334	39.8%	390	38.5%	379	30.6%
4	369	27.4%	342	32.5%	411	34.3%
5	308	32.5%	358	44.7%	352	30.7%
Elementary	1011	33.0%	1090	38.6%	1142	32.0%
6	337	29.4%	265	26.8%	326	30.7%
7	263	22.4%	324	22.8%	290	27.2%
8	194	10.3%	198	12.1%	270	10.4%
Middle	794	22.4%	787	21.5%	886	23.4%
9	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
High	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Overall	1805	28.4%	1877	31.4%	2028	28.2%

Math Achievement Comparison



The geographic district consistently outperforms the School in the percent of students meeting/exceeding state expectations in math overall and at each level.

NA	Not reported by the state.
*	Not available due to student counts of 0.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet


Math Subgroup Achievement

CMAS Math: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends

- How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments in math over time?
- How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments compared to their peers over time?

Subgroup Achievement Gap Trends over Time				
CMAS Math		2015	2016	2017
Student Subgroup		%M/E	%M/E	%M/E
F/R Lunch	Y	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	20.8%	12.1%	28.6%
Minority	Y	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	26.1%	13.3%	24.5%
IEP	Y	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	25.0%	12.7%	26.4%
EL	Y	n<16	*	n<16
	N	24.0%	11.9%	24.6%
GT	Y	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	10.0%	8.5%	18.9%
Schoolwide		23.1%	11.9%	24.1%
Geographic District		28.4%	31.4%	28.2%

Traditionally underserved student performance comparisons on the CMAS English Language Arts section cannot be publicly reported in 2016 and 2017 due to low student counts (n<16).




CMAS Math: Subgroup Local Comparison

- How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?

School Subgroup Math Proficiency over Time						
CMAS Math	2015		2016		2017	
Subgroup	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
Minority	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
IEP	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
EL	n<16	--	0	*	n<16	--
GT	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
Schoolwide	26	730	67	721	58	732

Geographic District Subgroup Math Proficiency over Time						
CMAS Math	2015		2016		2017	
Subgroup	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	621	723	679	721	781	718
Minority	587	725	631	727	709	722
IEP	216	706	210	700	229	700
EL	131	714	140	714	161	712
GT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Geo. District	2098	736	2146	736	2288	733

Math Subgroup Achievement Comparison



Traditionally underserved student performance comparisons on the CMAS English Language Arts section cannot be publicly reported in 2016 and 2017 due to low student counts (n<16).

NA	Not reported by the state.
*	Not available due to student counts of 0.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet


Academic Performance

Math Growth

CMAS Math: School Status and Trends

-Are students making sufficient growth on state assessments over time?

Growth over Time in Math				
CMAS Math	2016		2017	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	0	*	0	*
5	0	*	0	*
Elementary	0	*	0	*
6	0	*	0	*
7	0	*	0	*
8	0	*	0	*
Middle	0	*	0	*
9	34	38.0	43	58.0
High	34	38.0	43	58.0
Overall	34	38.0	43	58.0





Overall the School is meeting state expectations for growth and growth scores have increased over time overall.

CMAS Math: Levels of Growth

-How is student growth distributed across growth levels over time?

Math Levels of Growth		
CMAS Math	%Students	
Category	2016	2017
Low (below 35)	38%	33%
Typical (35-65)	35%	21%
High (above 65)	26%	47%




Math At/Below 50th %ile		
CMAS Math	%Students	
Category	2016	2017
At or Above 50	41%	58%
Below 50	59%	42%

Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 33% of students with growth scores while students with high growth rates, categorized as students with a MGP above 65, account for 47% of students. The percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has increased from 41% in 2016 to 58% in 2017.

CMAS Math: Local Comparison

-How are students growing on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?

Geographic District Growth over Time in Math				
CMAS Math	2016		2017	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	303	51.0	360	54.0
5	324	65.5	307	48.0
Elementary	627	NA	667	51.0
6	232	43.5	279	48.0
7	288	57.0	255	51.0
8	169	37.0	233	44.0
Middle	689	NA	767	47.0
9	132	55.0	n < 20	--
High	132	NA	n < 20	--
Overall	1448	53.0	1451	49.0



The School demonstrates higher growth scores than their geographic district overall. Additionally, the geographic district growth scores have decreased over time while the School's growth scores have increased.

NA	Not reported by the state.
*	Not available due to student counts of 0.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

Academic Performance


Math Subgroup Growth

CMAS Math: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends

- How are traditionally underserved students growing on state assessments in math over time?
- How are traditionally underserved students growing on state assessments compared to their peers over time?

Subgroup Growth Gap Trends over Time			
CMAS Math		2016	2017
Student Subgroup		MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	n<20	n<20
	N	38.0	65.0
Minority	Y	n<20	n<20
	N	37.0	52.0
IEP	Y	n<20	n<20
	N	47.0	61.0
EL	Y	n<20	n<20
	N	38.0	55.0
GT	Y	n<20	n<20
	N	38.0	64.0
Schoolwide		38.0	n<20
Geographic District		53.0	49.0

Traditionally underserved student performance on the CMAS math section cannot be publicly reported in 2016 and 2017 due to low student counts (n<20).



CMAS Math: Subgroup Local Comparison


- How are traditionally underserved students growing on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?

Subgroup Math Growth over Time				
CMAS Math	2016		2017	
Subgroup	N	MGP	N	MGP
F/R Lunch	n<20	--	n < 20	--
Minority	n<20	--	n < 20	--
IEP	n<20	--	n < 20	--
EL	n<20	--	n < 20	--
GT	n<20	--	n < 20	--
Schoolwide	34	38.0	43	58.0

Traditionally underserved student performance on the CMAS math section cannot be publicly reported in 2016 and 2017 due to low student counts (n<20).

Geographic District Subgroup Math Growth				
CMAS Math	2016		2017	
Subgroup	N	MGP	N	MGP
F/R Lunch	479	51.0	500	45.0
Minority	451	52.0	471	44.0
IEP	157	39.0	147	45.0
EL	104	49.0	109	47.0
GT	110	57.0	46	55.5
Geo. District	1448	53.0	1451	49.0

Math Subgroup Growth Comparison



NA	Not reported by the state.
*	Not available due to student counts of 0.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

Academic Performance

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Achievement

PSAT: School Status and Trends


-How are students achieving on PWR state assessments over time?

Achievement over Time in EBRW ^A				
PSAT	2016		2017	
Assessment	N	MSS	N	MSS
EBRW	66	513	70	492

^AEvidence-based Reading and Writing

Achievement over Time in Math				
PSAT	2016		2017	
Assessment	N	MSS	N	MSS
Math	66	466	70	447

Achievement over Time Overall				
PSAT	2016		2017	
Assessment	N	MSS	N	MSS
Overall	66	980	70	939



The School's PSAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing scores meet state expectations and the scores have decreased from the year prior. The School's PSAT math scores are approaching state expectations and the scores have decreased from the year prior.


PSAT: Local Comparison

-How are students achieving on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?

Geo. District Achievement over Time in EBRW				
PSAT	2016		2017	
Assessment	N	MSS	N	MSS
EBRW	253	501	307	494

Geo. District Achievement over Time in Math				
PSAT	2016		2017	
Assessment	N	MSS	N	MSS
Math	253	478	307	468

Geo. District Achievement over Time Overall				
PSAT	2016		2017	
Assessment	N	MSS	N	MSS
Overall	253	979	307	962



Overall, the School's PSAT scores are lower than the geographic district. The School also produced scores lower than the geographic district on the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing and math section of the PSAT. Additionally, both the geographic district and the School's scores have decreased.

NA	Not reported by the state.
*	Not available due to student counts of 0.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet


Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Achievement

PSAT: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends

- How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments for postsecondary readiness?
- How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments for postsecondary readiness compared to their peers over time?

Subgroup PSAT Proficiency in EBRW			
PSAT		2016	2017
Student Subgroup		MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	n<16	n<16
	N	529	496
Minority	Y	n<16	n<16
	N	529	496
IEP	Y	n<16	n<16
	N	520	500
EL	Y	*	*
	N	513	492
GT	Y	*	n<16
	N	513	479
Schoolwide		513	492
Geographic District		501	494

Traditionally underserved student performance on the PSAT cannot be publicly reported in 2016 and 2017 due to low student counts (n<16).



PSAT: Subgroup Local Comparison


- How are traditionally underserved students growing on state assessments for postsecondary readiness in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?

School Subgroup Proficiency in EBRW				
PSAT	2016		2017	
Subgroup	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	n<16	--	n<16	--
Minority	n<16	--	n<16	--
IEP	n<16	--	n<16	--
EL	0	*	0	*
GT	0	*	n<16	--
Schoolwide	66	513	70	492

Traditionally underserved student performance on the PSAT cannot be publicly reported in 2016 and 2017 due to low student counts (n<16).

Geo. District Subgroup Proficiency in EBRW				
PSAT	2016		2017	
Subgroup	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	NA	NA	118	434
Minority	NA	NA	135	450
IEP	NA	NA	41	394
EL	NA	NA	23	392
GT	NA	NA	NA	NA
Geo. District	253	501	307	494

EBRW Subgroup PSAT Comparison



NA	Not reported by the state.
*	Not available due to student counts of 0.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet


Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Achievement

PSAT: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends

- How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments for postsecondary readiness?
- How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments for postsecondary readiness compared to their peers over time?

Subgroup PSAT Proficiency in Math			
PSAT		2016	2017
Student Subgroup		MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	n<16	n<16
	N	475	449
Minority	Y	n<16	n<16
	N	475	449
IEP	Y	n<16	n<16
	N	471	450
EL	Y	*	*
	N	466	447
GT	Y	*	n<16
	N	466	433
Schoolwide		466	447
Geographic District		478	468

Traditionally underserved student performance on the PSAT cannot be publicly reported in 2016 and 2017 due to low student counts (n<16).



PSAT: Subgroup Local Comparison


- How are traditionally underserved students growing on state assessments for postsecondary readiness in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?

School Subgroup Proficiency in Math				
PSAT	2016		2017	
Subgroup	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	n<16	--	n<16	--
Minority	n<16	--	n<16	--
IEP	n<16	--	n<16	--
EL	0	*	0	*
GT	0	*	n<16	--
Schoolwide	66	466	70	447

Traditionally underserved student performance on the PSAT cannot be publicly reported in 2016 and 2017 due to low student counts (n<16).

Geo. District Subgroup Proficiency in Math				
PSAT	2016		2017	
Subgroup	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	NA	NA	118	428
Minority	NA	NA	135	438
IEP	NA	NA	41	395
EL	NA	NA	23	406
GT	NA	NA	NA	NA
Geo. District	253	478	307	468

Math Subgroup PSAT Comparison



NA	Not reported by the state.
*	Not available due to student counts of 0.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

Academic Performance

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Achievement


SAT: School Status and Trends

-How are students achieving on PWR state assessments over time?

Achievement over Time in EBRW				
SAT	2016		2017	
Assessment	N	MSS	N	MSS
EBRW	NA	NA	59	551

Achievement over Time in Math				
SAT	2016		2017	
Assessment	N	MSS	N	MSS
Math	NA	NA	59	505

Achievement over Time Overall				
SAT	2016		2017	
Assessment	N	MSS	N	MSS
Overall	NA	NA	59	1056



The School's Evidence-Based Reading and Writing and math SAT scores meets Colorado's SAT Benchmarks.


SAT: Local Comparison

-How are students achieving on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?

Geo. District Achievement over Time in EBRW				
SAT	2016		2017	
Assessment	N	MSS	N	MSS
EBRW	NA	NA	248	537

Geo. District Achievement over Time in Math				
SAT	2016		2017	
Assessment	N	MSS	N	MSS
Math	NA	NA	248	515

Geo. District Achievement over Time Overall				
SAT	2016		2017	
Assessment	N	MSS	N	MSS
Overall	NA	NA	248	1052



Overall, the School's SAT scores are higher than the geographic district. The School also produced scores higher than the geographic district on the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing section of the SAT. The geographic district outperformed the School in math.

NA	Not reported by the state.
*	Not available due to student counts of 0.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet







Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Achievement

SAT: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends

- How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments for postsecondary readiness?
- How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments for postsecondary readiness compared to their peers over time?







School Subgroup SAT Proficiency in EBRW			
SAT		2017	
Student Subgroup		N	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	n<16	--
	N	49	569
Minority	Y	n<16	--
	N	49	569
IEP	Y	n<16	--
	N	54	563
EL	Y	n<16	--
	N	57	558
GT	Y	n<16	--
	N	52	541
Schoolwide		59	551
Geographic District		248	537

Traditionally underserved student performance on the SAT cannot be publicly reported in 2016 and 2017 due to low student counts (n<16).



School Subgroup SAT Proficiency in Math			
SAT		2017	
Student Subgroup		N	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	n<16	--
	N	49	518
Minority	Y	n<16	--
	N	49	518
IEP	Y	n<16	--
	N	54	518
EL	Y	n<16	--
	N	57	507
GT	Y	n<16	--
	N	52	494
Schoolwide		59	505
Geographic District		248	515

Traditionally underserved student performance on the SAT cannot be publicly reported in 2016 and 2017 due to low student counts (n<16).



NA	Not reported by the state.
*	Not available due to student counts of 0.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Growth


PSAT to SAT: School Status and Trends

-How are students growing on PWR state assessments over time?

Growth over Time in EBRW				
PSAT to SAT	2016		2017	
Assessment	N	MGP	N	MGP
EBRW	NA	NA	51	56.0

Growth over Time in Math				
PSAT to SAT	2016		2017	
Assessment	N	MGP	N	MGP
Math	NA	NA	51	59.0

Growth over Time Overall				
SAT	2016		2017	
Assessment	N	MSS	N	MSS
Overall	NA	NA	NA	NA





The School meets state expectations for PSAT to SAT growth in Evidence-Based Reading and Writing and math.

PSAT to SAT: Levels of Growth

-How are students growing and how is student growth distributed across growth levels over time?



EBRW Levels of Growth	
PSAT to SAT	2017
Category	
Low (below 35)	27%
Typical (35-65)	31%
High (above 65)	41%



Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 27% of students with growth scores while students with high growth rates, categorized as students with a MGP above 65, account for 41% of students. 55% of students were at or above the 50th percentile for growth.

EBRW 50th %ile	
PSAT to SAT	2017
Category	
At or Above 50	55%
Below 50	45%

Math Levels of Growth	
PSAT to SAT	2017
Category	
Low (below 35)	25%
Typical (35-65)	35%
High (above 65)	39%



Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 25% of students with growth scores while students with high growth rates, categorized as students with a MGP above 65, account for 39% of students. 59% of students were at or above the 50th percentile for growth.

Math 50th %ile	
PSAT to SAT	2017
Category	
At or Above 50	59%
Below 50	41%

NA	Not reported by the state.
*	Not available due to student counts of 0.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet


Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Growth

PSAT to SAT: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends

-How are traditionally underserved students growing on state assessments for postsecondary readiness compared to their peers over time?

EBRW Subgroup PSAT to SAT Growth			
PSAT to SAT		2017	
Subgroup		N	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	n<20	--
	N	44	56.0
Minority	Y	n<20	--
	N	43	56.0
IEP	Y	n<20	--
	N	46	53.0
EL	Y	n<20	--
	N	50	56.0
GT	Y	n<20	--
	N	44	59.0
Schoolwide		51	56.0

Traditionally underserved student PSAT to SAT growth cannot be publicly reported in 2017 due to low student counts (n<20).



PSAT to SAT: Subgroup Local Comparison


-How are students growing on postsecondary readiness assessments in comparison to the geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?

School EBRW Subgroup Growth		
PSAT to SAT		2017
Subgroup	N	MGP
F/R Lunch	n<20	--
Minority	n<20	--
IEP	n<20	--
EL	n<20	--
GT	n<20	--
Schoolwide		51
		56.0

Traditionally underserved student PSAT to SAT growth cannot be publicly reported in 2017 due to low student counts (n<20).

Geo. District EBRW Growth		
PSAT to SAT		2017
Subgroup	N	MGP
F/R Lunch	49	49.0
Minority	47	48.0
IEP	n < 20	-
EL	n < 20	-
GT	NA	NA
Geo. District		223
		52.0

EBRW Subgroup SAT Growth Comparison



NA	Not reported by the state.
*	Not available due to student counts of 0.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet


Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Growth

PSAT to SAT: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends

-How are traditionally underserved students growing on state assessments for postsecondary readiness compared to their peers over time?

Math Subgroup PSAT to SAT Growth			
PSAT to SAT		2017	
Subgroup		N	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	n<20	--
	N	44	61.0
Minority	Y	n<20	--
	N	43	60.0
IEP	Y	n<20	--
	N	46	61.0
EL	Y	n<20	--
	N	50	59.5
GT	Y	n<20	--
	N	44	56.5
Schoolwide		51	59.0

Traditionally underserved student PSAT to SAT growth cannot be publicly reported in 2017 due to low student counts (n<20).



PSAT to SAT: Subgroup Local Comparison


-How are students growing on postsecondary readiness assessments in comparison to the geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?

School Math Subgroup Growth		
PSAT to SAT	2017	
Subgroup	N	MGP
F/R Lunch	n<20	--
Minority	n<20	--
IEP	n<20	--
EL	n<20	--
GT	n<20	--
Schoolwide	51	59.0

Traditionally underserved student PSAT to SAT growth cannot be publicly reported in 2017 due to low student counts (n<20).

Geo. District Math Growth		
PSAT to SAT	2017	
Subgroup	N	MGP
F/R Lunch	49	51.0
Minority	47	56.0
IEP	n < 20	-
EL	n < 20	-
GT	NA	NA
Geo. District	223	54.0

Math Subgroup SAT Growth Comparison



NA	Not reported by the state.
*	Not available due to student counts of 0.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

Academic Performance







Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Additional Indicators

Graduation Rate: School Status and Trends & Local Comparison

- Are students graduating high school? How is the graduation rate changing over time?
- How is the graduation rate for traditionally underserved students changing over time?
- How are graduation rates for traditionally underserved students compared to their peers over time?

School Subgroup Graduation Rates over Time										
Student Subgroup	Best of	4yr		5yr		6yr		7yr		
		N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	
F/R Lunch	Y	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
	N	6yr	62	98.4%	47	97.9%	38	100.0%	43	95.3%
Minority	Y	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
	N	7yr	63	93.7%	49	98.0%	38	97.4%	46	100.0%
IEP	Y	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
	N	5yr	62	95.2%	51	98.0%	38	97.4%	50	94.0%
EL	Y	--	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*
	N	5yr	71	93.0%	54	98.1%	44	97.7%	54	94.4%
GT	Y	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
	N	5yr	56	91.1%	40	97.5%	34	97.1%	43	95.3%
Schoolwide	5yr	71	93.0%	54	98.1%	44	97.7%	54	94.4%	
Geographic District	6yr	273	80.2%	255	83.5%	302	84.8%	348	78.2%	

Traditionally underserved student graduation rates cannot be publicly reported due to low student counts (n<16). The School's "best of" graduation rate is the 5-year graduation rate of 98.1%. This exceeds state expectations.



NA	Not reported by the state.
*	Not available due to student counts of 0.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Additional Indicators





Graduation Rate: School Status and Trends & Local Comparison

- Are students graduating high school? How is the graduation rate changing over time?
- How is the graduation rate for traditionally underserved students changing over time?
- How are graduation rates for traditionally underserved students compared to their peers over time?
- What is the graduation rate in comparison to the geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?

School Subgroup Graduation Rates over Time									
Subgroup	Best of	4-Year		5-Year		6-Year		7-Year	
		N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
F/R Lunch	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
Minority	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
IEP	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
EL	--	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*
GT	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
Schoolwide	5yr	71	93.0%	54	98.1%	44	97.7%	54	94.4%

Traditionally underserved student graduation rates cannot be publicly reported due to low student counts (n<16). The School's "best of" graduation rate is greater than the geographic district's "best of" graduation rate by 13.3 percentage points.

Geographic District Subgroup Graduation Rates over Time									
Subgroup	Best of	4-Year		5-Year		6-Year		7-Year	
		N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
F/R Lunch	4yr	97	70.1%	83	68.7%	93	65.6%	133	68.4%
Minority	5yr	76	68.4%	62	82.3%	79	73.4%	93	66.7%
IEP	7yr	35	60.0%	30	73.3%	22	72.7%	40	80.0%
EL	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
GT	6yr	42	92.9%	41	95.1%	59	96.6%	54	96.3%
Geo. District	6yr	273	80.2%	255	83.5%	302	84.8%	348	78.2%



NA	Not reported by the state.
*	Not available due to student counts of 0.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet


Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Additional Indicators

Dropout Rate: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends

- Are students dropping out of high school?
- How is the dropout rate changing over time?

Subgroup Dropout Rate Trends over Time				
Dropout		2014	2015	2016
Student Subgroup		Rate	Rate	Rate
F/R Lunch	Y	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%
	N	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%
Minority	Y	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N	0.0%	1.3%	1.6%
IEP	Y	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%
	N	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%
EL	Y	0.0%	n<16	n<16
	N	0.0%	1.2%	1.5%
GT	Y	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%
	N	0.0%	1.0%	1.6%
Schoolwide		0.0%	1.2%	1.5%
Geographic District		2.7%	1.4%	1.2%

The School meets state expectations for dropout rates and rates have slightly increased over time. Traditionally underserved student population dropout rates are largely lower than their non-subgroup peers. Students eligible for free or reduced price lunch, students with disabilities, and Gifted students have higher dropout rates than their non-subgroup peers in 2015 and 2016.




Dropout Rate: Subgroup Local Comparison

- What is the dropout rate in comparison to the geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?

School Subgroup Dropout Rates over Time						
Dropout	2014		2015		2016	
Subgroup	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
F/R Lunch	88	0.0%	23	0.0%	39	2.6%
Minority	89	0.0%	22	0.0%	38	0.0%
IEP	26	0.0%	28	0.0%	25	4.0%
EL	18	0.0%	n<16	--	n<16	--
GT	38	0.0%	40	2.5%	33	0.0%
Schoolwide	424	0.0%	342	1.2%	344	1.5%

Geographic District Subgroup Dropout Rates over Time						
Dropout	2014		2015		2016	
Subgroup	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
F/R Lunch	574	5.1%	577	1.4%	592	2.2%
Minority	568	4.9%	529	2.3%	586	1.7%
IEP	208	2.4%	236	0.8%	242	1.7%
EL	51	7.8%	51	2.0%	57	0.0%
GT	234	0.9%	183	0.0%	174	0.0%
Geo. District	2083	2.7%	2042	1.4%	2163	1.2%

Dropout Rate Subgroup Achievement Comparison



The School largely has lower dropout rates than their geographic district. Students eligible for free or reduced price lunch, students with disabilities, and Gifted students have higher dropout rates than their peers in the geographic district in 2015 and 2016.

NA	Not reported by the state.
*	Not available due to student counts of 0.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Additional Indicators

Matriculation Rate: School Status and Trends & Local Comparison


- Are high school graduates adequately prepared for post-secondary academic success?
- How are the matriculation rates changing over time?
- What is the matriculation rate in comparison to the geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?

School Matriculation Rate Trends over Time				
Matriculation Category	2016		2017	
	N	Rate	N	Rate
2 yr	53	1.9%	68	2.9%
4 yr	53	66.0%	68	60.3%
CTE	53	3.8%	68	0.0%
Schoolwide	53	69.8%	68	63.2%

The School is meeting state expectations for matriculation and matriculation rates have decreased over time. The School outperforms the geographic district..

Geo. District Matriculation Rate Trends over Time				
Matriculation Category	2016		2017	
	N	Rate	N	Rate
2 yr	233	9.0%	756	9.1%
4 yr	233	49.8%	756	49.9%
CTE	233	1.7%	756	3.0%
Geo. District	233	60.1%	756	61.2%

Matriculation Rate Subgroup Achievement Comparison



NA	Not reported by the state.
*	Not available due to student counts of 0.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

Academic Performance Metrics

School Observations

OPTIONAL To be populated by the school and provided to CSI for review and possible inclusion prior to the distribution of the final CARS Report.

Financial Performance

Fiscal Years 2015-2017 Financial Results

Government-Wide Financial Statement Metrics

- What is the school's debt?
- What is the school's net asset position?
- Is the school in default with any financial covenants they have with loan agreements?

Government-Wide Financial Statement Metrics


Metric	2015	2016	2017
Debt to Asset Ratio	1.85	1.91	1.81
Change in Net Position	\$ 31,739.00	\$ (390,509.00)	\$ (1,683,341.00)
Default	NO	NO	NO

Governmental Funds Financial Statement Metrics

- Has the school met the statutory TABOR emergency reserve requirement?
- What is the school's months of cash on hand?
- What is the school's unassigned fund balance on hand?
- What is the school's current ratio?
- What is the school's aggregate 3-year total margin?

Governmental Funds Financial Statement Metrics

Metric	2015	2016	2017
Positive Unassigned Fund Balance (TABOR)	YES	YES	YES
Months of Cash on Hand	3.12	2.28	1.95
Months of Unassigned Fund Balance on Hand	0.46	0.85	0.32
Current Ratio	2.29	10.09	6.13
Operating Margin	11.3%	3.1%	-2.4%



Proprietary Funds Financial Statement Metrics

- What is the school's months of cash on hand?
- What is the school's current ratio?
- What is the school's debt?
- What is the school's net asset position?

Proprietary Funds Financial Statement Metrics

Metric	2015	2016	2017
Months of Cash on Hand	1.05	1.09	0.01
Current Ratio	0.26	0.01	0.00
Debt to Asset Ratio	1.02	1.03	1.04
Change in Net Position	\$ (19,837.00)	\$ (11,328.00)	\$ (33,485.00)

Enrollment

- What is the school's funded pupil count variance?

Enrollment

Metric	2015	2016	2017
Funded Pupil Count (FPC) Current-Year Variance	3.8%	-5.0%	-5.5%
Change in FPC from Prior-Year	13.8%	-5.6%	-7.0%

Fiscal Years 2015-2017 Financial Results

Financial Performance Narrative

Animas High School ended the year with a decrease in net position and reported no statutory violations in their Assurances for Financial Accreditation. The school's funded-pupil count came in under target by 16 pupils (6 percent), and 20.5 pupils (7 percent) lower than the prior year. As expected of all PERA employers, the school has a high debt to asset ratio due to the inclusion of the PERA Net Pension Liability per GASB no. 68. The decrease in net position is primarily due to changes in the Net Pension Liability for the school as well. The school's governmental funds ended the year with just under 2 months of cash on hand and enough current assets to cover current liabilities. The school experienced a negative operating margin of 2.4 percent and a decrease in their unassigned fund balance.

School Observations

OPTIONAL To be populated by the school and provided to CSI for review and possible inclusion prior to the distribution of the final CARS Report.

Organizational Performance

Organizational Performance Metrics

Education Program

-Is the school complying with applicable education requirements?

The essential delivery of the education program in all material respects and operation reflects the essential terms of the program as defined in the charter agreement. Includes:

- *Instructional days or minutes requirements*
- *Graduation and promotion requirements*
- *Alignment with content standards, including Common Core*
- *State-required assessments*
- *Implementation of mandated programming as a result of state or federal funding*

CSI Review

CSI was not made aware of any issues relating to applicable education requirements for the 2016-17 school year.

Diversity, Equity of Access, and Inclusion

-Is the school protecting the rights of all students?

Protecting student rights pursuant to:

- *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Americans with Disabilities Act relating to the treatment of students with identified disabilities and those suspected of having a disability, consistent with the school's status and responsibilities as a school in a district LEA*
- *Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and US Department of Education authorities relating to English Language Learner requirements*
- *Law, policies and practices related to admissions, lottery, waiting lists, fair and open recruitment, enrollment, the collection and protection of student information*
- *Conduct of discipline procedures, including discipline hearings and suspension and expulsion policies and practices, in compliance with CRS 22-33-105 and 22-33-106*
- *Recognition of due process protections, privacy, civil rights and student liberties requirements, including 1st Amendment protections and the Establishment Clause restrictions prohibiting public schools from engaging in religious instruction*

CSI Review

The School is collaborating with the CSI Student Services Team on diversity, equity of access, and inclusion measures for subgroup populations through the Tiers of Support process. An updated Student Services Screener Report with 16-17 data will be released in January 2018.

AHS has strong procedures for identifying gifted students and has increased programming for the affective needs of gifted students

Governance Management

-Is the school complying with governance requirements?

Includes:

- *Adequate Board policies and by laws, including those related to oversight of an education service provider, if applicable (CRS 22-30.5-509(s)), and those regarding conflicts of interest, anti-nepotism, excessive compensation, and board composition*
- *Compliance with State open meetings law*
- *Maintaining authority over management, holding it accountable for performance as agreed under a written performance*
- *Requiring annual financial reports of the education service provider (CRS 22-30.5-509(s)), if applicable*

CSI Review

CSI was not made aware of any issues relating to governance requirements for the 2016-17 school year.

Organizational Performance

Organizational Performance Metrics

Financial Management

-Is the school satisfying financial reporting and compliance requirements?

Includes:

- *Compliance with the Financial Transparency Act (CRS 22-44-301)*
- *Complete and on-time submission of financial reports, including financial audit, corrective action plans, annual budget, revised budgets (if applicable), periodic financial reports as required by the authorizer, and any reporting requirements if the board contracts with an education service provider*
- *Meeting all reporting requirements related to the use of public funds*
- *The school's audit is an unqualified audit opinion and devoid of significant findings and conditions, material weaknesses, or significant internal control weaknesses*

CSI Review

CSI was not made aware of any significant issues relating to financial reporting and compliance requirements.

School Operations and Environment

-Is the school complying with health and safety requirements?

Includes:

- *Up to date fire inspections and related records*
- *Documentation of requisite insurance coverage*
- *Provision of appropriate nursing services and dispensing of pharmaceuticals, including compliance with 1 CCR 301-68*
- *Compliance with food services requirements, if applicable*
- *Maintaining the security of and provide access to student records under the Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act*
- *Access to documents maintained by the school protected under the state's freedom of information law*
- *Timely transfer of student records*
- *Proper and secure maintenance of testing materials*
- *Up to date emergency response plan, including compliance with NIMS requirements*

-Is the school complying with facilities and transportation requirements?

Includes:

- *Viable certificate of occupancy or other required building use authorization*
- *Student transportation safety requirements, if applicable*

-Is the school complying with employee credentialing and background check requirements?

Includes:

- *Highly Qualified Teacher and Paraprofessional requirements within Title II of the ESEA relating to state certification*
- *Performing background checks of all applicable individuals*
- *Complying with state employment requirements*

CSI Review

CSI was not made aware of any issues relating to health and safety requirements for the 2016-17 school year.

CSI was not made aware of any issues relating to facilities and transportation requirements for the 2016-17 school year.

CSI was not made aware of any issues relating to credentialing and background check requirements for the 2016-17 school year.

Additional Obligations

-Is the school complying with all other obligations?

CSI Review

The School did not exhibit any major operational concerns during the 2016-17 school year.

Organizational Performance


Organizational Performance Metrics

Organizational Performance Additional Narrative

N/A

School Observations

OPTIONAL To be populated by the school and provided to CSI for review and possible inclusion prior to the distribution of the final CARS Report.





Colorado Charter School Institute
1580 Logan Street Suite 210 | Denver, CO 80203
P: (303) 866-3299 | www.csi.state.co.us