



Colorado Charter School Institute
Annual Review of Schools (CARS) Report
2017-2018

Early College of Arvada





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.

Table of Contents

CSI Annual Review of Schools (CARS) Summary.....	4
How to Use the CARS Report.....	5
CSI Performance Frameworks.....	6
School Overview.....	8
CSI Annual Review of Schools (CARS) Rating.....	9
Participation.....	10
Academic Performance	
CMAS English Language Arts.....	12
CMAS Math.....	16
CMAS Science.....	20
English Language Proficiency.....	22
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness.....	23
School Observations.....	35
Financial Performance.....	36
Organizational Performance.....	38

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 **September**. 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, listed below:

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 October 12th**.

Once all data have been reviewed (and where applicable incorporated into the report), CSI will send each school a final report in **November**. 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).

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 2018. 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.
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. Scores before 2017-18 reflect all students in 7th, 8th, and 9th grades who took any type of CMAS math test. State reporting did 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 can release an additional report containing disaggregated math results by test by request.
- 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?

Early College of Arvada Overview

Year Opened/Transferred: 2008-2009

Grades Served: 6-12

School Model: Early College

Town/City: Arvada


District of Residence: Adams County School District 50

Original Application Type: New School


Enrollment and Student Demographics over Time

October Student Counts	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Trend
Enrollment Over Time	279	286	341	351	343	
Minority	51.3%	57.3%	63.3%	68.1%	71.7%	
EL	19.0%	29.4%	29.0%	27.9%	31.5%	
FRL	44.8%	51.4%	44.6%	53.8%	51.0%	
Gifted	7.9%	5.9%	7.9%	12.8%	13.4%	
SPED	8.6%	8.0%	6.5%	6.6%	7.3%	
504	3.2%	3.5%	2.6%	4.0%	5.0%	


Enrollment over Time




Minority Students




English Learners




Lunch Eligibility




Gifted Students



Students with Disabilities



Students with a 504



Note on Data Source: Demographic data included in CARS comes from the annual student October Count files.

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	Improvement
Financial	Financial performance does impact the school accreditation rating
Organizational	Organizational performance does not impact the school accreditation rating
Overall Rating	Priority Improvement: Decreased due to Financial Noncompliance

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	264	239	90.5%	17	96.8%	Meets 95%
Math	264	239	90.5%	18	97.2%	Meets 95%
Science	105	92	87.6%	7	93.9%	Does Not Meet 95%


Test Participation Rates - Disaggregated by Test						
Subject	Total Records	Valid Scores	Participation Rate	Parent Excuses	Accountability Participation Rate	Rating
CMAS English Language Arts	147	132	89.8%	14	99.2%	Meets 95%
CMAS Math	147	132	89.8%	15	100.0%	Meets 95%
CMAS Science	105	92	87.6%	7	93.9%	Does Not Meet 95%
PSAT/SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing	117	107	91.5%	3	93.9%	Does Not Meet 95%
PSAT/SAT Math	117	107	91.5%	3	93.9%	Does Not Meet 95%

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	October Count	Tested Population	October Count	Tested Population	October Count
F/R Lunch	46.9%	51.0%	47.3%	51.0%	43.5%	51.0%
Minority	74.9%	71.7%	74.9%	71.7%	70.7%	71.7%
IEP	6.3%	7.3%	6.3%	7.3%	5.4%	7.3%
EL	35.1%	31.5%	35.6%	31.5%	30.4%	31.5%
GT	12.1%	13.4%	12.1%	13.4%	13.0%	13.4%


English Language Arts



Math



Science




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		2018	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elementary	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
6	36	711	50	718	31	724	31	722
7	24	707	53	714	58	726	41	709
8	38	719	34	717	52	713	60	719
Middle	98	713	137	716	141	721	132	718
Overall	145	716	176	719	180	720	132	717



*Overall results before 2017-18 also include high school grade levels.




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		2018	
Grade/Level	N	%M/E	N	%M/E	N	%M/E	N	%M/E
3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elementary	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
6	36	13.9%	50	6.0%	31	16.1%	31	12.9%
7	24	8.3%	53	18.9%	58	25.9%	41	17.1%
8	38	13.2%	34	23.5%	52	13.5%	60	20.0%
Middle	98	12.2%	137	15.3%	141	19.1%	132	17.4%
Overall	145	15.9%	176	18.2%	180	18.3%	132	17.4%



Geographic District Proficiency over Time in ELA								
CMAS ELA	2015		2016		2017		2018	
Grade/Level	N	%M/E	N	%M/E	N	%M/E	N	%M/E
3	719	16.8%	692	15.8%	687	15.9%	667	19.6%
4	737	22.7%	666	20.9%	720	19.4%	688	24.7%
5	812	22.2%	706	19.3%	687	26.3%	684	28.7%
Elementary	2268	20.6%	2064	18.6%	2094	20.5%	2039	24.4%
6	695	14.4%	700	18.4%	629	18.3%	611	20.9%
7	691	16.4%	656	18.6%	731	29.4%	619	25.2%
8	688	18.9%	614	22.1%	660	25.3%	699	29.9%
Middle	2074	16.5%	1970	19.6%	2020	24.6%	1929	25.6%
Overall	4342	18.7%	4034	19.1%	4114	22.5%	3968	24.9%



Achievement Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show schoolwide performance on the English Language Arts state assessment over time disaggregated by grade and class level. The color key to the right describes when mean scale scores exceeded, met, approached, or did not meet state expectations. From 2014-15 to 2015-16, overall mean scale score increased. From 2015-16 to 2016-17, overall mean scale score increased. Since last school year, overall mean scale score has decreased by 3 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Adams County School District 50) for the past four years. Overall, the school has performed lower than their geo. district in 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018. This year, the school performed lower than their geo. district by 7.5 percentage points.

Looking through CARS: There are four pages for CMAS English Language Arts achievement and growth data. Both achievement and growth sections have trends over time, geographic district comparisons, and subgroup comparisons. Narrative boxes provide further context to the data on each page.

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 in ELA					
CMAS ELA		2015	2016	2017	2018
Student Subgroup		%M/E	%M/E	%M/E	%M/E
F/R Lunch	Y	10.3%	18.2%	10.5%	12.5%
	N	22.4%	18.2%	27.1%	28.8%
Minority	Y	7.1%	13.2%	17.1%	17.2%
	N	27.9%	31.9%	21.6%	27.6%
IEP	Y	11.8%	--	--	--
	N	16.4%	19.5%	20.0%	21.1%
EL	Y	6.6%	13.8%	17.8%	2.9%
	N	22.6%	21.9%	18.7%	26.8%
GT	Y	--	41.2%	63.6%	--
	N	16.1%	15.7%	12.0%	10.8%
Schoolwide		15.9%	18.2%	18.3%	17.4%
Geographic District		18.7%	19.1%	22.5%	24.9%




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 Proficiency over Time in ELA								
CMAS ELA	2015		2016		2017		2018	
Subgroup	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	78	712	55	713	95	714	64	710
Minority	84	711	129	715	129	717	87	717
IEP	17	695	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
EL	61	708	80	714	73	712	34	706
GT	n<16	--	17	749	22	758	n<16	--

Geographic District Subgroup Proficiency over Time in ELA								
CMAS ELA	2015		2016		2017		2018	
Subgroup	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	3868	719	3722	719	3627	721	3046	726
Minority	3894	719	3765	719	3784	721	3278	726
IEP	606	699	550	695	550	696	511	700
EL	2419	718	2361	718	2335	720	1874	723
GT	393	761	261	762	212	763	159	772



Achievement Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show the performance of student subgroups on the English Language Arts state assessment over time. In English Language Arts, the percent of students eligible for free or reduced priced lunch (FRL) meeting or exceeding expectations increased, minority student performance increased, English learner (EL) performance decreased, and overall student performance decreased. This year, non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, overall, Adams County School District 50 outperformed the school. In 2018, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: FRL, minority, EL, additional details are available in the graphs on the right.

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




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		2018	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elementary	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	46	11.5	30	26.5	28	23.5
7	51	45.0	56	38.0	33	24.0
8	30	25.5	49	47.0	51	43.0
Middle	127	21.0	135	40.0	112	30.5
Overall	159	27.0	165	40.0	112	30.5



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		2018	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	585	44.0	636	42.0	623	48.0
5	610	46.0	614	52.5	631	60.0
Elementary	NA	--	1274	48.0	1254	54.0
6	630	40.0	578	48.0	561	51.0
7	569	46.0	663	61.0	548	62.5
8	556	60.0	591	59.0	638	56.0
Middle	NA	--	1808	56.0	1747	55.0
Overall	3510	47.0	3617	51.0	3001	55.0




Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative
The graphs above show schoolwide growth on the English Language Arts state assessment. From 2016 to 2018, overall student growth has increased. Since last year, student growth decreased by 9.5 percentile points. In 2018, overall student growth did not meet state expectations and was below the geo. district. Overall student growth for the geo. district has increased 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	2018
Low (below 35)	55%	42%	55%
Typical (35-65)	22%	38%	29%
High (above 65)	23%	21%	16%



ELA At/Below 50th %ile			
CMAS ELA	%Students		
Category	2016	2017	2018
At or Above 50	30%	37%	28%
Below 50	70%	63%	72%



Levels of Growth Narrative
Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 55.4% of students with growth scores (students in fourth through eighth grades) while students with high growth rates, categorized as students with a MGP above 65, account for 16.1% of students. The percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased from last year (37% to 27.7%). Since 2016, the percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased (30.2% to 27.7%).

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 in ELA				
CMAS ELA		2016	2017	2018
Student Subgroup		MGP	MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	46.0	38.0	24.0
	N	18.5	45.5	40.0
Minority	Y	26.0	40.5	31.0
	N	27.0	40.0	23.0
IEP	Y	--	--	--
	N	26.0	40.0	31.0
EL	Y	39.0	40.0	37.0
	N	22.5	40.0	26.0
GT	Y	--	49.5	--
	N	27.0	39.0	28.0
Schoolwide		27.0	40.0	30.5
Geographic District		47.0	51.0	55.0



CMAS ELA: 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 Growth over Time in ELA						
CMAS ELA	2016		2017		2018	
Subgroup	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
F/R Lunch	49	46.0	89	38.0	62	24.0
Minority	120	26.0	120	40.5	83	31.0
IEP	n<20	--	n<20	--	n<20	--
EL	75	39.0	71	40.0	31	37.0
GT	n<20	--	20	49.5	n<20	--



Geographic District Subgroup Growth over Time in ELA						
CMAS ELA	2016		2017		2018	
Subgroup	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
F/R Lunch	2938	46.0	2972	50.0	2413	54.0
Minority	2968	47.0	3103	51.0	2604	55.0
IEP	394	34.0	381	40.0	345	46.0
EL	1902	47.0	1948	50.0	1508	57.0
GT	259	62.0	195	55.0	142	66.5

Growth Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show growth of student subgroups on the English Language Arts state assessment over time. In English Language Arts, the percent of students eligible for free or reduced priced lunch (FRL) meeting or exceeding expectations decreased, minority student performance decreased, English learner (EL) performance decreased, and overall student performance decreased. This year, non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, minority students outperformed their non-minority peers, EL students outperformed their non-EL peers, overall, Adams County School District 50 outperformed the school. In 2018, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: FRL, minority, EL, additional details are available in the graphs on the right.

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




Mathematics Achievement

CMAS Math: School Status and Trends

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

Achievement over Time in Math								
CMAS Math	2015		2016		2017		2018	
	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elementary	0	--	0	--	0	--	n<16	--
6	36	723	49	717	31	719	31	717
7	24	719	53	711	58	721	41	708
8	37	719	34	694	53	705	60	717
Middle	97	720	136	709	142	715	116	715
Overall	144	724	175	710	180	714	132	714



*Overall results before 2017-18 also include high school grade levels.




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		2018	
	N	%M/E	N	%M/E	N	%M/E	N	%M/E
3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elementary	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
6	36	13.9%	49	10.2%	31	16.1%	31	6.5%
7	24	4.2%	53	7.5%	58	6.9%	41	7.3%
8	37	18.9%	34	5.9%	53	9.4%	60	16.7%
Middle	97	13.4%	136	8.1%	142	9.9%	116	12.9%
Overall	144	16.0%	175	7.4%	180	8.9%	132	11.4%



Geographic District Proficiency over Time in Math								
CMAS Math	2015		2016		2017		2018	
	N	%M/E	N	%M/E	N	%M/E	N	%M/E
3	732	19.8%	699	18.0%	691	18.7%	672	18.8%
4	745	14.5%	674	11.1%	730	12.2%	695	16.4%
5	810	18.4%	705	16.0%	686	17.1%	688	18.2%
Elementary	2287	17.6%	2078	15.1%	2107	15.9%	2055	17.8%
6	701	9.3%	701	10.7%	628	8.8%	613	10.0%
7	694	9.4%	659	9.0%	731	9.7%	623	7.4%
8	684	12.4%	617	8.4%	657	11.3%	697	14.8%
Middle	2079	10.3%	1977	9.4%	2016	9.9%	1933	10.9%
Overall	4366	14.1%	4055	12.3%	4123	13.0%	3988	14.4%



Achievement Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show schoolwide performance on the Math state assessment over time disaggregated by grade and class level. The color key to the right describes when mean scale scores exceeded, met, approached, or did not meet state expectations. From 2014-15 to 2015-16, overall mean scale score decreased. From 2015-16 to 2016-17, overall mean scale score increased. Since last school year, overall mean scale score has increased by 0 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Adams County School District 50) for the past four years. Overall, the school has performed lower than their geo. district in 2016, 2017, and 2018. This year, the school performed lower than their geo. district by 3.1 percentage points.

Looking through CARS: There are four pages for CMAS Mathematics achievement and growth data. Both achievement and growth sections have trends over time, geographic district comparisons, and subgroup comparisons. Narrative boxes provide further context to the data on each page.

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


Mathematics Subgroup Achievement

CMAS Math: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends

-How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments in Mathematics over time?

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


Subgroup Achievement Gap Trends over Time in Math					
CMAS Math		2015	2016	2017	2018
Student Subgroup		%M/E	%M/E	%M/E	%M/E
F/R Lunch	Y	12.8%	3.6%	4.2%	7.7%
	N	19.7%	9.2%	14.1%	19.6%
Minority	Y	7.2%	3.9%	6.9%	10.3%
	N	27.9%	17.4%	14.0%	20.7%
IEP	Y	5.9%	--	--	--
	N	17.3%	8.0%	9.1%	13.8%
EL	Y	8.6%	5.0%	4.1%	2.9%
	N	20.9%	9.5%	12.3%	17.3%
GT	Y	--	38.9%	50.0%	--
	N	14.0%	3.8%	3.2%	6.9%
Schoolwide		16.0%	7.4%	8.9%	11.4%
Geographic District		14.1%	12.3%	13.0%	14.4%



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 Proficiency over Time in Math								
CMAS Math	2015		2016		2017		2018	
Subgroup	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	78	720	55	703	95	709	65	711
Minority	83	718	129	707	130	711	87	713
IEP	17	702	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
EL	58	719	80	707	74	705	35	701
GT	n<16	--	18	744	22	751	n<16	--



Geographic District Subgroup Proficiency over Time in Math								
CMAS Math	2015		2016		2017		2018	
Subgroup	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	3870	715	3710	714	3682	714	3064	716
Minority	3899	716	3756	714	3847	714	3302	716
IEP	605	698	550	695	553	694	506	695
EL	2432	716	2367	714	2398	714	1904	714
GT	392	757	260	759	213	762	159	765

Achievement Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show the performance of student subgroups on the Math state assessment over time. In Math, the percent of students eligible for free or reduced priced lunch (FRL) meeting or exceeding expectations increased, minority student performance increased, English learner (EL) performance decreased, and overall student performance increased. This year, non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, overall, Adams County School District 50 outperformed the school. In 2018, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: FRL, minority, EL, additional details are available in the graphs on the right.

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




Mathematics 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		2018	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elementary	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	45	15.0	30	36.5	28	49.0
7	51	27.0	55	31.0	33	22.0
8	32	16.0	49	42.0	51	49.0
Middle	128	18.0	134	40.0	112	40.0
Overall	158	21.5	162	40.0	112	40.0



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		2018	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	597	35.0	648	40.0	630	52.0
5	616	46.0	623	49.0	636	57.0
Elementary	NA	--	1295	45.0	1266	54.0
6	629	33.0	577	47.0	557	47.0
7	576	51.5	664	43.0	545	44.0
8	560	39.0	590	43.0	633	47.0
Middle	NA	--	1807	44.0	1735	46.0
Overall	3532	42.0	3640	45.0	3001	49.0



Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative



The graphs above show schoolwide growth on the Math state assessment. From 2016 to 2018, overall student growth has increased. Since last year, student growth decreased by 0 percentile points. In 2018, overall student growth was approaching state expectations and was below the geo. district. Overall student growth for the geo. district has increased over time.

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	2018
Low (below 35)	65%	43%	43%
Typical (35-65)	23%	38%	32%
High (above 65)	11%	19%	25%

Math At/Below 50th %ile			
CMAS Math	%Students		
Category	2016	2017	2018
At or Above 50	22%	35%	41%
Below 50	78%	65%	59%



Levels of Growth Narrative

Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 42.9% of students with growth scores (students in fourth through eighth grades) while students with high growth rates, categorized as students with a MGP above 65, account for 25% of students. The percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has increased from last year (35.2% to 41.1%). Since 2016, the percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has increased (22.2% to 41.1%).

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




Mathematics Subgroup Growth

CMAS Math: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends

-How are traditionally underserved students growing on state assessments in Mathematics over time?

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

Subgroup Growth Gap Trends over Time in Math				
CMAS Math		2016	2017	2018
Student Subgroup		MGP	MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	28.0	38.0	42.0
	N	19.0	43.0	40.0
Minority	Y	21.0	40.0	37.0
	N	24.5	40.0	47.0
IEP	Y	--	--	--
	N	22.5	39.0	40.0
EL	Y	22.0	36.0	37.5
	N	21.0	41.0	40.5
GT	Y	--	--	--
	N	20.5	40.0	40.0
Schoolwide		21.5	40.0	40.0
Geographic District		42.0	45.0	49.0



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 Growth over Time in Math						
CMAS Math	2016		2017		2018	
Subgroup	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
F/R Lunch	47	28.0	87	38.0	63	42.0
Minority	120	21.0	119	40.0	83	37.0
IEP	n<20	--	n<20	--	n<20	--
EL	75	22.0	71	36.0	32	37.5
GT	n<20	--	n<20	--	n<20	--

Geographic District Subgroup Growth over Time in Math						
CMAS Math	2016		2017		2018	
Subgroup	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
F/R Lunch	2961	40.0	2993	43.0	2410	49.0
Minority	2994	40.0	3128	43.0	2607	49.0
IEP	397	36.0	383	39.0	340	42.5
EL	1924	41.0	1972	43.0	1518	50.0
GT	256	60.0	196	60.5	142	55.5

Growth Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show growth of student subgroups on the Math state assessment over time. In Math, the percent of students eligible for free or reduced priced lunch (FRL) meeting or exceeding expectations increased, minority student performance decreased, English learner (EL) performance increased, and overall student performance increased. This year, FRL students outperformed their non-FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their EL peers, overall, Adams County School District 50 outperformed the school. In 2018, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: FRL, minority, EL, additional details are available in the graphs on the right.



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


Science Achievement

CMAS Science: School Status and Trends

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

Achievement over Time in Science								
CMAS SCI	2015		2016		2017		2018	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
5	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
8	43	537	35	523	56	498	60	522
11	0	--	n<16	--	51	598	32	596



Science Achievement over Time




CMAS Science: 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 Science								
CMAS SCI	2015		2016		2017		2018	
Grade/Level	N	%M/E	N	%M/E	N	%M/E	N	%M/E
5	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
8	43	16.3%	35	0.0%	56	14.3%	60	10.0%
11	0	--	n<16	--	51	19.6%	32	21.9%
Overall	43	16.3%	35	0.0%	107	16.8%	92	14.1%



Geographic District Proficiency over Time in Science								
CMAS SCI	2015		2016		2017		2018	
Grade/Level	N	%M/E	N	%M/E	N	%M/E	N	%M/E
5	819	15.9%	701	11.6%	684	13.5%	687	13.5%
8	701	10.7%	612	9.2%	645	10.2%	693	10.5%
11	0	--	529	5.9%	548	7.8%	594	5.7%
Overall	1520	13.5%	1842	9.1%	1877	10.7%	1974	10.1%



Achievement Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show schoolwide performance on the Science state assessment over time disaggregated by grade and class level. The color key to the right describes when mean scale scores exceeded, met, approached, or did not meet state expectations. 8th grade mean scale score has increased by 24 scale score points. 11th grade mean scale score has decreased by 2 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Adams County School District 50) for the past four years. In 2018, the school performed lower than the geo. district in 8th grade, greater than the geo. district in 11th grade, and, overall, 14% of students met or exceeded state expectations.

Looking through CARS: There are two pages for CMAS Science achievement data. No growth data is available for CMAS Science. CMAS Science is administered to 5th, 8th, and 11th grade. Achievement contains trends over time, geographic district comparisons, and subgroup comparisons. Narrative boxes provide further context to the data on each page.

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


Science Subgroup Achievement

CMAS Science: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends

-How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments in Science over time?

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


Subgroup Achievement Gap Trends over Time in SCI					
CMAS SCI		2015	2016	2017	2018
Student Subgroup	%M/E	%M/E	%M/E	%M/E	%M/E
F/R Lunch	Y	25.0%	0.0%	6.7%	5.0%
	N	10.5%	21.4%	25.0%	23.3%
Minority	Y	14.3%	0.0%	7.2%	13.6%
	N	22.2%	35.3%	37.5%	16.7%
IEP	Y	--	--	--	--
	N	22.6%	14.0%	17.0%	15.4%
EL	Y	--	0.0%	8.3%	10.7%
	N	20.8%	23.1%	24.5%	16.4%
GT	Y	--	--	--	--
	N	16.2%	13.0%	16.8%	8.5%



CMAS Science: 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 Proficiency over Time in Science								
CMAS SCI	2015		2016		2017		2018	
Subgroup	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	20	541	18	526	45	518	40	524
Minority	21	510	29	519	69	515	59	551
IEP	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
EL	n<16	--	20	490	48	502	28	515
GT	n<16	--	0	--	0	--	n<16	--



Geographic District Subgroup Proficiency over Time in Science								
CMAS SCI	2015		2016		2017		2018	
Subgroup	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	1200	534	1424	519	1393	522	1416	523
Minority	1203	534	1461	519	1521	522	1636	523
IEP	198	469	179	457	202	449	221	461
EL	744	533	939	514	992	517	880	509
GT	156	668	123	658	94	676	139	663

Achievement Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show the performance of student subgroups on the English Language Arts state assessment over time. In English Language Arts, the percent of students eligible for free or reduced priced lunch (FRL) meeting or exceeding expectations decreased, minority student performance increased, English learner (EL) performance increased, and overall student performance decreased. This year, non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, overall, the school outperformed Adams County School District 50. In 2018, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: FRL, minority, EL, additional details are available in the graphs on the right.


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

Exceeds Meets Approaching Does Not Meet

English Language Proficiency (ELP) Growth ACCESS for ELLs: School Status and Trends

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


Growth on ACCESS			
ACCESS	2018		
Grade/Level	N	MGP	%On Track
K	NA	--	--
1	NA	--	--
2	NA	--	--
3	NA	--	--
4	NA	--	--
5	NA	--	--
Elementary	NA	--	--
6	n<20	--	--
7	n<20	--	--
8	n<20	--	--
Middle	23	22.0	17.4%
9	n<20	--	--
10	n<20	--	--
11	n<20	--	--
12	n<20	--	--
High	35	28.0	28.6%
Overall	58	26.5	24.1%



ACCESS for ELLs: 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 on ACCESS			
ACCESS	2018		
Grade/Level	N	MGP	%On Track
Elementary	1044	48.0	NA
Middle	461	56.0	NA
High	501	41.0	NA
Overall	2006	48.0	NA



ACCESS: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends*

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

*ACCESS subgroup status and gap trends are not available due to low student counts. CSI can provide this data to schools if requested.

Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show schoolwide growth on the ACCESS for ELLs state assessment. In 2018, overall student growth did not meet state expectations and was below the geo. district. 24% of students were reported as being on track to reach English language proficiency.

Looking through CARS: There is one page for ELP growth data. ACCESS is the assessment used. Growth data is not available for comparison before 2018. "% On Track" are the percent of students on track to reach EL proficiency. Narrative boxes provide further context to the data on each page.

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


Evidence-Based Reading & Writing Achievement

PSAT/SAT EBRW: School Status and Trends

-How are students achieving on state assessments in Evidence-Based Reading & Writing over time?

Achievement over Time in EBRW						
EBRW	2016		2017		2018	
Test	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
PSAT 8/9*	NA	--	NA	--	65	401
PSAT 10*	52	472	42	438	42	454
SAT	NA	--	53	492	37	498

PSAT 8/9 was administered for the first time during the 2017-18 school year.
PSAT 10 was administered for the first time during the 2015-16 school year.
SAT was administered for the first time during the 2016-17 school year.




PSAT/SAT EBRW: 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?


Geographic District Proficiency over Time in EBRW						
EBRW	2016		2017		2018	
Test	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
PSAT 8/9	NA	--	NA	--	642	389
PSAT 10	595	404	555	405	627	416
SAT	NA	--	545	434	603	438

*Grade level benchmarks for PSAT 8/9 and PSAT 10 are not available. CDE renormed the benchmarks in 2018 using combined PSAT 8/9 and PSAT 10 scores.


EBRW PSAT 8/9



EBRW PSAT 10



EBRW SAT



Achievement Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show schoolwide performance on the PSAT/SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (EBRW) state assessments over time disaggregated by grade and class level. The color key to the right describes when mean scale scores exceeded, met, approached, or did not meet state expectations. Mean scale scores for PSAT 10 has increased by 16.4 scale score points. Mean scale scores for SAT has increased by 5.9 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Adams County School District 50) for the past three years. In 2018, the school performed greater than the geo. district for PSAT 8/9, greater than the geo. district for PSAT 10, and greater than the geo. district for SAT.

Looking through CARS: The following pages contain all postsecondary and workforce readiness measures evaluated in the CSI Academic Performance Framework. The next four pages contain PSAT/SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (EBRW) achievement and growth results. Achievement and growth results contain data for trends over time, local comparisons, and subgroup comparisons. Both achievement and growth sections have trends over time, geographic district comparisons, and subgroup comparisons. Narrative boxes provide further context to the data on each page. Additional measures include: graduation rates, dropout rates, and matriculation rates.

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


Evidence-Based Reading & Writing Subgroup Achievement

PSAT/SAT EBRW: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends

-How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments in Evidence-Based Reading & Writing over time?

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

Achievement Gap Trends over Time in EBRW				
PSAT/SAT EBRW		2016	2017	2018
Student Subgroup		%M/E	%M/E	%M/E
F/R Lunch	Y	--	33.3%	22.0%
	N	--	50.0%	40.8%
Minority	Y	--	26.8%	24.5%
	N	--	69.7%	52.8%
IEP	Y	--	--	--
	N	--	44.6%	34.5%
EL	Y	--	21.6%	14.0%
	N	--	57.7%	46.6%
GT	Y	--	100.0%	85.7%
	N	--	30.1%	22.0%




PSAT/SAT EBRW: 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 Proficiency over Time in EBRW				
EBRW	2017		2018	
	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	38	439	59	422
Minority	56	424	94	424
IEP	n<16	--	n<16	--
EL	37	412	57	409
GT	16	598	21	569

Geo.District Subgroup Proficiency in EBRW				
EBRW	2017		2018	
	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	745	416	1255	412
Minority	892	418	1498	410
IEP	107	361	192	361
EL	571	417	776	393
GT	101	506	143	518



Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show the performance of student subgroups on the PSAT/SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (EBRW) state assessments over time. In EBRW, the percent of students eligible for free or reduced priced lunch (FRL) meeting or exceeding expectations decreased, minority student performance decreased, English learner (EL) performance decreased, Gifted student (GT) performance decreased, any subgroups with N-values less than 16 were not reported due to low student counts. This year, non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, GT students outperformed their non-GT peers, any subgroups with N-values less than 16 were not reported due to low student counts. In 2018, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: FRL, minority, EL, GT, and any additional details are available in the graphs on the right.

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

Evidence-Based Reading & Writing Growth

PSAT/SAT EBRW: School Status and Trends

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




Growth over Time in EBRW				
EBRW	2017		2018	
	N	MGP	N	MGP
CMAS 8 to PSAT 9	NA	--	50	45.0
CMAS 9 to PSAT10	NA	--	31	70.0
PSAT 10 to SAT	43	46.0	30	53.5



PSAT/SAT EBRW: 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 EBRW				
EBRW	2017		2018	
	N	MGP	N	MGP
CMAS 8 to PSAT 9	NA	--	582	37.0
CMAS 9 to PSAT10	NA	--	507	46.0
PSAT 10 to SAT	457	38.0	1573	42.0




PSAT/SAT EBRW: Levels of Growth

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

EBRW Levels of Growth		
EBRW	% Students	
Category	2017	2018
Low (below 35)	44%	30%
Typical (35-65)	26%	32%
High (above 65)	30%	39%



EBRW At/Below 50th %ile		
EBRW	% Students	
Category	2017	2018
At or Above 50	47%	50%
Below 50	53%	50%



Status, Trends, and Levels of Growth Narrative

The graphs above show schoolwide growth on the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing state assessments. In 2018, CMAS 8 to PSAT 9 student growth was approaching state expectations and was above the geo. district. CMAS 9 to PSAT 10 student growth exceeded state expectations and was above the geo. district. PSAT 10 to SAT student growth met state expectations and was above the geo. district. From last year, SAT student growth has increased. The graphs to the left show how student growth is distributed across growth levels. Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 29.7% of students with growth scores while students with high growth rates, categorized as students with a MGP above 65, account for 38.7% of students. The percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has increased from last year (46.5% to 50.5%).

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


Evidence-Based Reading & Writing Subgroup Growth

PSAT/SAT EBRW: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends

-How are traditionally underserved students growing on state assessments in Evidence-Based Reading & Writing over time?

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

Growth Gap Trends over Time in EBRW			
EBRW		2017	2018
Student Subgroup		MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	33.0	50.0
	N	50.0	52.5
Minority	Y	31.0	48.0
	N	--	73.0
IEP	Y	--	--
	N	47.5	54.0
EL	Y	--	--
	N	47.5	54.0
GT	Y	--	--
	N	46.0	48.0
Schoolwide		46.0	50.0
Geographic District		38.0	42.0



PSAT/SAT EBRW: 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 Growth over Time in EBRW				
EBRW	2017		2018	
Subgroup	N	MGP	N	MGP
F/R Lunch	20	33.0	51	50.0
Minority	25	31.0	83	48.0
IEP	n<20	--	n<20	--
EL	n<20	--	47	48.0
GT	n<20	--	n<20	--

Geo.District Subgroup Growth over Time in EBRW				
EBRW	2017		2018	
Subgroup	N	MGP	N	MGP
F/R Lunch	306	38.0	1138	41.0
Minority	391	38.0	1369	41.0
IEP	32	18.0	156	37.5
EL	NA	--	723	42.0
GT	44	41.5	139	47.0

Growth Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show growth of student subgroups on the PSAT/SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (EBRW) state assessments over time. In EBRW, the percent of students eligible for free or reduced priced lunch (FRL) meeting or exceeding expectations increased, minority student performance increased, performance for students with disabilities (IEP) decreased, any subgroups with N-values less than 20 were not reported due to low student counts. This year, non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, any subgroups with N-values less than 20 were not reported due to low student counts. In 2018, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: FRL, minority, EL, and any additional details are available in the graphs on the right.



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


Mathematics Achievement

PSAT/SAT Math: School Status and Trends

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

Achievement over Time in Math						
Math	2016		2017		2018	
Test	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
PSAT 8/9*	NA	--	NA	--	65	397
PSAT 10*	52	463	42	441	42	415
SAT	NA	--	53	484	37	463

PSAT 8/9 was administered for the first time during the 2017-18 school year.
PSAT 10 was administered for the first time during the 2015-16 school year.
SAT was administered for the first time during the 2016-17 school year.



PSAT/SAT 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?




Geographic District Proficiency over Time in Math						
Math	2016		2017		2018	
Test	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
PSAT 8/9	NA	--	NA	--	642	384
PSAT 10	595	410	555	410	627	400
SAT	NA	--	545	417	603	419

*Grade level benchmarks for PSAT 8/9 and PSAT 10 are not available. CDE renormed the benchmarks in 2018 using combined PSAT 8/9 and PSAT 10 scores.

Math PSAT 8/9

Math PSAT 10

Math SAT



Achievement Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show schoolwide performance on the PSAT/SAT Math state assessments over time disaggregated by grade and class level. The color key to the right describes when mean scale scores exceeded, met, approached, or did not meet state expectations. Mean scale scores for PSAT 10 has decreased by 26.4 scale score points. Mean scale scores for SAT has decreased by 21.2 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Adams County School District 50) for the past three years. In 2018, the school performed greater than the geo. district for PSAT 8/9, greater than the geo. district for PSAT 10, and greater than the geo. district for SAT.

Looking through CARS: The following pages contain all postsecondary and workforce readiness measures evaluated in the CSI Academic Performance Framework.

The next four pages contain PSAT/SAT Math achievement and growth results. Achievement and growth results contain data for trends over time, local comparisons, and subgroup comparisons. Both achievement and growth sections have trends over time, geographic district comparisons, and subgroup comparisons. Narrative boxes provide further context to the data on each page.

Additional measures include: graduation rates, dropout rates, and matriculation rates.

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

Mathematics Subgroup Achievement

PSAT/SAT Math: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends

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

PSAT/SAT Math		2016	2017	2018
Student Subgroup		%M/E	%M/E	%M/E
F/R Lunch	Y	--	38.5%	23.7%
	N	--	44.0%	40.8%
Minority	Y	--	28.6%	26.6%
	N	--	63.6%	50.0%
IEP	Y	--	--	--
	N	--	42.2%	36.1%
EL	Y	--	32.4%	24.6%
	N	--	48.1%	39.7%
GT	Y	--	87.5%	90.5%
	N	--	31.5%	22.0%




PSAT/SAT 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?

Math	2017		2018	
	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	38	438	59	399
Minority	56	432	94	410
IEP	n<16	--	n<16	--
EL	37	430	57	403
GT	16	560	21	531

Math	2017		2018	
	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	745	408	1260	398
Minority	892	409	1504	399
IEP	107	353	192	336
EL	571	409	782	384
GT	101	505	143	512



Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show the performance of student subgroups on the PSAT/SAT Math state assessments over time. In Math, the percent of students eligible for free or reduced priced lunch (FRL) meeting or exceeding expectations decreased, minority student performance decreased, English learner (EL) performance decreased, Gifted student (GT) performance increased, any subgroups with N-values less than 16 were not reported due to low student counts. This year, non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, GT students outperformed their non-GT peers, any subgroups with N-values less than 16 were not reported due to low student counts. In 2018, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: FRL, minority, EL, GT, and any additional details are available in the graphs on the right.

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




Mathematics Growth

PSAT/SAT Math: School Status and Trends

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




Growth over Time in Math				
Math	2017		2018	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP
CMAS 8 to PSAT 9	NA	--	50	48.5
CMAS 9 to PSAT10	NA	--	31	59.0
PSAT 10 to SAT	43	43.0	30	49.0



PSAT/SAT 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				
Math	2017		2018	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP
CMAS 8 to PSAT 9	NA	--	582	45.0
CMAS 9 to PSAT10	NA	--	514	48.0
PSAT 10 to SAT	457	31.0	1580	45.5




PSAT/SAT Math: Levels of Growth

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

Math Levels of Growth		
Math	% Students	
Category	2017	2018
Low (below 35)	37%	29%
Typical (35-65)	35%	37%
High (above 65)	28%	34%



Math At/Below 50th %ile		
Math	% Students	
Category	2017	2018
At or Above 50	44%	52%
Below 50	56%	48%



Status, Trends, and Levels of Growth Narrative

The graphs above show schoolwide growth on the Math state assessments. In 2018, CMAS 8 to PSAT 9 student growth was approaching state expectations and was above the geo. district. CMAS 9 to PSAT 10 student growth met state expectations and was above the geo. district. PSAT 10 to SAT student growth was approaching state expectations and was above the geo. district. From last year, SAT student growth has increased. The graphs to the left show how student growth is distributed across growth levels. Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 28.8% of students with growth scores while students with high growth rates, categorized as students with a MGP above 65, account for 34.2% of students. The percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has increased from last year (44.2% to 52.3%).

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


Mathematics Subgroup Growth

PSAT/SAT Math: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends

-How are traditionally underserved students growing on state assessments in Mathematics over time?

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


Growth Gap Trends over Time in Math			
Math		2017	2018
Student Subgroup		MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	24.0	47.0
	N	54.0	55.5
Minority	Y	29.0	48.0
	N	--	59.0
IEP	Y	--	--
	N	42.5	51.0
EL	Y	--	--
	N	42.5	51.0
GT	Y	--	--
	N	41.0	48.0
Schoolwide		43.0	50.0
Geographic District		31.0	45.5



PSAT/SAT 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 Growth over Time in Math				
Math	2017		2018	
Subgroup	N	MGP	N	MGP
F/R Lunch	20	24.0	51	47.0
Minority	25	29.0	83	48.0
IEP	n<20	--	n<20	--
EL	n<20	--	47	48.0
GT	n<20	--	n<20	--



Geo.District Subgroup Growth over Time in Math				
Math	2017		2018	
Subgroup	N	MGP	N	MGP
F/R Lunch	306	29.0	1141	45.0
Minority	391	30.0	1375	46.0
IEP	32	22.0	157	32.0
EL	NA	--	727	45.0
GT	44	42.0	140	47.5

Growth Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show growth of student subgroups on the PSAT/SAT Math state assessments over time. In Math, the percent of students eligible for free or reduced priced lunch (FRL) meeting or exceeding expectations increased, minority student performance increased, performance for students with disabilities (IEP) decreased, any subgroups with N-values less than 20 were not reported due to low student counts. This year, non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, any subgroups with N-values less than 20 were not reported due to low student counts. In 2018, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: FRL, minority, EL, and any additional details are available in the graphs on the right.

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

- 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	4-Year		5-Year		6-Year		7-Year		
		N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	
		F/R Lunch	Y	6yr	18	50.0%	18	83.3%	18	88.9%
	N	4yr	16	81.3%	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
Minority	Y	5yr	18	61.1%	17	76.5%	n<16	--	n<16	--
	N	4yr	16	68.8%	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
IEP	Y	NA	n<16	--	n<16	--	0	--	n<16	--
	N	6yr	32	68.8%	28	85.7%	29	89.7%	21	71.4%
EL	Y	NA	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
	N	5yr	24	62.5%	22	90.9%	22	90.9%	18	72.2%
GT	Y	NA	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
	N	5yr	30	66.7%	24	87.5%	23	87.0%	18	77.8%
Schoolwide		6yr	34	64.7%	30	86.7%	29	89.7%	22	72.7%
Geographic District		6yr	647	57.8%	671	69.0%	647	73.1%	629	72.3%



Graduation Rates School Status

The graphs above show schoolwide graduation rates disaggregated by student subgroups. Overall, the school's best of graduation rate is the 6 year rate of 89.7%. The best of rate for the geo. district is the 6 year rate of 73.1%. The best of rate for students eligible for free or reduced price lunch is the 6 year rate of 88.9%. The best of rate for minority students is the 5 year rate of 76.5%.

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 & 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	6yr	18	50.0%	18	83.3%	18	88.9%	n<16	--
Minority	5yr	18	61.1%	17	76.5%	n<16	--	n<16	--
IEP	NA	n<16	--	n<16	--	0	--	n<16	--
EL	NA	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
GT	NA	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
Schoolwide	6yr	34	64.7%	30	86.7%	29	89.7%	22	72.7%

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	6yr	562	57.5%	590	67.6%	573	72.1%	522	71.5%
Minority	7yr	531	59.7%	548	71.2%	518	74.7%	478	74.9%
IEP	7yr	56	32.1%	81	54.3%	73	47.9%	56	64.3%
EL	7yr	226	59.3%	239	72.0%	304	77.6%	255	78.0%
GT	5yr	45	80.0%	51	98.0%	49	89.8%	41	95.1%
Geo. District	6yr	647	57.8%	671	69.0%	647	73.1%	629	72.3%



Graduation Rates Status and Local Comparison

The graphs above show schoolwide graduation rates disaggregated by student subgroups compared to the geographic district. The best of rate for students eligible for free or reduced price lunch is the 6 year rate of 88.9%. The 6 year rate for FRL students in the geo. district is 72.1%. The best of rate for minority students is the 5 year rate of 76.5%. The 5 year rate for minority students in the geo. district is 71.2%. Any student subgroup with an N less than 16 won't be reported due to low student counts.

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	2017
Student Subgroup		Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate
F/R Lunch	Y	0.8%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%
	N	2.1%	1.2%	0.9%	0.5%
Minority	Y	0.6%	2.7%	0.9%	0.4%
	N	2.6%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%
IEP	Y	8.3%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%
	N	1.0%	2.6%	0.6%	0.3%
EL	Y	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%
	N	1.9%	3.3%	0.9%	0.4%
GT	Y	4.0%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%
	N	1.4%	2.6%	0.7%	0.3%
Schoolwide		1.6%	2.8%	0.6%	0.3%
Geographic District		3.4%	4.7%	4.4%	17.0%



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		2017	
Subgroup	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
F/R Lunch	128	0.8%	158	4.4%	124	0.0%	176	0.0%
Minority	168	0.6%	188	2.7%	212	0.9%	257	0.4%
IEP	24	8.3%	21	4.8%	22	0.0%	28	0.0%
EL	57	0.0%	84	1.2%	114	0.0%	112	0.0%
GT	25	4.0%	18	5.6%	38	0.0%	46	0.0%
Schoolwide	320	1.6%	326	2.8%	344	0.6%	397	0.3%



Geographic District Subgroup Dropout Rates over Time								
Dropout	2014		2015		2016		2017	
Subgroup	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
F/R Lunch	3720	3.0%	4005	4.0%	3884	3.9%	3514	2.2%
Minority	4152	3.4%	4264	4.6%	4246	4.1%	4329	2.7%
IEP	512	2.7%	600	5.3%	580	5.5%	571	3.3%
EL	1669	3.0%	1855	3.8%	1951	3.6%	1883	1.8%
GT	323	0.3%	370	0.8%	364	0.8%	317	0.3%
Geo. District	5112	3.4%	5206	4.7%	5143	4.4%	565	17.0%

Dropout Rates Status and Local Comparison	
The graphs above show dropout rates disaggregated by student group and dropout rates compared to the geographic district. From last year, students eligible for free or reduced priced lunch (FRL) dropout rates had no change, minority student dropout rates decreased, students with disabilities (IEP) dropout rates had no change, English learner (EL) dropout rates had no change, gifted student (GT) dropout rates had no change, and overall student dropout rates decreased. This year, non-FRL students had higher dropout rates than their FRL peers, minority students had higher dropout rates than their non-minority peers, general education students had higher dropout rates than their IEP peers, non-EL students had higher dropout rates than their EL peers, non-GT students had higher dropout rates than their GT peers, overall, Adams County School District 50 had higher dropout rates than the school. In 2018, the following subgroups had dropout rates lower than the geo. district: FRL, minority, IEP, EL, GT, additional details are available in the graphs on the right.	

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






Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Additional Indicators

Matriculation Rate: School Status and 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	2016		2017		2018	
Category	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
2 yr	27	11.1%	23	4.3%	34	11.8%
4 yr	27	63.0%	23	43.5%	34	38.2%
CTE	27	3.7%	23	0.0%	34	2.9%
Schoolwide	27	77.8%	23	47.8%	34	52.9%

Geo. District Matriculation Rate Trends over Time						
Matriculation	2016		2017		2018	
Category	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
2 yr	493	10%	483	9%	498	11%
4 yr	493	18%	483	20%	498	20%
CTE	493	3%	483	4%	498	4%
Geo. District	493	30.0%	483	33.1%	498	33.7%



Matriculation Rates Status and Local Comparison

The graphs above show schoolwide matriculation rates compared to the matriculation rates for Adams County School District 50. In 2018, school matriculation rates and was above the geo. district. Since last year, schoolwide matriculation rates increased from 47.8% to 52.9%.

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.


Fiscal Years 2015-2018 Financial Results

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?

Looking through CARS: There are two pages for Financial Performance results. All applicable financial indicators have been uniquely color coded to demonstrate the school's financial health. The financial performance narrative on the second page describes the school's overall financial performance in more detail. To understand if financial performance impacted your school's accreditation rating, view the "CARS Rating" page in this report.

Governmental Funds Financial Statement Metrics				
Metric	2015	2016	2017	2018
Operating Margin	4.2%	-2.7%	1.6%	-3.1%
Months of Cash on Hand	1.57	0.95	1.08	0.80
Current Ratio	2.62	1.68	1.91	1.30
Months of Unassigned Fund Balance on Hand	0.70	0.31	0.40	-0.10
Positive Unassigned Fund Balance (TABOR)	YES	YES	YES	NO



Enrollment

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

Enrollment				
Metric	2015	2016	2017	2018
Funded Pupil Count (FPC) Current-Year Variance	-8.4%	6.6%	-4.4%	-11.8%
Change in FPC from Prior-Year	2.4%	19.2%	2.3%	-2.8%

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	2018
Months of Cash on Hand	--	--	--	2.20
Current Ratio	--	--	26.26	--
Debt to Asset Ratio	--	--	0.04	0.00
Change in Net Position	--	--	\$1,335,692	(\$1,062,765)

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	2018
Debt to Asset Ratio	2.80	2.51	1.41	1.68
Change in Net Position	\$66,336	(\$258,278)	(\$2,068,947)	(\$2,303,376)
Default	--	--	NO	NO

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

Fiscal Years 2015-2018 Financial Results

Financial Performance Narrative

Early College of Arvada ended the year with insufficient reserves to satisfy the TABOR reserve requirement, a decrease in net position, and reported 3 statutory violations in their Assurances for Financial Accreditation. The school's funded-pupil count came in lower than budget by 45.5 pupils (12 percent), and 9.5 pupils (3 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 0.8 months of cash on hand and sufficient current assets to cover current liabilities. The school experienced a negative operating margin of 3 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.

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

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 2017-18 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

Early College of Arvada has been an active participant in the MTSS Collaborative Grant funded by CDE. They have worked extensively over the last two years improving their Multi-Tiered Systems of Supports in order to meet the needs of all their learners.

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 2017-18 school year.

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

Early College of Arvada is not meeting TABOR.

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 2017-18 school year. CSI was not made aware of any issues relating to facilities and transportation requirements for the 2017-18 school year. CSI was not made aware of any issues relating to employee credentialing and background check requirements for the 2017-18 school year.

Additional Obligations

-Is the school complying with all other obligations?

CSI Review

CSI was not made aware of any other issues of noncompliance.

Organizational Performance Metrics

Organizational Performance Additional Narrative

Overall, the School exhibited strong operational performance during the 2017-18 school year. Some of the Organizational Submissions were completed after the deadline, but overall the submissions were compliant and required only minimal revisions. In addition, the School is generally very responsive to feedback and questions.

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.



Expanding Frontiers in Public Education

1580 Logan Street Ste. 210 Denver, CO 80203 ▪ P: 303.866.3299 ▪ F: 303.866.2530 ▪ www.csi.state.co.us