



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

**Stone Creek Charter 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.

## 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 Mathematics.....	16
CMAS Science.....	20
English Language Proficiency.....	22
School Observations.....	23
Financial Performance.....	24
Organizational Performance.....	26

## 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?

# Stone Creek Charter School Overview

Year Opened/Transferred: 2006-2007

Grades Served: K-8

School Model: Core Knowledge

Town/City: Avon/Gypsum


District of Residence: Eagle County RE 50

Original Application Type: New School


## Enrollment and Student Demographics over Time

October Student Counts	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Trend
<b>Enrollment Over Time</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>310</b>	
Minority	28.2%	30.3%	29.9%	28.5%	33.9%	
EL	17.5%	17.6%	17.9%	20.4%	21.9%	
FRL	14.1%	17.3%	13.7%	14.8%	15.2%	
Gifted	4.5%	4.8%	5.2%	8.8%	11.0%	
SPED	9.6%	10.6%	12.4%	14.8%	17.4%	
504	2.7%	2.1%	4.8%	2.8%	3.2%	


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	Performance
Financial	Financial performance does not impact the school accreditation rating
Organizational	Organizational performance does not impact the school accreditation rating
Overall Rating	Performance

## 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	<b>Meets 95%</b>

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	230	229	99.6%	1	100.0%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
Math	230	229	99.6%	1	100.0%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
Science	75	75	100.0%	0	100.0%	<b>Meets 95%</b>


Test Participation Rates - Disaggregated by Test						
Subject	Total Records	Valid Scores	Participation Rate	Parent Excuses	Accountability Participation Rate	Rating
CMAS English Language Arts	230	229	99.6%	1	100.0%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
CMAS Math	230	229	99.6%	1	100.0%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
CMAS Science	75	75	100.0%	0	100.0%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
PSAT/SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing	0	0	--	0	--	<b>NA</b>
PSAT/SAT Math	0	0	--	0	--	<b>NA</b>

## 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	15.7%	15.2%	15.7%	15.2%	16.0%	15.2%
Minority	34.9%	33.9%	34.9%	33.9%	30.7%	33.9%
IEP	19.2%	17.4%	19.2%	17.4%	21.3%	17.4%
EL	25.8%	21.9%	25.8%	21.9%	21.3%	21.9%
GT	14.8%	11.0%	14.8%	11.0%	13.3%	11.0%


### 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	35	737	37	753	32	746	40	739
4	34	746	31	750	35	760	29	749
5	46	743	31	740	27	750	39	745
Elementary	115	742	99	748	94	752	108	744
6	24	753	38	752	30	748	46	748
7	28	753	23	755	35	756	40	755
8	33	759	25	757	18	747	35	755
Middle	85	755	86	754	83	751	121	753
<b>Overall</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>748</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>751</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>752</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>748</b>



\*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	35	34.3%	37	54.1%	32	59.4%	40	40.0%
4	34	50.0%	31	54.8%	35	62.9%	29	51.7%
5	46	43.5%	31	38.7%	27	55.6%	39	41.0%
Elementary	115	42.6%	99	49.5%	94	59.6%	108	43.5%
6	24	50.0%	38	57.9%	30	46.7%	46	39.1%
7	28	50.0%	23	56.5%	35	62.9%	40	55.0%
8	33	63.6%	25	60.0%	18	44.4%	35	60.0%
Middle	85	55.3%	86	58.1%	83	53.0%	121	50.4%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>48.0%</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>53.5%</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>56.5%</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>47.2%</b>



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	542	31.5%	547	24.3%	485	35.9%	451	33.5%
4	449	38.8%	524	41.4%	542	42.4%	481	41.2%
5	497	39.8%	454	36.1%	513	51.3%	545	44.0%
Elementary	1488	36.5%	1525	33.7%	1540	43.3%	1477	39.9%
6	511	42.1%	493	38.7%	428	38.6%	500	42.2%
7	472	46.4%	480	40.2%	486	50.0%	437	48.3%
8	443	47.6%	442	48.9%	469	47.3%	499	45.7%
Middle	1426	45.2%	1415	42.4%	1383	45.6%	1436	45.3%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>2914</b>	<b>40.8%</b>	<b>2940</b>	<b>37.9%</b>	<b>2923</b>	<b>44.4%</b>	<b>2913</b>	<b>42.5%</b>



## 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 3.8 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Eagle County RE 50) for the past four years. Overall, the school has performed greater than their geo. district in 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018. This year, the school performed greater than their geo. district by 4.6 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?

CMAS ELA	2015	2016	2017	2018	
Student Subgroup	%M/E	%M/E	%M/E	%M/E	
F/R Lunch	Y	32.4%	38.7%	42.9%	36.4%
	N	51.5%	56.5%	59.1%	52.7%
Minority	Y	39.4%	43.1%	38.0%	32.9%
	N	52.2%	58.3%	63.8%	59.7%
IEP	Y	25.0%	34.6%	31.0%	31.0%
	N	50.6%	56.6%	61.5%	54.9%
EL	Y	22.5%	26.3%	34.1%	19.6%
	N	54.4%	60.5%	63.2%	61.0%
GT	Y	100.0%	--	91.3%	93.8%
	N	43.5%	50.0%	51.3%	42.6%
Schoolwide	48.0%	53.5%	56.5%	47.2%	
Geographic District	40.8%	37.9%	44.4%	42.5%	




## 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?

CMAS ELA	2015		2016		2017		2018	
Subgroup	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	37	735	31	736	28	737	33	733
Minority	66	735	58	736	50	735	76	737
IEP	20	724	26	733	29	727	42	729
EL	40	724	38	725	41	734	56	727
GT	16	795	n<16	--	23	778	32	783

CMAS ELA	2015		2016		2017		2018	
Subgroup	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	1235	724	1306	722	1285	725	1104	724
Minority	1768	727	1789	725	1787	728	1567	728
IEP	355	705	362	700	353	701	339	700
EL	1424	724	1453	722	1412	725	1183	723
GT	312	777	359	775	387	779	390	778



**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 decreased, performance for students with disabilities (IEP) decreased, English learner (EL) performance decreased, Gifted student (GT) performance increased, and overall student performance decreased. This year, non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, general education students outperformed their IEP peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, GT students outperformed their non-GT peers, overall, the school outperformed Eagle County RE 50. In 2018, the following subgroups outperformed 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.




## 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	29	54.0	32	62.5	28	42.0
5	30	42.5	25	40.0	35	31.0
Elementary	59	52.0	57	54.0	63	37.0
6	38	77.0	29	66.0	40	49.5
7	20	59.5	34	62.0	33	52.0
8	25	56.0	n<20	--	35	44.0
Middle	83	65.0	81	60.0	108	49.0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>59.5</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>57.5</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>44.0</b>



### 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	497	48.0	512	61.0	450	51.5
5	419	47.0	485	64.0	499	51.0
Elementary	NA	--	1003	62.0	960	51.0
6	457	49.0	406	55.0	468	47.0
7	455	48.0	456	57.5	391	51.0
8	397	56.0	443	59.0	451	47.0
Middle	NA	--	1299	57.0	1299	49.0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>2539</b>	<b>47.0</b>	<b>2616</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>2259</b>	<b>49.0</b>




**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 decreased. Since last year, student growth decreased by 13.5 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 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)	24%	29%	40%
Typical (35-65)	31%	29%	31%
High (above 65)	45%	42%	29%



ELA At/Below 50th %ile			
CMAS ELA	%Students		
Category	2016	2017	2018
At or Above 50	63%	58%	46%
Below 50	37%	42%	54%



**Levels of Growth Narrative**  
 Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 40% 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 29% of students. The percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased from last year (58% to 46%). Since 2016, the percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased (63% to 46%).

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




## 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	61.0	63.0	34.0
	N	59.0	56.0	48.0
Minority	Y	56.0	66.0	48.0
	N	61.0	51.0	42.5
IEP	Y	--	39.5	44.0
	N	61.0	59.0	44.5
EL	Y	54.0	67.0	45.0
	N	61.0	54.0	44.0
GT	Y	--	--	70.0
	N	59.0	59.5	44.0
Schoolwide		59.5	57.5	44.0
Geographic District		47.0	55.0	49.0



### 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	28	61.0	21	63.0	32	34.0
Minority	49	56.0	43	66.0	57	48.0
IEP	n<20	--	22	39.5	31	44.0
EL	31	54.0	35	67.0	45	45.0
GT	n<20	--	n<20	--	29	70.0



Geographic District Subgroup Growth over Time in ELA						
CMAS ELA	2016		2017		2018	
Subgroup	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
F/R Lunch	986	46.0	1036	51.0	854	46.0
Minority	1389	45.0	1468	52.0	1238	48.0
IEP	256	38.0	277	42.0	256	36.0
EL	1128	45.0	1190	52.0	920	47.0
GT	308	54.0	338	59.0	321	55.0

**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, performance for students with disabilities (IEP) 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, general education students outperformed their IEP peers, EL students outperformed their non-EL peers, GT students outperformed their non-GT peers, overall, Eagle County RE 50 outperformed the school.

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	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	35	734	37	753	32	746	40	730
4	35	734	31	733	36	746	29	726
5	46	728	31	743	27	736	39	727
Elementary	116	731	99	744	95	743	103	728
6	24	733	38	738	31	744	46	730
7	28	733	23	746	35	742	40	748
8	33	741	25	736	18	742	35	750
Middle	85	736	86	740	84	743	114	742
<b>Overall</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>734</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>742</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>743</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>735</b>



\*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	
Grade/Level	N	%M/E	N	%M/E	N	%M/E	N	%M/E
3	35	37.1%	37	59.5%	32	46.9%	40	30.0%
4	35	42.9%	31	35.5%	36	52.8%	29	31.0%
5	46	21.7%	31	38.7%	27	37.0%	39	28.2%
Elementary	116	32.8%	99	45.5%	95	46.3%	108	29.6%
6	24	29.2%	38	34.2%	31	35.5%	46	23.9%
7	28	14.3%	23	39.1%	35	37.1%	40	52.5%
8	33	36.4%	25	20.0%	18	55.6%	35	48.6%
Middle	85	27.1%	86	31.4%	84	40.5%	114	43.0%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>30.3%</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>38.9%</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>43.6%</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>35.4%</b>



Geographic District Proficiency over Time in Math								
CMAS Math	2015		2016		2017		2018	
Grade/Level	N	%M/E	N	%M/E	N	%M/E	N	%M/E
3	542	33.0%	556	27.7%	491	32.4%	482	29.9%
4	450	22.9%	531	25.8%	554	24.5%	490	23.7%
5	496	25.6%	450	24.2%	517	26.9%	549	27.0%
Elementary	1488	27.5%	1537	26.0%	1562	27.8%	1521	26.8%
6	512	29.3%	493	32.5%	431	27.8%	513	23.8%
7	490	31.2%	478	28.5%	482	25.9%	429	24.2%
8	382	25.9%	357	24.4%	329	14.9%	345	14.8%
Middle	1384	29.0%	1328	28.8%	1242	23.7%	1287	21.5%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>2872</b>	<b>28.2%</b>	<b>2865</b>	<b>27.3%</b>	<b>2804</b>	<b>26.0%</b>	<b>2808</b>	<b>24.4%</b>



### 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 increased. From 2015-16 to 2016-17, overall mean scale score increased. Since last school year, overall mean scale score has decreased by 7.7 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Eagle County RE 50) for the past four years. Overall, the school has performed greater than their geo. district in 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018. This year, the school performed greater than their geo. district by 11 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?

CMAS Math	2015	2016	2017	2018	
Student Subgroup	%M/E	%M/E	%M/E	%M/E	
F/R Lunch	Y	18.4%	12.9%	28.6%	25.7%
	N	33.1%	44.2%	46.4%	39.6%
Minority	Y	11.9%	19.0%	25.0%	26.9%
	N	39.6%	48.0%	51.2%	43.2%
IEP	Y	20.0%	30.8%	27.6%	23.8%
	N	31.5%	40.3%	46.7%	40.6%
EL	Y	9.8%	13.2%	20.9%	15.5%
	N	35.6%	45.6%	50.7%	45.3%
GT	Y	87.5%	--	78.3%	87.9%
	N	25.4%	34.7%	38.5%	28.3%
Schoolwide	30.3%	38.9%	43.6%	35.4%	
Geographic District	28.2%	27.3%	26.0%	24.4%	



## 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?

CMAS Math	2015		2016		2017		2018	
Subgroup	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	38	719	31	725	28	730	35	729
Minority	67	719	58	726	52	727	78	727
IEP	20	716	26	730	29	720	42	716
EL	41	711	38	717	43	726	58	719
GT	16	774	n<16	--	23	773	33	770

CMAS Math	2015		2016		2017		2018	
Subgroup	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
F/R Lunch	1225	720	1320	715	1321	715	1123	713
Minority	1754	722	1811	718	1832	718	1595	716
IEP	355	708	364	700	360	700	342	696
EL	1411	720	1473	716	1455	716	1210	712
GT	307	767	360	766	385	768	391	766

**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 decreased, minority student performance increased, performance for students with disabilities (IEP) decreased, English learner (EL) performance decreased, Gifted student (GT) performance increased, and overall student performance decreased. This year, non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, general education students outperformed their IEP peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, GT students outperformed their non-GT peers, overall, the school outperformed Eagle County RE 50. In 2018, the following subgroups outperformed 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.




## 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	29	37.0	32	46.5	28	39.0
5	31	59.0	25	54.0	35	13.0
Elementary	60	52.0	57	53.0	63	23.0
6	38	77.0	28	64.0	40	55.5
7	20	80.5	34	75.0	33	72.0
8	25	66.0	n<20	--	35	50.0
Middle	83	71.0	80	68.5	108	65.0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>66.0</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>63.0</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>46.0</b>






### 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	498	41.0	516	52.5	457	45.0
5	418	45.0	492	51.0	506	47.0
Elementary	NA	--	1013	51.0	974	46.5
6	457	55.0	405	64.0	471	49.0
7	453	55.0	449	53.0	389	51.0
8	330	56.0	298	56.0	317	42.0
Middle	NA	--	1147	57.0	1166	48.0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>2376</b>	<b>49.0</b>	<b>2393</b>	<b>53.0</b>	<b>2140</b>	<b>47.0</b>



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 decreased. Since last year, student growth decreased by 17 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 decreased 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)	21%	24%	39%
Typical (35-65)	29%	27%	25%
High (above 65)	50%	49%	36%

Math At/Below 50th %ile			
CMAS Math	%Students		
Category	2016	2017	2018
At or Above 50	66%	64%	47%
Below 50	34%	36%	53%



Levels of Growth Narrative

Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 39% 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 36% of students. The percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased from last year (64% to 47%). Since 2016, the percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased (66% to 47%).

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	66.0	63.0	38.0
	N	65.0	64.5	46.0
Minority	Y	56.5	67.0	51.0
	N	70.0	63.0	42.0
IEP	Y	--	49.5	23.0
	N	64.0	65.0	50.5
EL	Y	41.0	68.0	48.0
	N	70.0	62.5	44.0
GT	Y	--	--	64.0
	N	64.0	63.5	42.0
Schoolwide		66.0	63.0	46.0
Geographic District		49.0	53.0	47.0



### 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	29	66.0	21	63.0	32	38.0
Minority	50	56.5	43	67.0	57	51.0
IEP	n<20	--	22	49.5	31	23.0
EL	32	41.0	35	68.0	45	48.0
GT	n<20	--	n<20	--	29	64.0

Geographic District Subgroup Growth over Time in Math						
CMAS Math	2016		2017		2018	
Subgroup	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
F/R Lunch	981	42.0	996	52.0	851	44.0
Minority	1362	44.0	1395	52.0	1214	45.0
IEP	257	41.0	281	49.0	257	39.0
EL	1123	44.0	1143	52.0	931	45.0
GT	256	53.0	257	60.0	267	51.0

**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 decreased, minority student performance decreased, performance for students with disabilities (IEP) 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, general education students outperformed their IEP peers, EL students outperformed their non-EL peers, GT students outperformed their non-GT peers, overall, Eagle County RE 50 outperformed the school. In 2018, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: minority, 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.




## 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	47	644	33	641	29	607	40	645
8	33	633	25	625	19	627	35	649
11	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--



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	47	46.8%	33	48.5%	29	51.7%	40	55.0%
8	33	36.4%	25	36.0%	19	47.4%	35	57.1%
11	0	--	0	--	0	--	0	--
<b>Overall</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>42.5%</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>43.1%</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>50.0%</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>56.0%</b>



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	495	32.1%	449	33.4%	510	37.1%	547	34.9%
8	467	41.8%	444	40.5%	477	36.3%	493	27.6%
11	0	--	359	24.8%	310	21.3%	329	20.7%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>962</b>	<b>36.8%</b>	<b>1252</b>	<b>33.5%</b>	<b>1297</b>	<b>33.0%</b>	<b>1369</b>	<b>28.9%</b>



### 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. 5th grade mean scale score has increased by 38 scale score points. 8th grade mean scale score has increased by 22 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Eagle County RE 50) for the past four years. In 2018, the school performed greater than the geo. district in 5th grade, greater than the geo. district in 8th grade, and, overall, 56% 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	--	17.6%	--	--
	N	43.3%	53.8%	56.4%	58.3%
Minority	Y	30.4%	21.7%	--	45.5%
	N	49.1%	57.6%	68.8%	62.0%
IEP	Y	--	--	--	--
	N	46.4%	45.3%	55.3%	64.9%
EL	Y	12.5%	--	--	31.3%
	N	51.6%	52.4%	63.9%	64.3%
GT	Y	--	--	--	--
	N	41.1%	42.9%	51.1%	51.6%



### 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	n<16	--	17	591	n<16	--	n<16	--
Minority	23	609	23	588	n<16	--	22	627
IEP	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--	n<16	--
EL	16	582	n<16	--	n<16	--	16	590
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	348	553	487	553	506	548	476	525
Minority	518	566	688	559	743	556	767	536
IEP	105	520	117	509	133	473	155	463
EL	403	554	555	552	611	550	508	508
GT	89	725	161	722	158	721	150	715

**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, and overall student performance increased. This year, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, overall, the school outperformed Eagle County RE 50. In 2018, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: 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 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	n<20	--	--
2	n<20	--	--
3	n<20	--	--
4	n<20	--	--
5	n<20	--	--
Elementary	26	27.5	46.2%
6	n<20	--	--
7	n<20	--	--
8	n<20	--	--
Middle	n<20	--	--
9	NA	--	--
10	NA	--	--
11	NA	--	--
12	NA	--	--
High	NA	--	--
<b>Overall</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>35.0</b>	<b>48.8%</b>



### 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	889	45.0	NA
Middle	261	51.0	NA
High	252	34.5	NA
<b>Overall</b>	<b>1402</b>	<b>45.0</b>	<b>NA</b>



### 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. 49% 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

## 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	12.0%	3.8%	3.8%	6.8%
Months of Cash on Hand	2.65	2.92	3.43	3.70
Current Ratio	4.17	5.03	8.20	7.80
Months of Unassigned Fund Balance on Hand	1.77	2.12	2.56	3.30
Positive Unassigned Fund Balance (TABOR)	YES	YES	YES	YES



### Enrollment

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

Enrollment				
Metric	2015	2016	2017	2018
Funded Pupil Count (FPC) Current-Year Variance	2.7%	-13.4%	-8.1%	0.2%
Change in FPC from Prior-Year	11.3%	-11.4%	-1.7%	8.7%

### 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	--	--	--	--
Current Ratio	--	--	--	--
Debt to Asset Ratio	--	--	--	--
Change in Net Position	--	--	--	--

### 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	3.36	2.78	1.99	2.68
Change in Net Position	\$153,863	(\$243,228)	(\$1,485,796)	(\$1,573,790)
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

Stone Creek Charter School ended the year with sufficient reserves to satisfy the TABOR reserve requirement, a decrease in net position, and reported no statutory violations in their Assurances for Financial Accreditation. The school's funded-pupil count came in higher than budget by 0.7 pupils (0 percent), and 26 pupils (9 percent) higher 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 3.7 months of cash on hand and sufficient current assets to cover current liabilities. The school experienced a positive operating margin of 7 percent and an increase 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

CSI was not made aware of any issues related to protecting the rights of all 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 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

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 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](http://www.csi.state.co.us)