



**Colorado Charter School Institute**  
**Annual Review of Schools (CARS) Report**  
**2018-2019**

**Animas High School**



Expanding Frontiers in Public Education

1600 Broadway Ste. 1250 Denver, CO 80202 • P: 303.866.3299 • F: 303.866.2530 • [www.csi.state.co.us](http://www.csi.state.co.us)



# **COLORADO**

## CHARTER SCHOOL INSTITUTE

### **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	11
CMAS Math	15
CMAS Science	11
English Language Proficiency	13
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	14
School Observations	26
Financial Performance	27
Organizational Performance	29

## 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 | Anastasia Hawkins - 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 September 27th**.

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

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

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

# CSI Performance Framework

## Academic Performance Framework\*

### 1. Academic Achievement

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

### 2. Academic Growth

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

### 3. Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

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

#### \*Data Notes:

- Data sources include achievement, growth, and postsecondary and workforce readiness state files from 2010 to 2019. 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?

# Animas High School Overview

Year Opened/Transferred: 2007-2008

Grades Served: 9-12

School Model: Project-Based Learning








Town/City: Durango

District of Residence: Durango 9-R

Original Application Type: New School

Enrollment and Student Demographics over Time						
October Student Counts	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Trend
<b>Enrollment Over Time</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>252</b>	
F/R Lunch	8.0%	10.7%	12.4%	17.8%	19.8%	
Minority	6.7%	7.4%	15.7%	17.4%	20.2%	
IEP	7.1%	8.0%	8.4%	9.3%	7.9%	
EL	0.0%	1.0%	1.5%	1.9%	2.4%	
Gifted	12.2%	10.4%	11.3%	10.9%	9.5%	
504	5.1%	3.7%	11.3%	14.7%	14.7%	

Enrollment over Time



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

\*Geo.Dist refers to the district in which your school is located (your school's geographic district).

## 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.

## Calculating your CARS Academic Rating

To determine your rating, CSI uses the CSI Academic Performance Framework to determine the percent of points earned overall and by level. The following are the cut score points that determine each rating:

**Performance with Distinction:** Greater than 71.3% Points Earned

**Performance:** Between 53% to 71.3% Points Earned

**Improvement:** Between 42% to 52.9% Points Earned

**Priority Improvement:** Between 34% and 41.9% Points Earned

**Turnaround:** Below 34% Points Earned

Framework	CARS Rating
<b>Academic</b>	Performance Plan
Elementary School Rating	--
Middle School Rating	--
High School Rating	Performance (Points Earned: 62.2%)
<b>Financial</b>	Financial performance does not impact the school accreditation rating
<b>Organizational</b>	Organizational performance does not impact the school accreditation rating
<b>Overall CARS Rating</b>	<b>Performance Plan</b>

## 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	175	173	98.9%	2	100.0%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
Math	175	173	98.9%	2	100.0%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
Science	70	64	91.4%	5	98.5%	<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	0	0	--	0	--	<b>NA</b>
CMAS Math	0	0	--	0	--	<b>NA</b>
CMAS Science	70	64	91.4%	5	98.5%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
PSAT/SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing	175	173	98.9%	2	100.0%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
PSAT/SAT Math	175	173	98.9%	2	100.0%	<b>Meets 95%</b>

## Science Achievement


### CMAS Science: School Status, Trends, and Local Comparison Tables

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

Achievement over Time in Science										
CMAS Science	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
Elementary (5th)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Middle (8th)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
High (11th)	--	--	56	627	42	636	33	620	63	618

Geographic District Achievement over Time in Science										
CMAS Science	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
Elementary (5th)	304	643	348	656	338	634	379	636	356	625
Middle (8th)	277	608	259	623	325	593	301	616	291	598
High (11th)	--	--	252	635	201	647	258	640	239	636

### CMAS Science: School Local Comparison Graphs



### 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. 11th grade mean scale score has decreased by 1.6 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Durango 9-R) for the past four years. In 2019, the school performed lower than the geo. district in 11th grade, overall trends are in the graphs above.

Symbol	Meaning
NA	Not reported by the state.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

## Science Subgroup Achievement

### CMAS Science: Subgroup Status, Gap Trends, and Local Comparison Tables

- 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?
- 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?

#### Elementary (5th) Achievement Gap Trends

Subgroup Achievement Gap Trends over Time in Science						
CMAS Science		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Student Subgroup		MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	--	--	--	--	--
Minority	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	--	--	--	--	--
IEP	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	--	--	--	--	--
EL	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	--	--	--	--	--
GT	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	--	--	--	--	--

Geographic District Gap Trends over Time in Science						
CMAS Science		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Student Subgroup		MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	604	588	589	584	569
	N	660	690	659	666	656
Minority	Y	603	611	605	585	583
	N	657	676	648	658	648
IEP	Y	537	500	533	531	511
	N	652	671	646	644	638
EL	Y	574	555	561	530	538
	N	648	665	639	643	633
GT	Y	744	773	749	759	721
	N	635	643	626	624	615

#### Middle (8th) Achievement Gap Trends

Subgroup Achievement Gap Trends over Time in Science						
CMAS Science		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Student Subgroup		MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	--	--	--	--	--
Minority	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	--	--	--	--	--
IEP	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	--	--	--	--	--
EL	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	--	--	--	--	--
GT	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	--	--	--	--	--

Geographic District Gap Trends over Time in Science						
CMAS Science		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Student Subgroup		MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	543	542	548	558	528
	N	632	658	621	639	629
Minority	Y	563	595	541	573	537
	N	624	631	619	633	631
IEP	Y	490	496	480	468	433
	N	622	638	609	630	614
EL	Y	500	--	512	469	471
	N	615	626	599	624	608
GT	Y	701	--	--	745	737
	N	597	614	593	607	584

#### High (11th) Achievement Gap Trends

Subgroup Achievement Gap Trends over Time in Science						
CMAS Science		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Student Subgroup		MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	--	626	657	635	626
Minority	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	--	626	657	618	623
IEP	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	--	626	646	646	627
EL	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	--	627	643	617	622
GT	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	--	625	623	596	612

Geographic District Gap Trends over Time in Science						
CMAS Science		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Student Subgroup		MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	--	604	612	593	594
	N	--	645	661	651	645
Minority	Y	--	568	615	599	598
	N	--	655	660	655	645
IEP	Y	--	567	566	559	525
	N	--	643	654	648	643
EL	Y	--	--	583	--	--
	N	--	642	653	646	639
GT	Y	--	741	--	734	--
	N	--	626	647	632	629

#### Achievement Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show disaggregated subgroup achievement performance disaggregated by grade level. Comparison geographic district values are in the tables to the right.

Symbol	Meaning
NA	Not reported by the state.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

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

Growth over Time on ACCESS									
ACCESS	2016**		2017**		2018		2019		
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	% On Track
Elementary	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Middle	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
High	--	--	--	--	n < 20	--	n < 20	--	--
<b>Overall</b>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Geographic District Growth over Time on ACCESS									
ACCESS	2016**		2017**		2018		2019		
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	% On Track
Elementary	--	--	--	--	102	45.0	79	47.0	64.6%
Middle	--	--	--	--	25	33.0	29	39.0	27.6%
High	--	--	--	--	20	75.5	n < 20	--	--
<b>Overall</b>	--	--	--	--	147	47.0	121	43.0	52.1%


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

\*\*ACCESS growth was not released in 2016 or 2017.


**What is On Track Growth?** This metric reports whether students are on-track to achieve language proficiency. As CDE states, "The Colorado growth model calculates projected targets that indicate how much growth would be required for an individual student to achieve a specified level of proficiency within 1, 2, or 3 years. These projected targets can then be compared against the student's observed growth percentile to determine whether the student is on-track to meet their proficiency goal within the allotted timeline".

### ACCESS: School Local Comparison Graphs


% On Track - Elementary



% On Track - Middle



% On Track - High



### Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative

--

Symbol	Meaning
NA	Not reported by the state.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

## Evidence-Based Reading and Writing Achievement

### PSAT/SAT EBRW: School Status, Trends, and Local Comparison Tables

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

Achievement over Time in EBRW										
PSAT/SAT EBRW	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019 <sup>^</sup>	
	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
PSAT (9th)*	--	--	--	--	--	--	57	464	41	494
PSAT (10th)*	--	--	--	--	67	492	73	481	60	482
PSAT (9th&10th)	--	--	--	--	--	--	130	474	101	486
SAT (11th)	--	--	--	--	55	554	52	557	66	521
<b>Overall</b>	--	--	--	--	<b>122</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>497</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>500</b>

Geographic District Achievement over Time in EBRW										
PSAT/SAT EBRW	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019 <sup>^</sup>	
	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
PSAT (9th)*	--	--	--	--	--	--	373	466	348	481
PSAT (10th)*	--	--	--	--	285	494	303	496	364	484
PSAT (9th&10th)	--	--	--	--	--	--	676	479	712	483
SAT (11th)	--	--	--	--	239	541	282	531	291	528
<b>Overall</b>	--	--	--	--	<b>524</b>	<b>515</b>	<b>958</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>1,003</b>	<b>496</b>

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


<sup>^</sup>CDE renormed SAT benchmarks in 2019. Therefore, benchmarks from 2016-2018 do not look the same as benchmarks from 2019.

### PSAT/SAT EBRW: School Status, Trends, and Local Comparison Graphs

EBRW - Schoolwide

EBRW - PSAT (9&10)

EBRW - SAT (11)



### Achievement Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show schoolwide performance on the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing state assessment over time disaggregated by test and grade level. From 2017 to 2019, overall student achievement decreased by 20.2 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score increased by 2.8 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Durango 9-R) for the past five years. Overall, the school outperforms their geo. district by 4 scale score points.

Symbol	Meaning
NA	Not reported by the state.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

## Evidence-Based Reading and Writing Subgroup Achievement


### PSAT/SAT EBRW: Subgroup Status, Gap Trends, and Local Comparison Tables

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


Subgroup Achievement Gap Trends over Time in EBRW						
PSAT/SAT EBRW		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Student Subgroup		MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	--	--	447	459	480
	N	--	--	532	506	507
Minority	Y	--	--	463	468	487
	N	--	--	529	503	504
IEP	Y	--	--	--	400	--
	N	--	--	531	507	506
EL	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	--	--	522	498	501
GT	Y	--	--	599	623	--
	N	--	--	508	484	492
Schoolwide		--	--	520	497	500

Geographic District Gap Trends over Time in EBRW						
PSAT/SAT EBRW		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Student Subgroup		MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	--	--	460	443	445
	N	--	--	532	509	511
Minority	Y	--	--	469	448	450
	N	--	--	531	511	510
IEP	Y	--	--	407	391	399
	N	--	--	525	505	504
EL	Y	--	--	409	383	373
	N	--	--	520	497	499
GT	Y	--	--	--	626	628
	N	--	--	516	485	486
Geographic District		--	--	515	494	496

### PSAT/SAT: Subgroup Gap Trends Graphs



### PSAT/SAT: Subgroup Local Comparison Graphs



### Achievement Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show the performance of student subgroups on the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing state assessment over time. PSAT/SAT combined results show non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, overall the school outperformed District.

Symbol	Meaning
NA	Not reported by the state.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

## Evidence-Based Reading and Writing Growth

### PSAT/SAT EBRW: School Status, Trends, and Local Comparison Tables

- Are students making sufficient growth on state assessments over time?
- How are students growing on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?

Growth over Time in EBRW						
PSAT/SAT EBRW	2017		2018		2019	
	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
CMAS 8 to PSAT 9 <sup>^</sup>	--	--	48	66.0	--	--
PSAT 9 to PSAT 10	--	--	59	53.0	56	35.0
PSAT 10 to SAT 11	51	56.0	46	68.0	63	64.0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>62.0</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>47.0</b>


Geographic District Growth over Time in EBRW						
PSAT/SAT EBRW	2017		2018		2019	
	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
CMAS 8 to PSAT 9 <sup>^</sup>	--	--	306	53.5	--	--
PSAT 9 to PSAT 10	--	--	249	41.0	344	46.5
PSAT 10 to SAT 11	223	52.0	253	50.0	263	56.0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>52.0</b>	<b>808</b>	<b>47.0</b>	<b>607</b>	<b>50.0</b>

<sup>^</sup>In 2019, the Colorado Department of Education released the following: "CMAS English Language Arts assessment results will no longer be linked to PSAT/SAT results in determining student growth percentiles. Rather, the following ELA growth progressions will be used at the high school level:

- Grade 9 PSAT to grade 10 PSAT
- Grade 10 PSAT to grade 11 SAT

For these two progressions, historical data will be limited to PSAT results only. Math growth will be calculated and presented in the same manner as 2018 performance frameworks". To align with the state, your CARS report does not include 2019 CMAS to PSAT EBRW growth.

### PSAT/SAT EBRW: School Status, Trends, and Local Comparison Graphs




#### Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs show schoolwide growth on the English Language Arts state assessment. From 2016 to 2019, overall student growth decreased. Since last year, student growth decreased by 15 percentile points. In 2019, overall student growth was approaching state expectations and was below the geo. district. Overall student growth for the geo. district has decreased over time.


### PSAT/SAT EBRW: Levels of Growth Tables

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

EBRW Levels of Growth			
PSAT/SAT EBRW	%Students		
Category	2017	2018	2019
Low (below 35)	27%	26%	--
Typical (35-65)	31%	28%	--
High (above 65)	41%	46%	--



EBRW At/Below 50th %ile			
PSAT/SAT EBRW	%Students		
Category	2017	2018	2019
At or Above 50	55%	59%	--
Below 50	45%	41%	--



#### Levels of Growth Narrative

--
----

Symbol	Meaning
NA	Not reported by the state.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

## Evidence-Based Reading and Writing Subgroup Growth


### PSAT/SAT EBRW: Subgroup Status, Gap Trends, and Local Comparison Tables

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


PSAT/SAT EBRW	2017	2018	2019
Student Subgroup	MGP	MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	--	46.0
	N	56.0	63.0
Minority	Y	--	65.0
	N	56.0	62.0
IEP	Y	--	--
	N	53.0	63.0
EL	Y	--	--
	N	56.0	62.0
GT	Y	--	--
	N	59.0	57.0
Schoolwide	56.0	62.0	47.0

PSAT/SAT EBRW	2017	2018	2019
Student Subgroup	MGP	MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	49.0	42.0
	N	52.0	49.0
Minority	Y	48.0	43.0
	N	53.0	49.0
IEP	Y	--	40.5
	N	53.0	48.0
EL	Y	--	--
	N	51.0	47.0
GT	Y	--	62.0
	N	52.0	45.0
Geographic District	52.0	47.0	50.0

### PSAT/SAT EBRW: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends Graphs



### PSAT/SAT EBRW: Subgroup Local Comparison Graphs



### Growth Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show the performance of student subgroups on the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing state assessment over time. PSAT/SAT combined results show non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, overall Durango 9-R outperformed the school.

Symbol	Meaning
NA	Not reported by the state.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

## Mathematics Achievement

### PSAT/SAT Math: School Status, Trends, and Local Comparison Tables

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

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

Achievement over Time in Math										
PSAT/SAT Math	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019 <sup>^</sup>	
	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
PSAT (9th)*	--	--	--	--	--	--	57	423	41	435
PSAT (10th)*	--	--	--	--	67	446	73	439	60	445
PSAT (9th&10th)	--	--	--	--	--	--	130	432	101	441
SAT (11th)	--	--	--	--	55	507	52	510	66	477
<b>Overall</b>	--	--	--	--	<b>122</b>	<b>473</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>455</b>

Geographic District Achievement over Time in Math										
PSAT/SAT Math	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019 <sup>^</sup>	
	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
PSAT (9th)*	--	--	--	--	--	--	373	447	348	447
PSAT (10th)*	--	--	--	--	285	468	303	456	364	455
PSAT (9th&10th)	--	--	--	--	--	--	676	451	712	451
SAT (11th)	--	--	--	--	239	515	282	509	291	507
<b>Overall</b>	--	--	--	--	<b>524</b>	<b>490</b>	<b>958</b>	<b>468</b>	<b>1,003</b>	<b>467</b>

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


<sup>^</sup>CDE renormed SAT benchmarks in 2019. Therefore, benchmarks from 2016-2018 do not look the same as benchmarks from 2019.

### PSAT/SAT Math: School Status, Trends, and Local Comparison Graphs

EBRW - Schoolwide

EBRW - PSAT (9&10)

EBRW - SAT (11)



### Achievement Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show schoolwide performance on the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing state assessment over time disaggregated by test and grade level. From 2017 to 2019, overall student achievement decreased by 18.5 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score increased by 0.7 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Durango 9-R) for the past five years. Overall, the school performs lower than their geo. district by 13 scale score points.

Symbol	Meaning
NA	Not reported by the state.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

## Mathematics Subgroup Achievement


### PSAT/SAT Math: Subgroup Status, Gap Trends, and Local Comparison Tables

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


Subgroup Achievement Gap Trends over Time in Math						
PSAT/SAT Math		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Student Subgroup		MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	--	--	411	422	422
	N	--	--	483	462	466
Minority	Y	--	--	428	428	441
	N	--	--	480	459	459
IEP	Y	--	--	--	352	--
	N	--	--	481	464	458
EL	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	--	--	475	454	456
GT	Y	--	--	559	577	--
	N	--	--	460	441	447
Schoolwide		--	--	473	454	455

Geographic District Gap Trends over Time in Math						
PSAT/SAT Math		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Student Subgroup		MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	--	--	441	422	424
	N	--	--	505	481	481
Minority	Y	--	--	454	430	432
	N	--	--	502	482	479
IEP	Y	--	--	390	380	380
	N	--	--	499	477	474
EL	Y	--	--	410	371	370
	N	--	--	494	470	470
GT	Y	--	--	--	594	603
	N	--	--	491	459	458
Geographic District		--	--	490	468	467

### PSAT/SAT: Subgroup Gap Trends Graphs



### PSAT/SAT: Subgroup Local Comparison Graphs



### Achievement Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show the performance of student subgroups on the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing state assessment over time. PSAT/SAT combined results show non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, overall District outperformed the school.

Symbol	Meaning
NA	Not reported by the state.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

## Mathematics Growth

### PSAT/SAT Math: School Status, Trends, and Local Comparison Tables

- Are students making sufficient growth on state assessments over time?
- How are students growing on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?

Growth over Time in Math						
PSAT/SAT Math	2017		2018		2019	
	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
CMAS 8 to PSAT 9 <sup>^</sup>	--	--	48	35.0	33	24.0
PSAT 9 to PSAT 10	--	--	60	41.5	56	41.0
PSAT 10 to SAT 11	51	59.0	46	65.5	63	55.0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>46.5</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>41.5</b>


Geographic District Growth over Time in Math						
PSAT/SAT Math	2017		2018		2019	
	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
CMAS 8 to PSAT 9 <sup>^</sup>	--	--	309	46.0	279	50.0
PSAT 9 to PSAT 10	--	--	174	20.5	344	53.5
PSAT 10 to SAT 11	223	54.0	253	63.0	263	50.0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>54.0</b>	<b>736</b>	<b>43.0</b>	<b>886</b>	<b>51.0</b>

<sup>^</sup>In 2019, the Colorado Department of Education released the following: "CMAS English Language Arts assessment results will no longer be linked to PSAT/SAT results in determining student growth percentiles. Rather, the following ELA growth progressions will be used at the high school level:

- Grade 9 PSAT to grade 10 PSAT
- Grade 10 PSAT to grade 11 SAT

For these two progressions, historical data will be limited to PSAT results only. Math growth will be calculated and presented in the same manner as 2018 performance frameworks". To align with the state, your CARS report does not include 2019 CMAS to PSAT EBRW growth.

### PSAT/SAT Math: School Status, Trends, and Local Comparison Graphs




#### Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs show schoolwide growth on the English Language Arts state assessment. From 2016 to 2019, overall student growth decreased. Since last year, student growth decreased by 5 percentile points. In 2019, overall student growth was approaching state expectations and was below the geo. district. Overall student growth for the geo. district has decreased over time.


### PSAT/SAT Math: Levels of Growth Tables

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

Math Levels of Growth			
PSAT/SAT Math	%Students		
Category	2017	2018	2019
Low (below 35)	25%	38%	--
Typical (35-65)	35%	29%	--
High (above 65)	39%	32%	--



Math At/Below 50th %ile			
PSAT/SAT Math	%Students		
Category	2017	2018	2019
At or Above 50	59%	45%	--
Below 50	41%	55%	--



#### Levels of Growth Narrative

--
----

Symbol	Meaning
NA	Not reported by the state.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

## Mathematics Subgroup Growth


### PSAT/SAT Math: Subgroup Status, Gap Trends, and Local Comparison Tables

- How are traditionally underserved students growing on state assessments in Math over time?
- How are traditionally underserved students growing on state assessments compared to their peers over time?
- 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 Gap Trends over Time in Math				
PSAT/SAT Math		2017	2018	2019
Student Subgroup		MGP	MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	--	36.5	26.0
	N	61.0	49.0	48.5
Minority	Y	--	39.5	32.0
	N	60.0	48.5	46.5
IEP	Y	--	--	--
	N	61.0	49.0	41.5
EL	Y	--	--	--
	N	59.5	47.0	42.0
GT	Y	--	--	--
	N	56.5	44.0	41.0
Schoolwide		59.0	46.5	41.5

Subgroup Growth Gap Trends over Time in Math				
PSAT/SAT Math		2017	2018	2019
Student Subgroup		MGP	MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	51.0	40.0	48.5
	N	54.0	44.0	51.0
Minority	Y	56.0	45.5	49.5
	N	53.5	43.0	51.0
IEP	Y	--	41.0	41.0
	N	54.0	44.0	51.0
EL	Y	--	30.0	--
	N	54.0	44.0	51.0
GT	Y	--	31.0	66.0
	N	54.0	44.0	50.0
Geographic District		54.0	43.0	51.0

### PSAT/SAT Math: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends Graphs



### PSAT/SAT Math: Subgroup Local Comparison Graphs



### Growth Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show the performance of student subgroups on the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing state assessment over time. PSAT/SAT combined results show non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, overall Durango 9-R outperformed the school.

Symbol	Meaning
NA	Not reported by the state.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

## Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Additional Indicators


### Graduation Rate: School Status, Subgroup Status, Gap Trends, and Local Comparison Tables

- 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?


Subgroup Graduation Gap Trends over Time						
Graduation Rate	Student Subgroup	Best Of	4-year Rate	5-year Rate	6-year Rate	7-year Rate
F/R Lunch	Y	7-year	57%	83%	88%	100%
	N	6-year	91%	92%	98%	98%
Minority	Y	5-year	73%	100%	100%	100%
	N	7-year	90%	90%	97%	98%
IEP	Y	4-year	100%	33%	100%	100%
	N	7-year	85%	94%	97%	98%
EL	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	7-year	86%	91%	97%	98%
GT	Y	5-year	89%	100%	100%	100%
	N	7-year	85%	90%	96%	98%
Schoolwide		7-year	86%	91%	97%	98%

Geographic District Graduation Gap Trends over Time						
Graduation Rate	Student Subgroup	Best Of	4-year Rate	5-year Rate	6-year Rate	7-year Rate
F/R Lunch	Y	6-year	58%	76%	79%	74%
	N	6-year	90%	91%	92%	92%
Minority	Y	7-year	69%	74%	84%	86%
	N	5-year	80%	90%	89%	86%
IEP	Y	7-year	56%	78%	78%	83%
	N	6-year	80%	87%	89%	86%
EL	Y	6-year	38%	88%	100%	33%
	N	7-year	79%	86%	87%	87%
GT	Y	4-year	100%	96%	93%	95%
	N	6-year	75%	85%	86%	84%
Geographic District		6-year	78%	86%	87%	86%

### Graduation Rate: Subgroup Gap Trends Graphs



### Graduation Rate: Subgroup Local Comparison Graphs



Graduation rates in Colorado are shown through anticipated graduation year cohort groups. 4-year represents the class of 2017-18, 5-year represents the class of 2016-17, and so on. Best Of rates are used for accountability.

### Graduation Rate Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show schoolwide graduation rates disaggregated by student subgroups for the school and geo. district. Overall, the school's best of graduation rate is the 7 year rate of 98%. The best of rate for the geo. district is the 6 year rate of 87%. The best of rate for students eligible for free or reduced price lunch is the 7 year rate of 100%. The best of rate for minority students is the 5 year rate of 100%. The best of rate for students with disabilities is the 4 year rate of 100%. The best of rate for gifted students is the 5 year rate of 100%.

Symbol	Meaning
NA	Not reported by the state.
--	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 Tables

- Are students dropping out of high school?
- How is the dropout rate changing over time?
- What is the dropout rate in comparison to the geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?


Dropout Rate		2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Student Subgroup		Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate
F/R Lunch	Y	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	4.9%	1.8%
	N	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	0.8%	1.6%
Minority	Y	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	3.5%
	N	0.0%	1.3%	1.6%	1.2%	1.2%
IEP	Y	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	3.8%	0.0%
	N	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	1.1%	1.8%
EL	Y	0.0%	--	--	--	--
	N	0.0%	1.2%	1.5%	1.3%	1.6%
GT	Y	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%
	N	0.0%	1.0%	1.6%	1.5%	1.4%
Schoolwide		0.0%	1.2%	1.5%	1.3%	1.6%

Dropout Rate		2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Student Subgroup		Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate
F/R Lunch	Y	5.1%	1.4%	2.2%	4.3%	4.2%
	N	1.9%	1.4%	0.8%	1.6%	2.7%
Minority	Y	4.9%	2.3%	1.7%	4.7%	4.8%
	N	1.9%	1.1%	1.0%	1.5%	3.1%
IEP	Y	2.4%	0.8%	1.7%	1.9%	4.7%
	N	2.8%	1.5%	1.1%	2.5%	2.9%
EL	Y	7.8%	2.0%	0.0%	1.3%	5.1%
	N	2.6%	1.4%	1.2%	2.5%	3.0%
GT	Y	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N	3.0%	1.6%	1.3%	2.5%	3.2%
Geographic District		2.7%	1.4%	1.2%	2.4%	3.1%

### Dropout Rate: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends Graphs



### Dropout Rate: Subgroup Local Comparison Graphs



### Dropout Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show dropout rates disaggregated by student group and dropout rates compared to the geographic district. From last year, FRL dropout rates decreased, minority student dropout rates increased, IEP dropout rates decreased, GT dropout rates increased, and overall student dropout rates had no change. In 2018, the following subgroups had dropout rates lower than the geo. district: FRL, minority, IEP, - additional details are available in the graphs above.

Symbol	Meaning
NA	Not reported by the state.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

## 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	2015		2016		2017		2018 <sup>^</sup>	
Category	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
2 year	53	1.9%	68	2.9%	66	3.0%	46	8.7%
4 year	53	66.0%	68	60.3%	66	51.5%	46	60.9%
CTE	53	3.8%	68	0.0%	66	4.5%	46	2.2%
Schoolwide	53	69.8%	68	63.2%	66	59.1%	46	71.7%

Matriculation rates, like graduation and dropout rates, are on a one-year lag. Therefore, 2018 represents data from the class of 2017-18, 2017 represents data from the class of 2016-17, and so on. Schoolwide matriculation rates are the only rates used for accountability.

Geo. District Matriculation Rate Trends over Time								
Matriculation	2015		2016		2017		2018 <sup>^</sup>	
Category	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
2 year	233	9.0%	246	13.0%	288	8.7%	255	7.1%
4 year	233	49.8%	246	46.3%	288	52.8%	255	54.9%
CTE	233	1.7%	246	3.7%	288	2.4%	255	1.6%
Geo. District	233	60.1%	246	61.8%	288	63.2%	255	63.1%


<sup>^</sup>CDE renormed matriculation benchmarks for the most recent school year. Therefore, benchmarks from previous school years do not look the same as benchmarks from the 2017-18 school year.

### Matriculation Rate: School Status and Local Comparison Graphs

2 Year Matriculation Rates

4 Year Matriculation Rates

CTE Matriculation Rates



### Matriculation Rates Status and Local Comparison

The graphs above show schoolwide matriculation rates compared to the matriculation rates for Durango 9-R. In 2018, school matriculation rates met state expectations and was above the geo. district. Since last year, schoolwide matriculation rates increased from 59% to 72%.

Symbol	Meaning
NA	Not reported by the state.
--	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 2015-2019 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?

Governmental Funds Financial Statement Metrics					
Metric	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Operating Margin	11.3%	3.1%	-2.4%	-4.4%	1.0%
Months of Cash on Hand	3.12	2.28	1.95	1.00	1.40
Current Ratio	2.29	10.09	6.13	7.80	10.00
Months of Unassigned Fund Balance on Hand	0.46	0.85	0.32	1.00	0.70
Positive Unassigned Fund Balance (TABOR)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES



### Enrollment

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

Enrollment					
Metric	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Funded Pupil Count (FPC) Current-Year Variance	3.8%	-5.0%	-5.5%	-7.5%	-4.1%
Change in FPC from Prior-Year	13.8%	-5.6%	-7.0%	-6.2%	61.9%

### 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	2019
Months of Cash on Hand	1.05	1.09	0.01	0.00	0.00
Current Ratio	0.26	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.20
Debt to Asset Ratio	1.02	1.03	1.04	0.00	1.00
Change in Net Position	(\$19,837)	(\$11,328)	(\$33,485)	\$7,051	\$15,356

### 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	2019
Debt to Asset Ratio	1.85	1.91	1.81	2.32	2.64
Change in Net Position	\$31,739	(\$390,509)	(\$1,683,341)	(\$2,072,763)	\$861,760
Default	NO	NO	NO	NO	No

Symbol	Meaning
NA	Not reported by the state.
--	Not reportable due to low student counts.

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

## Fiscal Years 2015-2019 Financial Results

### Financial Performance Narrative

Animas High School ended the year with sufficient reserves to satisfy the TABOR reserve requirement, an increase in net position, and reported 1 statutory violation in their Assurances for Financial Accreditation. The school's funded-pupil count came in lower than budget by 29 pupils (4 percent), and 419.8 pupils (62 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 school's governmental funds ended the year with 1.4 months of cash on hand and sufficient current assets to cover current liabilities. The school experienced a positive operating margin of 1 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.

Symbol	Meaning
NA	Not reported by the state.
--	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 2018-19 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 2018-19 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 requirements,*
- *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 2018-19 school year. CSI was not made aware of any issues relating to facilities and transportation requirements for the 2018-19 school year. CSI was not made aware of any issues relating to employee credentialing and background check requirements for the 2018-19 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 2018-19 school year. Some deadlines were missed, but none were significant enough to warrant a Notice of Concern. Many of the Organizational Submissions were completed late but were compliant, with no revisions required.

#### 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

1600 Broadway Ste. 1250 Denver, CO 80202 ▪ P: 303.866.3299 ▪ F: 303.866.2530 ▪ [www.csi.state.co.us](http://www.csi.state.co.us)