



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

Stone Creek Charter 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



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	19
English Language Proficiency	21
School Observations	22
Financial Performance	23
Organizational Performance	25

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?

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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Trend
Enrollment Over Time	330	291	284	310	327	
F/R Lunch	17.3%	13.7%	14.8%	15.2%	10.4%	
Minority	30.3%	29.9%	28.5%	33.9%	32.1%	
IEP	10.6%	12.4%	14.8%	17.4%	17.4%	
EL	17.6%	17.9%	20.4%	21.9%	18.7%	
Gifted	4.8%	5.2%	8.8%	11.0%	10.1%	
504	2.1%	4.8%	2.8%	3.2%	3.1%	

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
Academic	Performance Plan
Elementary School Rating	Improvement (Points Earned: 43.5%)
Middle School Rating	Performance with Distinction (Points Earned: 74.3%)
High School Rating	--
Financial	Financial performance does not impact the school accreditation rating
Organizational	Organizational performance does not impact the school accreditation rating
Overall CARS Rating	Performance Plan

Participation

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

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

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

Assurance	
	Rating
Accountability Participation Rate	Meets 95%

Test Participation Rates (Ratings are based on Accountability Participation Rate)						
Subject	Total Records	Valid Scores	Participation Rate	Parent Excuses	Accountability Participation Rate	Rating
English Language Arts	229	229	100.0%	0	100.0%	Meets 95%
Math	229	229	100.0%	0	100.0%	Meets 95%
Science	71	71	100.0%	0	100.0%	Meets 95%

Test Participation Rates - Disaggregated by Test						
Subject	Total Records	Valid Scores	Participation Rate	Parent Excuses	Accountability Participation Rate	Rating
CMAS English Language Arts	229	229	100.0%	0	100.0%	Meets 95%
CMAS Math	229	229	100.0%	0	100.0%	Meets 95%
CMAS Science	71	71	100.0%	0	100.0%	Meets 95%
PSAT/SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing	0	0	--	0	--	NA
PSAT/SAT Math	0	0	--	0	--	NA

English Language Arts Achievement

CMAS ELA: School Status, Trends, and Local Comparison Tables


- How are students achieving on state assessments in English Language Arts 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 ELA										
CMAS ELA	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	35	737	37	753	32	746	38	739	35	733
4	34	746	31	750	35	760	29	749	40	738
5	46	743	31	740	27	750	35	745	36	739
Elementary	115	742	99	748	94	752	102	744	111	737
6	24	753	38	752	30	748	42	747	42	747
7	28	753	23	755	35	756	36	757	36	753
8	33	759	25	757	18	747	35	755	35	753
Middle	85	755	86	754	83	751	113	753	113	751
Overall	200	748	185	751	177	752	215	749	224	744


Geographic District Achievement over Time in ELA										
CMAS ELA	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	523	731	540	725	489	733	470	730	444	735
4	437	739	523	739	545	741	470	742	474	741
5	488	740	441	738	510	747	532	743	466	748
Elementary	1,461	736	1,518	734	1,551	741	1,496	739	1,399	741
6	502	742	480	738	415	742	498	742	529	742
7	458	744	478	740	473	747	429	743	504	750
8	433	748	438	747	456	746	493	743	432	750
Middle	1,380	745	1,382	742	1,337	745	1,396	742	1,450	747
Overall	3,277	740	3,243	737	3,230	741	2,892	741	2,849	744

CMAS ELA: School Status, Trends, and Local Comparison Graphs


ELA - Schoolwide



ELA - Elementary



ELA - Middle



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. From 2015 to 2019, overall student achievement decreased by 3.9 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score decreased by 4.8 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 five years. Overall, the school performs lower than their geo. district by 1 scale score points.

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

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

English Language Arts Subgroup Achievement


CMAS ELA: Subgroup Status, Gap Trends, and Local Comparison Tables

- 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?
- 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	2019	
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	
F/R Lunch	Y	735.4	736.4	736.8	733.4	720.9
	N	750.5	753.8	754.7	751.4	746.3
Minority	Y	734.7	736.5	735.4	736.7	731.1
	N	754.1	757.4	758.3	755.1	750.3
IEP	Y	723.8	733.3	727.2	728.9	720.6
	N	750.4	753.7	756.7	753.4	749.4
EL	Y	724.0	725.4	733.6	726.9	724.1
	N	753.6	757.5	757.3	756.3	749.7
GT	Y	794.8	--	778.3	782.8	780.6
	N	743.6	747.5	747.9	742.7	737.9
Schoolwide	747.7	750.9	751.8	748.6	743.8	

CMAS ELA	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	
F/R Lunch	Y	723.7	721.5	724.5	723.9	726.5
	N	749.9	748.1	752.0	750.8	755.1
Minority	Y	727.2	724.6	727.8	728.0	730.4
	N	755.1	753.1	757.5	755.4	761.1
IEP	Y	705.0	700.3	700.7	699.6	701.9
	N	744.3	742.0	746.0	746.0	749.9
EL	Y	724.4	721.8	725.1	722.8	725.8
	N	752.0	750.0	753.4	752.8	757.8
GT	Y	777.0	775.1	778.8	777.7	784.1
	N	736.2	732.9	736.1	734.8	738.1
Geographic District	740.0	737.4	741.1	740.6	744.3	

CMAS ELA: Subgroup Gap Trends Graphs



CMAS ELA: Subgroup Local Comparison Graphs



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. CMAS results show 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, Eagle County RE 50 outperformed the school. In 2019, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: FRL, EL, GT, - additional details are available in the graphs.

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


Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

English Language Arts Growth

CMAS ELA: School Status and Trends Tables and Graphs

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



Growth over Time in ELA								
CMAS ELA	2016		2017		2018		2019	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	29	54.0	32	62.5	28	42.0	39	38.0
5	30	42.5	25	40.0	35	31.0	36	28.5
Elementary	59	52.0	57	54.0	63	37.0	75	31.0
6	38	77.0	29	66.0	40	49.5	40	61.0
7	20	59.5	34	62.0	33	52.0	34	48.5
8	25	56.0	n < 20	--	35	44.0	34	50.0
Middle	83	65.0	81	60.0	108	49.0	108	50.0
Overall	142	59.5	138	57.5	171	44.0	183	43.0



CMAS ELA: Local Comparison Tables and Graphs

-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		2019	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	497	48.0	512	61.0	450	51.5	417	59.0
5	419	47.0	485	64.0	499	51.0	443	55.0
Elementary	926	48.0	1,003	62.0	960	51.0	873	56.0
6	447	49.0	400	55.0	457	48.0	508	55.0
7	455	48.0	456	57.5	391	51.0	474	62.0
8	397	56.0	443	59.0	451	47.0	407	60.0
Middle	1,299	50.0	1,299	57.0	1,299	49.0	1,376	59.0
Overall	2,539	47.0	2,616	55.0	2,259	49.0	2,249	59.0




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 1 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 increased over time.


CMAS ELA: Levels of Growth Tables and Graphs

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

ELA Levels of Growth				
CMAS ELA	%Students			
Category	2016	2017	2018	2019
Low (below 35)	24%	29%	40%	44%
Typical (35-65)	31%	29%	31%	30%
High (above 65)	45%	42%	29%	27%



ELA At/Below 50th %ile				
CMAS ELA	%Students			
Category	2016	2017	2018	2019
At or Above 50	63%	58%	46%	43%
Below 50	37%	42%	54%	57%



Levels of Growth Narrative
 Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 44% 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 27% of students. The percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased from last year (46% to 43%). Since 2016, the percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased (63% to 43%).

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

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

English Language Arts Subgroup Growth


CMAS ELA: Subgroup Status, Gap Trends, and Local Comparison Tables

- 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?
- 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?


CMAS ELA	2016	2017	2018	2019	
Student Subgroup	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP	
F/R Lunch	Y	61.0	63.0	34.0	--
	N	59.0	56.0	48.0	43.0
Minority	Y	56.0	66.0	48.0	48.0
	N	61.0	51.0	42.5	41.5
IEP	Y	--	39.5	44.0	33.0
	N	61.0	59.0	44.5	44.5
EL	Y	54.0	67.0	45.0	53.0
	N	61.0	54.0	44.0	40.5
GT	Y	--	--	70.0	45.0
	N	59.0	59.5	44.0	42.5
Schoolwide		59.5	57.5	44.0	43.0

CMAS ELA	2016	2017	2018	2019	
Student Subgroup	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP	
F/R Lunch	Y	46.0	51.0	46.0	54.0
	N	48.0	57.0	52.0	61.0
Minority	Y	45.0	52.0	48.0	56.0
	N	50.0	57.0	51.0	61.0
IEP	Y	38.0	42.0	36.0	45.0
	N	48.0	56.0	52.0	60.0
EL	Y	45.0	52.0	47.0	56.0
	N	49.0	57.0	51.0	60.0
GT	Y	54.0	59.0	55.0	66.0
	N	47.0	54.0	48.0	57.0
Geographic District		47.0	55.0	49.0	59.0

CMAS ELA: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends Graphs



CMAS ELA: Subgroup Local Comparison Graphs



Growth Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show the performance of student subgroups on the English Language Arts state assessment over time. CMAS results show 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 2019, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: minority, IEP, EL, GT, - additional details are available in the graphs.

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

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

Mathematics Achievement

CMAS Math: School Status, Trends, and Local Comparison Tables

-How are students achieving on state assessments in Mathematics 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										
CMAS Math	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	35	734	37	753	32	746	38	730	36	726
4	35	734	31	733	36	746	29	726	40	721
5	46	728	31	743	27	736	36	727	36	727
Elementary	116	732	99	744	95	743	103	728	112	724
6	24	733	38	738	31	744	42	730	42	733
7	28	734	23	746	35	742	37	749	36	740
8	33	741	25	736	18	742	35	750	35	747
Middle	85	736	86	740	84	743	114	742	113	739
Overall	201	734	185	742	179	743	217	735	225	732


Geographic District Achievement over Time in Math										
CMAS Math	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	523	733	540	727	489	731	470	731	447	735
4	438	729	521	726	548	728	477	726	472	729
5	487	730	438	729	514	730	537	729	475	733
Elementary	1,461	731	1,512	728	1,558	730	1,509	729	1,409	732
6	503	732	480	733	422	732	506	728	535	725
7	477	736	480	733	474	733	435	731	507	735
8	439	737	451	735	467	729	498	731	434	735
Middle	1,406	735	1,398	733	1,356	731	1,414	729	1,461	731
Overall	3,259	733	3,273	730	3,276	730	2,923	729	2,870	732

CMAS Math: School Status, Trends, and Local Comparison Graphs

Math - Schoolwide

Math - Elementary

Math - Middle



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. From 2015 to 2019, overall student achievement decreased by 1.6 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score decreased by 3.5 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 five years. Overall, the school outperforms their geo. district by 0 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


CMAS Math: Subgroup Status, Gap Trends, and Local Comparison Tables

- 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?
- 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	2019	
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	
F/R Lunch	Y	719.2	725.1	730.4	728.5	711.1
	N	736.9	745.1	744.9	736.7	734.2
Minority	Y	719.4	726.2	726.8	726.9	723.5
	N	740.6	748.9	749.2	740.2	736.2
IEP	Y	715.7	730.0	720.3	715.9	712.7
	N	735.5	743.7	747.0	740.1	736.7
EL	Y	710.9	717.2	726.0	719.1	714.7
	N	739.3	748.1	747.9	741.4	737.2
GT	Y	774.1	--	772.6	770.2	769.5
	N	730.0	738.2	738.3	729.2	725.9
Schoolwide	733.5	741.8	742.7	735.4	731.9	

CMAS Math	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	
F/R Lunch	Y	719.5	715.4	715.4	712.8	715.3
	N	740.6	740.1	740.0	739.5	741.7
Minority	Y	721.8	718.0	718.3	716.1	718.5
	N	745.3	745.2	745.0	745.0	747.9
IEP	Y	707.5	700.2	700.2	696.4	698.7
	N	735.8	733.9	733.8	733.6	736.1
EL	Y	720.3	715.8	716.0	712.1	714.7
	N	742.1	741.8	741.3	741.4	744.3
GT	Y	767.4	766.3	767.7	766.1	770.0
	N	729.3	726.0	725.4	723.7	725.8
Geographic District	732.7	730.1	730.1	729.2	731.7	

CMAS Math: Subgroup Gap Trends Graphs



CMAS Math: Subgroup Local Comparison Graphs



Achievement Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show the performance of student subgroups on the Math state assessment over time. CMAS results show 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 2019, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: minority, IEP, - additional details are available in the graphs.

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

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet


Mathematics Growth

CMAS Math: School Status and Trends Tables and Graphs

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

Growth over Time in Math

CMAS Math	2016		2017		2018		2019	
	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
Grade/Level								
4	29	37.0	32	46.5	28	39.0	39	33.0
5	31	59.0	25	54.0	35	13.0	36	29.0
Elementary	60	52.0	57	53.0	63	23.0	75	33.0
6	38	77.0	28	64.0	40	55.5	40	55.5
7	20	80.5	34	75.0	33	72.0	34	58.5
8	25	66.0	n < 20	--	35	50.0	34	47.0
Middle	83	71.0	80	68.5	108	65.0	108	53.5
Overall	143	66.0	137	63.0	171	46.0	183	44.0





CMAS Math: Local Comparison Tables and Graphs

-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		2019	
	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
Grade/Level								
4	498	41.0	516	52.5	457	45.0	448	49.0
5	418	45.0	492	51.0	506	47.0	452	56.0
Elementary	926	44.0	1,013	51.0	974	46.5	913	52.0
6	447	55.0	400	64.0	460	49.0	512	48.5
7	453	55.0	449	53.0	389	51.0	479	63.0
8	330	56.0	298	56.0	317	42.0	397	56.0
Middle	1,230	55.0	1,147	57.0	1,166	48.0	1,375	56.0
Overall	2,376	49.0	2,393	53.0	2,140	47.0	2,288	54.0




Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs show schoolwide growth on the Math state assessment. From 2016 to 2019, overall student growth decreased. Since last year, student growth decreased by 2 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 increased over time.


CMAS Math: Levels of Growth Tables and Graphs

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

CMAS Math	%Students			
	2016	2017	2018	2019
Category				
Low (below 35)	21%	24%	39%	43%
Typical (35-65)	29%	27%	25%	27%
High (above 65)	50%	49%	36%	30%



CMAS Math	%Students			
	2016	2017	2018	2019
Category				
At or Above 50	66%	64%	47%	44%
Below 50	34%	36%	53%	56%



Levels of Growth Narrative

Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 43% 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 30% of students. The percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased from last year (47% to 44%). Since 2016, the percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased (66% to 44%).

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

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

Mathematics Subgroup Growth


CMAS Math: Subgroup Status, Gap Trends, and Local Comparison Tables

- 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?
- 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?


CMAS Math	2016	2017	2018	2019	
Student Subgroup	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP	
F/R Lunch	Y	66.0	63.0	38.0	--
	N	65.0	64.5	46.0	44.0
Minority	Y	56.5	67.0	51.0	54.0
	N	70.0	63.0	42.0	37.5
IEP	Y	--	49.5	23.0	42.0
	N	64.0	65.0	50.5	45.0
EL	Y	41.0	68.0	48.0	51.0
	N	70.0	62.5	44.0	42.0
GT	Y	--	--	64.0	42.0
	N	64.0	63.5	42.0	45.0
Schoolwide	66.0	63.0	46.0	44.0	

CMAS Math	2016	2017	2018	2019	
Student Subgroup	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP	
F/R Lunch	Y	42.0	52.0	44.0	51.0
	N	53.0	53.0	49.0	57.0
Minority	Y	44.0	52.0	45.0	52.0
	N	55.0	54.0	51.0	56.0
IEP	Y	41.0	49.0	39.0	43.0
	N	50.0	53.0	48.0	56.0
EL	Y	44.0	52.0	45.0	51.0
	N	53.0	54.0	49.0	56.0
GT	Y	53.0	60.0	51.0	60.0
	N	49.0	52.0	47.0	53.0
Geographic District	49.0	53.0	47.0	54.0	

CMAS Math: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends Graphs



CMAS Math: Subgroup Local Comparison Graphs



Growth Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show the performance of student subgroups on the English Language Arts state assessment over time. CMAS results show minority students outperformed their non-minority peers, general education students outperformed their IEP peers, EL students outperformed their non-EL peers, non-GT students outperformed their GT peers, overall, Eagle County RE 50 outperformed the school. In 2019, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: IEP, GT, - additional details are available in the graphs.

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

Exceeds	Approaching
Meets	Does Not Meet

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)	45	646	31	641	27	609	37	649	36	618
Middle (8th)	33	633	25	625	18	635	35	649	35	617
High (11th)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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)	484	600	437	596	507	600	536	590	472	604
Middle (8th)	458	625	440	615	465	598	491	575	435	589
High (11th)	--	--	353	604	305	597	325	571	420	603

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. 5th grade mean scale score has decreased by 31.4 scale score points. 8th grade mean scale score has decreased by 32.5 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 2019, the school performed greater than the geo. district in 5th grade, greater than the geo. district in 8th 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	644	673	619	659	650
Minority	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	658	666	661	667	643
IEP	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	657	641	612	675	645
EL	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	658	669	650	677	640
GT	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	646	611	595	632	603

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	540	531	542	526	535
	N	639	648	645	636	643
Minority	Y	548	540	551	539	545
	N	662	663	662	654	672
IEP	Y	514	497	470	465	497
	N	613	607	618	611	619
EL	Y	536	531	543	525	532
	N	647	647	650	647	650
GT	Y	715	719	717	714	728
	N	587	574	580	572	584

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	638	630	--	646	633
Minority	Y	--	--	--	--	564
	N	648	--	--	649	666
IEP	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	640	638	--	655	625
EL	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	653	642	648	655	667
GT	Y	--	--	--	--	--
	N	614	617	621	643	585

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	570	564	541	521	526
	N	654	644	635	599	622
Minority	Y	584	562	548	534	528
	N	676	673	665	626	657
IEP	Y	528	517	450	439	441
	N	635	626	613	591	606
EL	Y	572	547	539	486	496
	N	666	665	649	616	637
GT	Y	735	740	733	713	728
	N	614	601	579	554	563

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	--	--	--	--	--
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	--	572	573	531	543
	N	--	625	609	588	621
Minority	Y	--	577	575	535	556
	N	--	650	637	625	657
IEP	Y	--	512	513	509	493
	N	--	613	606	576	611
EL	Y	--	578	575	498	506
	N	--	631	620	604	635
GT	Y	--	711	708	725	717
	N	--	587	586	562	591

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	--	--	--	--	26	27.5	28	66.5	78.6%
Middle	--	--	--	--	n < 20	--	n < 20	--	--
High	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Overall	--	--	--	--	41	35.0	47	68.0	74.5%

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	--	--	--	--	889	45.0	817	46.0	69.6%
Middle	--	--	--	--	261	51.0	296	38.0	33.2%
High	--	--	--	--	252	34.5	235	51.0	33.1%
Overall	--	--	--	--	1,402	45.0	1348	45.0	55.3%


^^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

The graphs above show schoolwide growth on the ACCESS for ELLs state assessment. In 2019, overall student growth exceeded state expectations and was above the geo. district. 75% of students were reported as being on track to reach English language proficiency.

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	12.0%	3.8%	3.8%	6.8%	8.7%
Months of Cash on Hand	2.65	2.92	3.43	3.70	4.80
Current Ratio	4.17	5.03	8.20	7.80	9.00
Months of Unassigned Fund Balance on Hand	1.77	2.12	2.56	3.30	4.00
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	2.7%	-13.4%	-8.1%	0.2%	-1.0%
Change in FPC from Prior-Year	11.3%	-11.4%	-1.7%	8.7%	4.1%

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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Current Ratio	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Debt to Asset Ratio	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Change in Net Position	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0	\$0

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	3.36	2.78	1.99	2.68	2.92
Change in Net Position	\$153,863	(\$243,228)	(\$1,485,796)	(\$1,573,790)	\$793,855
Default	N/A	N/A	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

Stone Creek Charter School ended the year with sufficient reserves to satisfy the TABOR reserve requirement, an increase in net position, and reported no statutory violations in their Assurances for Financial Accreditation. The school's funded-pupil count came in lower than budget by 3.3 pupils (1 percent), and 12.9 pupils (4 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 4.8 months of cash on hand and sufficient current assets to cover current liabilities. The school experienced a positive operating margin of 9 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.

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. The Organizational Submissions were mostly completed ontime and were generally compliant, with minor revisions needed. 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

1600 Broadway Ste. 1250 Denver, CO 80202 ▪ P: 303.866.3299 ▪ F: 303.866.2530 ▪ www.csi.state.co.us