



**Colorado Charter School Institute**  
Annual Review of Schools (CARS) Report  
2021-2022

**Colorado Early Colleges - Fort Collins**



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)



## 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
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	16
P/SAT Evidence-Based Reading & Writing	20
P/SAT Math	24
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	28
School Observations (if applicable)	31
Financial Performance	32
Organizational Performance	34

### CSI Annual Review of Schools (CARS) Summary

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


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

### CSI Performance Framework

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

### CARS Accreditation Ratings

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

A majority of the metrics within this report will be collected by CSI on a yearly basis. 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:** Andi Denton

**Organizational Performance:** Kim Caplan & Matt Hudson - State/Federal Programs  
Stephanie Aragon & Anastasia Hawkins - Compliance Monitoring

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).

**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 2016 to 2022. 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
--	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.

- 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?

## Colorado Early Colleges - Fort Collins Overview

Year Opened/Transferred: 2012-2013

Grades Served: 6-12

School Model: Early College



Town/City: Fort Collins

District of Residence: Poudre R-1

Original Application Type: Replication

Enrollment and Student Demographics over Time					
October Student Counts	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Enrollment Over Time	1117	1355	1319	1345	1249
F/R Lunch	17.6%	22.1%	20.8%	19.6%	15.5%
Minority	18.5%	21.2%	22.4%	22.0%	24.8%
IEP	1.9%	3.5%	3.4%	3.3%	4.1%
EL	1.9%	2.1%	1.7%	2.1%	3.0%
Gifted	5.4%	4.9%	8.6%	7.3%	5.0%
504	5.6%	8.6%	8.6%	8.3%	10.0%

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 70.1% Points Earned

**Performance:** Between 53% to 70.1% 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: Low Participation
Elementary School Rating	--
Middle School Rating	Performance (Points Earned: 72.3%)
High School Rating	Performance (Points Earned: 80.7%)
<b>Financial</b>	Financial performance does not impact the school accreditation rating
<b>Organizational</b>	Organizational performance does not impact the school accreditation
<b>Overall CARS Rating</b>	<b>Performance with Distinction</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	812	579	71.3%	219	97.6%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
Math	812	581	71.6%	220	98.1%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<b>N/A</b>

Test Participation Rates - Disaggregated by Test						
Subject	Total Records	Valid Scores	Participation Rate	Parent Excuses	Accountability Participation Rate	Rating
CMAS English Language Arts	178	123	69.1%	52	97.6%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
CMAS Math	178	125	70.2%	53	100.0%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
CMAS Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<b>N/A</b>
PSAT/SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing	634	456	71.9%	167	97.6%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
PSAT/SAT Math	634	456	71.9%	167	97.6%	<b>Meets 95%</b>

## 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	2016		2017		2018		2019		2022	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elementary	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	43	739	67	749	74	742	75	747	33	744
7	53	745	61	760	89	758	95	743	41	748
8	45	752	69	757	82	743	112	761	44	744
Middle	141	746	197	755	245	748	282	751	118	746
Overall	213	748	300	759	245	748	282	751	118	746


Geographic District Achievement over Time in ELA										
CMAS ELA	2016		2017		2018		2019		2022	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	2,161	748	2,157	751	2,188	753	2,080	753	1,971	749
4	2,225	755	2,160	756	2,203	760	2,217	761	2,018	753
5	2,076	754	2,252	756	2,198	758	2,229	761	2,006	758
Elementary	6,462	752	6,569	754	6,591	757	6,526	759	5,998	753
6	2,059	751	2,009	750	2,179	753	2,173	754	1,866	753
7	1,877	754	1,925	751	1,957	755	2,105	755	1,819	752
8	1,692	754	1,697	754	1,849	754	1,801	756	1,613	756
Middle	5,628	753	5,631	752	5,983	754	6,079	755	5,295	753
Overall	13,201	752	13,269	753	12,574	755	12,605	757	11,293	753

### 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 ELA state assessment over time disaggregated by grade and class level. From 2016 to 2022, overall student achievement decreased by 2.7 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score decreased by 5.9 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Poudre R-1) for the past five years. Overall, the school performs lower than their geo. district by 7.8 scale score points.

## 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?


Subgroup Achievement Gap Trends over Time in ELA						
CMAS ELA	2016	2017	2018	2019	2022	
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	
F/R Lunch	Y	n<16	n<16	746.8	743.8	737.5
	N	748.2	759.1	748.3	754.8	748.2
Minority	Y	747.1	751.5	738.9	741.2	738.7
	N	748.4	761.1	751.0	755.4	748.7
IEP	Y	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	749.7	760.4	749.8	752.2	748.6
EL	Y	n<16	n<16	733.1	732.7	720.3
	N	748.2	759.4	749.3	753.5	749.4
GT	Y	n<16	n<16	774.4	775.9	n<16
	N	747.9	759.0	743.6	749.3	742.8
Schoolwide	748	759	748	751	746	

Geographic District Gap Trends over Time in ELA						
CMAS ELA	2016	2017	2018	2019	2022	
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	
F/R Lunch	Y	731.3	730.5	731.8	733.5	725.8
	N	762.0	761.7	765.0	765.8	761.3
Minority	Y	737.9	739.0	740.5	742.1	738.6
	N	757.2	757.8	760.7	761.8	758.6
IEP	Y	699.3	700.5	703.4	705.0	701.2
	N	756.7	757.5	759.9	760.8	757.5
EL	Y	729.9	729.3	726.2	728.3	721.9
	N	754.6	755.5	758.3	759.5	756.2
GT	Y	786.9	788.4	792.5	791.9	790.7
	N	745.0	746.3	748.2	749.6	746.7
Geographic District	752	753	755	757	753	

### 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 ELA state assessment over time. CMAS results show the following (if applicable): non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, overall, Poudre R-1 outperformed the school. In 2022, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: EL, - additional details are available in the graphs.

## 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	2017		2018		2019		2022	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elementary	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	50	39.5	54	52.0	59	57.0	25	48.0
7	49	73.0	72	58.5	74	45.0	--	--
8	51	79.0	60	32.0	87	56.0	34	55.5
Middle	150	65.5	186	48.0	220	54.0	59	51.0
Overall	218	72.0	186	48.0	220	54.0	59	51.0



### 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	2017		2018		2019		2022	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	2,036	59.0	2,062	59.0	2,083	61.0	1,657	55.0
5	2,110	53.0	2,065	53.0	2,131	55.0	--	--
Elementary	4,146	56.0	4,129	56.0	4,214	58.0	1,657	55.0
6	1,884	42.5	2,045	48.0	2,042	46.0	1,557	47.0
7	1,785	41.0	1,780	48.0	1,965	45.0	--	--
8	1,534	45.0	1,647	50.0	1,665	47.0	1,318	55.0
Middle	5,203	43.0	5,472	49.0	5,672	46.0	2,875	50.0
Overall	10,277	49.0	9,601	52.0	9,886	51.0	4,532	52.0




**Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative**  
 The graphs show schoolwide growth on the ELA state assessment. From 2017 to 2022, overall student growth decreased. Since last year, student growth decreased by 3 percentile points. In 2022, overall student growth met 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?

CMAS ELA	ELA Levels of Growth			
	%Students			
Category	2017	2018	2019	2022
Low (below 35)	21%	35%	29%	37%
Typical (35-65)	22%	39%	32%	22%
High (above 65)	57%	26%	40%	42%



CMAS ELA	ELA At/Below 50th %ile			
	%Students			
Category	2017	2018	2019	2022
At or Above 50	69%	48%	54%	53%
Below 50	31%	52%	46%	49%



**Levels of Growth Narrative**  
 Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 37% 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 42% of students. The percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased from last year (54% to 53%). Since 2017, the percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased (69% to 53%).

## 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	2017	2018	2019	2022
Student Subgroup	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	n<20	47.0	50.5
	N	72.0	49.0	55.5
Minority	Y	68.5	57.0	46.5
	N	72.5	42.0	56.0
IEP	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	72.0	49.0	53.0
EL	Y	n<20	52.0	58.0
	N	72.0	46.0	52.0
GT	Y	n<20	54.0	55.0
	N	72.0	46.5	53.0
Schoolwide	72.0	48.0	54.0	51.0

CMAS ELA	2017	2018	2019	2022
Student Subgroup	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	44.0	44.0	46.0
	N	51.0	55.0	53.0
Minority	Y	46.0	49.0	48.0
	N	50.0	53.0	52.0
IEP	Y	37.0	40.0	42.0
	N	50.0	53.0	52.0
EL	Y	49.0	49.0	50.0
	N	49.0	52.0	51.0
GT	Y	58.0	63.0	57.0
	N	47.0	49.0	49.0
Geographic District	49.0	52.0	51.0	52.0

### 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 growth of student subgroups on the ELA state assessment over time. CMAS results show the following (if applicable): minority students outperformed their non-minority peers, overall, Poudre R-1 outperformed the school. In 2022, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: - additional details are available in the graphs.

## 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	2016		2017		2018		2019		2022	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elementary	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	43	730	67	737	77	737	77	739	33	728
7	53	730	61	737	89	739	95	733	42	738
8	45	725	69	735	83	734	115	743	46	738
Middle	141	728	197	736	249	737	287	739	121	735
Overall	214	734	304	744	249	737	287	739	121	735

Geographic District Achievement over Time in Math										
CMAS Math	2016		2017		2018		2019		2022	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	2,159	747	2,160	755	2,193	753	2,089	753	1,978	749
4	2,227	746	2,165	750	2,204	750	2,219	750	2,029	746
5	2,075	747	2,251	749	2,213	752	2,234	754	2,010	751
Elementary	6,461	747	6,576	751	6,612	752	6,542	752	6,020	749
6	2,072	744	2,026	744	2,196	743	2,180	747	1,857	741
7	1,892	743	1,937	743	1,971	745	2,113	746	1,807	742
8	1,692	740	1,706	741	1,859	743	1,811	754	1,596	751
Middle	5,656	743	5,669	743	6,024	744	6,104	749	5,257	744
Overall	13,230	744	13,313	747	12,636	748	12,646	751	11,277	747

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



#### Achievement Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show schoolwide performance on the Math state assessment over time disaggregated by grade and class level. From 2016 to 2022, overall student achievement increased by 1.1 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score decreased by 3.4 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district ( ) for the past five years. Overall, the school performs lower than their geo. district by 11.5 scale score points.

## 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?


Subgroup Achievement Gap Trends over Time in Math						
CMAS Math		2016	2017	2018	2019	2022
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	n<16	n<16	730.6	730.1	722.0
	N	734.0	744.2	738.8	742.5	739.6
Minority	Y	724.6	736.4	724.3	731.0	726.8
	N	736.0	746.1	741.0	741.5	739.0
IEP	Y	n<16	n<16	716.4	708.0	n<16
	N	735.5	745.2	738.2	740.6	738.5
EL	Y	n<16	n<16	721.5	725.8	713.5
	N	734.0	744.6	738.3	740.0	738.6
GT	Y	n<16	n<16	769.1	766.7	780.5
	N	733.7	744.0	731.6	736.3	728.2
Schoolwide		734	744	737	739	735

Geographic District Gap Trends over Time in Math						
CMAS Math		2016	2017	2018	2019	2022
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	725.7	726.5	727.2	729.0	720.6
	N	752.9	754.7	756.2	759.0	754.1
Minority	Y	731.5	733.9	734.8	737.4	733.3
	N	748.7	751.2	752.4	755.2	751.4
IEP	Y	700.3	701.8	702.3	706.7	702.8
	N	747.9	750.6	751.7	754.1	750.1
EL	Y	726.5	727.3	725.1	728.2	720.1
	N	746.1	748.9	750.1	752.8	749.1
GT	Y	778.1	781.8	783.3	788.7	785.3
	N	737.2	740.3	741.0	742.9	739.8
Geographic District		744	747	748	751	747

### 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 the following (if applicable): non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, GT students outperformed their non-GT peers, overall, Poudre R-1 outperformed the school. In 2022, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: minority, EL, GT, - additional details are available in the graphs.

## 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	2017		2018		2019		2022	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elementary	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	50	43.0	54	50.0	62	53.0	--	--
7	49	64.0	73	63.0	74	42.0	30	63.5
8	51	51.0	61	47.0	89	45.0	--	--
Middle	150	52.0	188	55.5	225	45.0	30	63.5
Overall	200	59.0	188	55.5	225	45.0	30	63.5



### 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	2017		2018		2019		2022	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	2,059	66.0	2,076	58.0	2,111	61.0	--	--
5	2,110	61.0	2,074	57.0	2,129	55.0	1,656	53.0
Elementary	4,169	64.0	4,152	58.0	4,240	58.0	1,656	53.0
6	1,892	48.0	2,050	45.0	2,045	54.0	--	--
7	1,801	49.0	1,487	54.0	1,978	54.0	1,526	47.0
8	1,537	52.0	1,310	54.0	1,385	57.0	--	--
Middle	5,230	50.0	4,847	50.0	5,408	55.0	1,526	47.0
Overall	9,924	55.0	8,999	54.0	9,648	56.0	3,182	50.0




**Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative**  
 The graphs show schoolwide growth on the Math state assessment. From 2017 to 2022, overall student growth increased. Since last year, student growth increased by 18.5 percentile points. In 2022, overall student growth met state expectations and was above the geo. district. Overall student growth for the geo. district has decreased over time.


### CMAS Math: Levels of Growth Tables and Graphs

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

Math Levels of Growth				
CMAS Math	%Students			
Category	2017	2018	2019	2022
Low (below 35)	26%	29%	37%	30%
Typical (35-65)	31%	32%	30%	27%
High (above 65)	44%	39%	33%	47%



Math At/Below 50th %ile				
CMAS Math	%Students			
Category	2017	2018	2019	2022
At or Above 50	59%	57%	47%	60%
Below 50	41%	43%	53%	43%



**Levels of Growth Narrative**  
 Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 30% 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 47% of students. The percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has increased from last year (47% to 60%). Since 2017, the percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has increased (59% to 60%).

## 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?


Subgroup Growth Gap Trends over Time in Math					
CMAS Math		2017	2018	2019	2022
Student Subgroup		MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	n<20	47.0	42.0	n<20
	N	59.0	59.5	47.5	67.5
Minority	Y	56.5	47.0	43.0	n<20
	N	59.5	60.0	46.0	64.0
IEP	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	59.0	55.5	44.0	71.0
EL	Y	n<20	43.0	52.0	n<20
	N	59.0	57.0	44.5	67.5
GT	Y	n<20	54.5	34.0	n<20
	N	59.0	56.5	47.0	63.5
Schoolwide		59.0	55.5	45.0	63.5

Subgroup Growth Gap Trends over Time in Math					
CMAS Math		2017	2018	2019	2022
Student Subgroup		MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	49.0	49.0	51.0	47.0
	N	58.0	56.0	58.0	51.0
Minority	Y	51.0	51.0	54.0	49.0
	N	57.0	55.0	57.0	51.0
IEP	Y	45.0	45.0	45.0	40.0
	N	56.0	54.0	57.0	51.0
EL	Y	51.0	51.0	55.0	52.0
	N	56.0	54.0	56.0	50.0
GT	Y	64.0	61.0	62.0	61.0
	N	54.0	52.0	55.0	48.0
Geographic District		55.0	54.0	56.0	50.0

### 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 growth of student subgroups on the Math state assessment over time. CMAS results show the following (if applicable): overall, the school outperformed Poudre R-1. In 2022, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: - additional details are available in the graphs.

## 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	2018		2019		2020		2021		2022		
	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	% On Track
Elementary	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Middle	--	--	--	--	n < 20	--	n < 20	--	n < 20	--	--
High	--	--	--	--	n < 20	--	n < 20	--	n < 20	--	--
Overall	--	--	--	--	n < 20	--	n < 20	--	n < 20	--	--

Geographic District Growth over Time on ACCESS											
ACCESS	2018		2019		2020		2021		2022		
	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	% On Track
Elementary	782	57.0	720	53.0	654	55.0	583	52.0	601	50.0	59.7%
Middle	174	48.5	134	62.5	101	55.0	78	50.0	103	58.0	23.1%
High	145	56.0	94	68.0	88	56.0	85	53.0	103	64.0	28.9%
Overall	1,101	56.0	948	56.0	843	55.0	746	52.0	807	53.0	52.2%

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


**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

Not applicable.

## Evidence-Based Reading and Writing Achievement

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

-How are students achieving on state assessments in Evidence-Based Reading & Writing 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	2016		2017		2018		2019 <sup>^</sup>		2022	
	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
PSAT (9th)*	--	--	--	--	151	485	183	502	129	488
PSAT (10th)*	--	--	106	515	154	549	167	525	146	532
PSAT (9th&10th)	--	--	--	--	305	517	350	513	275	511
SAT (11th)	--	--	161	576	155	573	203	574	168	570
Overall	--	--	267	552	460	536	553	535	443	534

Geographic District Achievement over Time in EBRW										
PSAT/SAT EBRW	2016		2017		2018		2019 <sup>^</sup>		2022	
	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
PSAT (9th)*	--	--	--	--	17	365	1,965	496	1,751	490
PSAT (10th)*	--	--	1,812	517	1,793	516	1,844	513	1,833	516
PSAT (9th&10th)	--	--	--	--	3,719	502	3,809	504	3,584	503
SAT (11th)	--	--	1,816	555	1,814	554	1,773	547	1,808	541
Overall	--	--	3,628	536	5,533	519	5,582	518	5,392	516

\*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 EBRW state assessment over time disaggregated by test and grade level. From 2017 to 2022, overall student achievement decreased by 18.1 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score decreased by 1.8 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Poudre R-1) for the past five years. Overall, the school outperforms their geo. district by 17.4 scale score points.












## 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 Evidence-Based Reading & Writing 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		2017	2018	2019	2022
Student Subgroup		MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	n<16	502	503	494
	N	552	544	544	540
Minority	Y	526	504	523	497
	N	556	543	539	544
IEP	Y	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	554	538	538	535
EL	Y	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	552	537	537	538
GT	Y	n<16	574	578	587
	N	552	535	532	529
Schoolwide		552	536	535	534

Geographic District Gap Trends over Time in EBRW					
PSAT/SAT EBRW		2017	2018	2019	2022
Student Subgroup		MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	468	450	447	451
	N	553	539	536	529
Minority	Y	497	480	480	480
	N	548	532	530	527
IEP	Y	392	370	379	395
	N	544	528	525	522
EL	Y	470	405	395	386
	N	542	525	523	520
GT	Y	641	616	610	604
	N	516	499	495	492
Geographic District		536	519	518	516



#### Achievement Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show the performance of student subgroups on the EBRW state assessment over time. PSAT/SAT results show the following (if applicable): non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, GT students outperformed their non-GT peers, overall, the school outperformed District. In 2022, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: FRL, minority, - additional details are available in the graphs.

## 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		2022	
	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
CMAS 8 to PSAT 9 <sup>^</sup>	--	--	110	66.0	--	--	n < 20	--
PSAT 9 to PSAT 10	--	--	106	55.5	132	51.5	111	52.0
PSAT 10 to SAT 11	132	58.0	121	68.0	153	51.0	136	54.0
Overall	132	58	337	66.0	285	51.0	247	53.0

<sup>^</sup>To align with the state, your CARS report does not include 2019 CMAS to PSAT EBRW growth.

Geographic District Growth over Time in EBRW								
PSAT/SAT EBRW	2017		2018		2019		2022	
	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
CMAS 8 to PSAT 9 <sup>^</sup>	--	--	1,458	55.0	--	--	n < 20	--
PSAT 9 to PSAT 10	--	--	978	58.0	1,673	52.0	1,531	48.0
PSAT 10 to SAT 11	1,620	54.0	1,608	57.0	1,635	57.0	1,565	51.0
Overall	1,620	54.0	4,051	56.0	3,308	54.0	3,096	50.0

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




**Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative**  
 The graphs above show schoolwide growth on the EBRW state assessment. From 2017 to 2022, overall student growth decreased. Since last year, student growth increased by 2 percentile points. In 2022, overall student growth met state expectations. Overall student growth 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			
	2017	2018	2019	2022
Low (below 35)	29%	26%	35%	32%
Typical (35-65)	34%	23%	25%	33%
High (above 65)	37%	50%	40%	35%



**Levels of Growth Narrative**  
 Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 32% 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 35% of students. The percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has increased from last year (52% to 55%). Since 2017, the percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased (57% to 52%).

EBRW At/Below 50th %ile				
PSAT/SAT EBRW	%Students			
	2017	2018	2019	2022
At or Above 50	57%	61%	52%	55%
Below 50	43%	39%	48%	45%

## 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 Evidence-Based Reading & Writing 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 EBRW					
PSAT/SAT		2017	2018	2019	2022
Student		MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	n<20	52.0	53.5	43.5
	N	58.0	66.0	51.0	54.0
Minority	Y	54.0	43.0	46.0	51.0
	N	59.0	67.0	52.0	54.0
IEP	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	57.0	66.0	51.0	52.0
EL	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	58.0	66.0	51.0	54.0
GT	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	58.0	66.0	52.0	52.0
Schoolwide		58.0	66.0	51.0	53.0

Subgroup Growth Gap Trends over Time in EBRW					
PSAT/SAT EBRW		2017	2018	2019	2022
Student Subgroup		MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	41.0	47.0	47.0	45.0
	N	55.0	59.0	56.0	51.0
Minority	Y	47.0	51.0	52.0	47.0
	N	55.0	58.0	55.0	50.0
IEP	Y	29.0	44.0	36.0	43.0
	N	55.0	57.0	55.0	50.0
EL	Y	47.0	50.0	49.0	36.0
	N	54.0	57.0	55.0	50.0
GT	Y	62.0	68.0	60.0	56.0
	N	53.0	53.0	53.0	48.0
Geographic District		54.0	56.0	54.0	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 growth of student subgroups on the EBRW state assessment over time. PSAT/SAT results show the following (if applicable): non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, overall, the school outperformed Poudre R-1. In 2022, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: minority, - additional details are available in the graphs.

**Math 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	2016		2017		2018		2019 <sup>^</sup>		2022	
	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
PSAT (9th) <sup>*</sup>	--	--	--	--	151	470	183	481	129	479
PSAT (10th) <sup>*</sup>	--	--	106	497	154	532	167	494	147	498
PSAT (9th&10th)	--	--	--	--	305	501	350	487	276	489
SAT (11th)	--	--	161	554	155	542	203	560	169	540
Overall	--	--	267	531	460	515	553	514	445	509

Geographic District Achievement over Time in Math										
PSAT/SAT Math	2016		2017		2018		2019 <sup>^</sup>		2022	
	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
PSAT (9th) <sup>*</sup>	--	--	--	--	17	344	1,966	483	1,751	476
PSAT (10th) <sup>*</sup>	--	--	1,812	508	1,795	507	1,844	501	1,834	491
PSAT (9th&10th)	--	--	--	--	3,723	493	3,810	492	3,585	484
SAT (11th)	--	--	1,816	544	1,814	541	1,773	543	1,809	521
Overall	--	--	3,628	526	5,537	509	5,583	508	5,394	496

\*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**



**Achievement Status and Local Comparison Narrative**

The graphs above show schoolwide performance on the Math state assessment over time disaggregated by test and grade level. From 2017 to 2022, overall student achievement decreased by 22.9 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score decreased by 5.6 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Poudre R-1) for the past five years. Overall, the school outperforms their geo. district by 12.1 scale score points.


## Math 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?

PSAT/SAT Math	2017	2018	2019	2022	
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	
F/R Lunch	Y	n<16	489	483	471
	N	531	521	522	515
Minority	Y	510	497	507	489
	N	535	519	516	514
IEP	Y	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	532	516	516	509
EL	Y	n<16	n<16	n<16	414
	N	531	515	515	512
GT	Y	n<16	573	576	560
	N	531	513	509	504
Schoolwide	531	515	514	509	

PSAT/SAT Math	2017	2018	2019	2022	
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	
F/R Lunch	Y	457	438	439	431
	N	543	529	526	509
Minority	Y	491	474	476	465
	N	536	520	518	506
IEP	Y	373	350	372	385
	N	534	518	515	501
EL	Y	480	412	402	408
	N	530	514	512	499
GT	Y	634	614	610	594
	N	505	487	482	470
Geographic District	526	509	508	496	



#### Achievement Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show the performance of student subgroups on the Math state assessment over time. PSAT/SAT results show the following (if applicable): non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, GT students outperformed their non-GT peers, overall, the school outperformed District. In 2022, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: FRL, minority, EL, - additional details are available in the graphs.

## Math 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		2022	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
CMAS 8 to PSAT 9^	--	--	112	62.0	127	58.0	71	68.0
PSAT 9 to PSAT 10	--	--	107	78.0	132	58.5	111	52.0
PSAT 10 to SAT 11	132	61.0	121	61.0	153	60.0	136	52.5
<b>Overall</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>65.0</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>58.0</b>

Geographic District Growth over Time in Math								
PSAT/SAT Math	2017		2018		2019		2022	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
CMAS 8 to PSAT 9^	--	--	1,469	44.0	1,268	47.0	1,258	50.0
PSAT 9 to PSAT 10	--	--	658	50.0	1,673	60.0	1,531	53.0
PSAT 10 to SAT 11	1,620	54.0	1,608	49.0	1,635	52.0	1,565	47.0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>1,620</b>	<b>54.0</b>	<b>3,741</b>	<b>47.0</b>	<b>4,576</b>	<b>54.0</b>	<b>4,354</b>	<b>50.0</b>

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



#### Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative


The graphs above show schoolwide growth on the Math state assessment. From 2017 to 2022, overall student growth decreased. Since last year, student growth decreased by 0 percentile points. In 2022, overall student growth met state expectations. Overall student growth was above 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	2022
Low (below 35)	26%	22%	23%	31%
Typical (35-65)	26%	29%	32%	28%
High (above 65)	48%	49%	45%	42%

Math At/Below 50th %ile				
PSAT/SAT Math	%Students			
Category	2017	2018	2019	2022
At or Above 50	60%	65%	61%	58%
Below 50	40%	35%	39%	42%



#### Levels of Growth Narrative

Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 31% 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 42% of students. The percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased from last year (61% to 58%). Since 2017, the percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased (60% to 61%).

## Math 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?


PSAT/SAT Math	2017	2018	2019	2022	
Student Subgroup	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP	
F/R Lunch	Y	n<20	65.0	53.5	60.0
	N	61.0	65.0	60.5	58.0
Minority	Y	54.0	72.5	57.0	57.0
	N	64.0	65.0	59.0	58.0
IEP	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	61.0	65.0	58.5	57.0
EL	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	61.0	65.0	58.0	58.0
GT	Y	n<20	n<20	53.0	54.0
	N	61.0	66.0	58.0	58.0
Schoolwide	61.0	65.0	58.0	58.0	

PSAT/SAT Math	2017	2018	2019	2022	
Student Subgroup	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP	
F/R Lunch	Y	39.0	44.0	46.0	43.0
	N	56.0	48.0	55.0	52.0
Minority	Y	45.0	47.0	53.0	48.0
	N	55.0	48.0	54.0	51.0
IEP	Y	23.5	37.5	40.0	34.0
	N	54.0	48.0	54.0	51.0
EL	Y	42.0	41.0	52.0	42.5
	N	54.0	48.0	54.0	51.0
GT	Y	58.0	49.0	56.0	52.0
	N	53.0	47.0	53.0	50.0
Geographic District	54.0	47.0	54.0	50.0	

### 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 growth of student subgroups on the Math state assessment over time. PSAT/SAT results show the following (if applicable): FRL students outperformed their non-FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, non-GT students outperformed their GT peers, overall, the school outperformed Poudre R-1. In 2022, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: FRL, minority, GT, - additional details are available in the graphs.

**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						
Student Subgroup	Best Of	4-year Rate	5-year Rate	6-year Rate	7-year Rate	Graduation Rate
						Rate
F/R Lunch	Y	6-year	57%	81%	96%	92%
	N	7-year	61%	81%	96%	98%
Minority	Y	6-year	61%	79%	100%	93%
	N	7-year	60%	81%	95%	97%
IEP	Y	6-year	33%	80%	100%	83%
	N	7-year	61%	81%	96%	97%
EL	Y	6-year	50%	50%	100%	100%
	N	7-year	60%	81%	96%	97%
GT	Y	6-year	86%	86%	100%	100%
	N	7-year	58%	81%	96%	96%
Schoolwide		7-year	60%	81%	96%	97%

Geographic District Graduation Gap Trends over Time						
Student Subgroup	Best Of	4-year Rate	5-year Rate	6-year Rate	7-year Rate	Graduation Rate
						Rate
F/R Lunch	Y	7-year	67%	68%	75%	75%
	N	6-year	93%	94%	95%	94%
Minority	Y	6-year	75%	76%	83%	79%
	N	7-year	88%	89%	90%	90%
IEP	Y	7-year	47%	54%	66%	70%
	N	6-year	88%	88%	90%	88%
EL	Y	7-year	61%	69%	74%	76%
	N	6-year	85%	86%	89%	88%
GT	Y	4-year	97%	96%	96%	96%
	N	6-year	82%	83%	86%	85%
Geographic District		6-year	84%	86%	88%	87%

**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 2020-21. 5-year represents the class of 2019-20, 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 97%. The best of rate for the geo. district is the 6 year rate of 88%. The best of rate for students eligible for free or reduced price lunch is the 6 year rate of 96%. The best of rate for minority students is the 6 year rate of 100%. The best of rate for students with disabilities is the 6 year rate of 100%. The best of rate for English Learners is the 6 year rate of 100%. The best of rate for gifted students is the 6 year rate of 100%.

**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?


Subgroup Dropout Gap Trends over Time						
Dropout Rate		2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Student Subgroup		Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate
F/R Lunch	Y	0.8%	0.5%	0.4%	1.1%	0.8%
	N	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.6%	0.4%
Minority	Y	1.4%	0.5%	0.0%	1.3%	0.7%
	N	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%
IEP	Y	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N	0.7%	0.4%	0.2%	0.7%	0.5%
EL	Y	--	--	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N	0.7%	0.3%	0.2%	0.7%	0.5%
GT	Y	--	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N	0.7%	0.4%	0.2%	0.8%	0.5%
Schoolwide		0.7%	0.4%	0.2%	0.7%	0.5%

Geographic District Subgroup Dropout Gap Trends over Time						
Dropout Rate		2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Student Subgroup		Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate
F/R Lunch	Y	3.6%	2.4%	2.4%	1.6%	1.5%
	N	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%
Minority	Y	2.5%	1.8%	1.9%	1.3%	1.4%
	N	0.9%	1.0%	0.6%	0.5%	0.4%
IEP	Y	2.4%	2.3%	1.5%	1.2%	0.8%
	N	1.2%	0.9%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%
EL	Y	3.3%	3.4%	1.6%	1.5%	4.3%
	N	1.3%	0.9%	1.0%	0.6%	0.6%
GT	Y	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
	N	1.5%	1.2%	1.2%	0.8%	0.8%
Geographic District		1.3%	1.0%	1.0%	0.7%	0.7%

**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 decreased, IEP dropout rates had no change, EL dropout rates had no change, gifted student (GT) dropout rates had no change, and overall student dropout rates had no change. In 2021, the following subgroups had dropout rates lower than the geo. district: FRL, minority, IEP, EL, GT, - additional details are available in the graphs above.

**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	2018		^2019		2020		2021		2022	
Category	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
2 year	179	53.6%	197	55.8%	209	56.5%	239	53.6%	247	53.0%
4 year	179	45.8%	197	48.7%	209	42.6%	239	38.1%	247	41.7%
CTE	179	11.2%	197	6.1%	209	9.1%	239	17.6%	247	11.3%
Schoolwide	179	78.2%	197	75.1%	209	75.1%	239	77.0%	247	72.5%

Geo. District Matriculation Rate Trends over Time										
Matriculation	2018		^2019		^^2020		2021		2022	
Category	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
2 year	1,862	11.2%	2,025	12.1%	--	--	1,925	11.0%	2,083	10.0%
4 year	1,862	44.9%	2,025	46.4%	--	--	1,925	37.8%	2,083	38.0%
CTE	1,862	11.0%	2,025	13.0%	--	--	1,925	14.6%	2,083	15.7%
Geo. District	1,862	62.8%	2,025	66.8%	--	--	1,925	58.8%	2,083	57.9%


Matriculation rates, like graduation and dropout rates, are on a one-year lag. Therefore, data for the current reporting year (2021-22) represent outcomes for the class of 2020-21 and data for the 2020-21 reporting year represent outcomes for the class of 2019-20, and so on. Schoolwide matriculation rates are the only rates used for accountability.

^ CDE renormed matriculation benchmarks in the 2018-19 school year.  
 ^^ Please note that Geo. District Matriculation data were not provided to CSI for the 2019-20 school year.

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


2 Year Matriculation Rates

■ 2 year    ◆ Geo. District




4 Year Matriculation Rates

■ 4 year    ◆ Geo. District



CTE Matriculation Rates

■ CTE    ◆ Geo. District



**Matriculation Rates Status and Local Comparison**

The graphs above show schoolwide matriculation rates compared to the matriculation rates for Poudre R-1. In 2022, school matriculation rates met state expectations and were above the geo. district. Since last year, schoolwide matriculation rates decreased from 77% to 73%.

**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 2018-2022 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Operating Margin	0.5%	1.8%	1.0%	2.0%	2.0%
Months of Cash on Hand	1.10	1.80	3.50	2.60	3.08
Current Ratio	3.10	2.10	2.80	6.60	5.23
Months of Unassigned Fund Balance on Hand	2.30	1.10	0.90	2.40	2.43
Positive Unassigned Fund Balance (TABOR)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES



### Enrollment

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

Enrollment					
Metric	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Funded Pupil Count (FPC) Current-Year Variance	-0.8%	1.3%	-4.9%	-2.5%	-6.0%
Change in FPC from Prior-Year	17.5%	17.1%	-2.5%	-1.0%	-6.3%

### 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Months of Cash on Hand	--	17.30	0.00	0.00	0.00
Current Ratio	--	4.00	1.80	1.80	--
Debt to Asset Ratio	--	1.00	1.10	1.10	--
Change in Net Position	--	(\$1,161,205)	(\$419,223)	(\$402,240)	\$1,574,458

### 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Debt to Asset Ratio	1.58	1.29	1.46	1.42	0.19
Change in Net Position	(\$4,488,088)	(\$1,594,582)	(\$1,243,006)	\$2,501,257	\$271,442
Default	No	No	No	No	No

**Fiscal Years 2018-2022 Financial Results**

**Financial Performance Narrative**

Colorado Early Colleges Fort Collins 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 -76.5 or -6.02 percent, and -80.5 students or -6.32 percent lower than the prior year. The school's governmental funds ended the year with 3.08 months of cash on hand and sufficient current assets to cover liabilities. The school experienced a positive operating margin of 1.98

**School Observations**

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

## Organizational Performance 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 in the 2021-22 school year.

### Diversity, Equity of Access, and Inclusion

-Is the school protecting the rights of all students?

*Protecting student rights pursuant to:*

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

#### CSI Review

The school received a Notice of Concern in the 2021-22 school year for failure to maintain sufficient qualified and licensed special education personnel needed to provide special education to qualifying students. With supports from CSI, the Notice was appropriately remedied in a timely manner.

### 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 in the 2021-22 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 in the 2021-22 school year.

### School Operations and Environment

-Is the school complying with health and safety requirements?

*Includes:*

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

-Is the school complying with facilities and transportation requirements?

*Includes:*

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

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

*Includes:*

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

#### CSI Review

CSI was not made aware of any issues relating to health and safety requirements in the 2021-22 school year. CSI was not made aware of any issues relating to facilities and transportation requirements in the 2021-22 school year. CSI was not made aware of any issues relating to employee credentialing and background check requirements in the 2021-22 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 in the 2021-22 school year.

## Organizational Performance Metrics

### Organizational Performance Additional Narrative

Overall, the school exhibited moderate operational performance in the 2021-22 school year. Organizational Submissions were submitted in a timely manner and feedback was appropriately addressed. The school received one Notice of Concern for failure to maintain sufficient qualified and licensed special education personnel needed to provide special education to qualifying students.

#### 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)