




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

**The Pinnacle 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](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?

**The Pinnacle Charter School Overview**

Year Opened/Transferred: 2006-2007

Grades Served: K-12

School Model: Core Knowledge


Town/City: Federal Heights

District of Residence: Adams 12 Five Star Schools


Original Application Type: Transfer

Enrollment and Student Demographics over Time					
October Student Counts	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Enrollment Over Time	1991	2040	2018	2107	2112
F/R Lunch	76.7%	69.2%	77.3%	73.8%	67.4%
Minority	84.7%	85.5%	86.7%	86.9%	88.9%
IEP	6.6%	7.7%	8.7%	8.3%	8.5%
EL	43.1%	41.9%	44.5%	44.7%	44.1%
Gifted	4.3%	3.8%	3.8%	2.7%	1.9%
504	1.4%	1.6%	1.8%	1.8%	1.8%


Enrollment over Time




Minority Students




English Learners




Lunch Eligibility




Gifted Students



Students with Disabilities



Students with a 504



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

\*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>	Improvement Plan: Low Participation
Elementary School Rating	Improvement (Points Earned: 46.4%)
Middle School Rating	Priority Improvement (Points Earned: 38.9%)
High School Rating	Improvement (Points Earned: 49.9%)
<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>Improvement</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>Does Not Meet 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	1,503	1,352	90.0%	54	93.3%	<b>Does Not Meet 95%</b>
Math	1,503	1,340	89.2%	54	92.5%	<b>Does Not Meet 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	1,036	988	95.4%	36	98.8%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
CMAS Math	1,036	976	94.2%	36	97.6%	<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	467	364	77.9%	18	81.1%	<b>Does Not Meet 95%</b>
PSAT/SAT Math	467	364	77.9%	18	81.1%	<b>Does Not Meet 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	159	717	166	722	149	719	163	725	143	706
4	163	724	164	733	162	728	163	728	167	714
5	169	718	163	727	166	730	166	733	157	726
Elementary	491	720	493	728	477	726	492	729	467	716
6	191	726	164	732	163	723	171	727	171	725
7	174	724	165	728	161	728	165	727	175	716
8	178	725	169	729	162	725	157	728	169	721
Middle	543	725	498	730	486	726	493	727	515	721
Overall	1,175	723	1,130	729	963	726	985	728	982	718




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	2,964	732	2,806	738	2,790	737	2,576	737	2,283	737
4	2,914	741	2,852	743	2,839	746	2,822	744	2,333	738
5	2,900	741	2,864	744	2,894	747	2,867	749	2,356	745
Elementary	8,778	738	8,522	742	8,523	743	8,265	744	6,972	740
6	2,846	736	2,804	741	2,774	743	2,816	742	2,122	739
7	2,827	737	2,804	744	2,782	747	2,731	747	2,104	740
8	2,773	739	2,760	742	2,792	744	2,685	747	1,924	739
Middle	8,494	738	8,368	742	8,348	745	8,232	745	6,150	739
Overall	19,724	738	19,509	741	16,871	744	16,497	744	13,122	740

### 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 5 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score decreased by 9.7 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Adams 12 Five Star Schools) for the past five years. Overall, the school performs lower than their geo. district by 21.5 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	MSS	
F/R Lunch	Y	n<16	726.4	723.2	725.9	717.0	
	N		723.4	736.2	735.0	732.6	721.1
Minority	Y		721.5	727.6	724.7	726.4	717.3
	N		730.5	737.4	732.1	738.3	725.2
IEP	Y		689.9	694.0	694.2	698.5	690.6
	N		725.5	732.3	728.9	731.3	721.4
EL	Y		720.0	726.1	721.6	722.8	711.2
	N		727.3	733.8	731.2	734.6	727.9
GT	Y		758.9	767.2	765.8	771.8	765.4
	N		721.1	727.0	723.6	725.9	717.3
Schoolwide		723	729	726	728	718	

Geographic District Gap Trends over Time in ELA							
CMAS ELA		2016	2017	2018	2019	2022	
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	
F/R Lunch	Y		722.3	724.9	726.2	727.0	720.6
	N		747.3	751.0	756.4	757.1	751.2
Minority	Y		728.6	731.1	733.8	735.0	730.8
	N		746.0	750.1	754.3	754.6	750.7
IEP	Y		700.1	700.5	701.7	703.6	699.4
	N		741.7	745.5	748.6	749.0	744.5
EL	Y		725.6	727.5	726.0	726.1	718.9
	N		741.5	745.1	749.3	749.9	745.7
GT	Y		776.4	778.6	783.5	781.6	775.6
	N		732.5	735.6	738.1	738.3	732.2
Geographic District		738	741	744	744	740	

### 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, general education students outperformed their IEP peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, GT students outperformed their non-GT peers, overall, Adams 12 Five Star Schools outperformed the school. In 2022, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: FRL, minority, IEP, EL, GT, - 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	157	62.0	157	36.0	162	45.0	91	45.0
5	163	49.0	163	41.0	163	46.0	--	--
Elementary	320	55.0	320	38.5	325	45.0	91	45.0
6	163	67.0	161	45.0	170	37.5	117	41.0
7	162	49.0	160	48.0	164	58.5	--	--
8	169	59.0	159	40.0	156	47.0	121	33.0
Middle	494	58.0	480	44.0	490	49.0	238	38.5
Overall	952	59.0	800	42.0	815	48.0	329	40.0



### 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	2,732	56.5	2,709	52.0	2,733	51.0	1,627	53.0
5	2,761	52.0	2,778	54.0	2,795	52.0	--	--
Elementary	5,493	54.0	5,487	53.0	5,528	51.0	1,627	53.0
6	2,675	50.0	2,667	51.0	2,736	46.0	1,459	45.0
7	2,681	56.0	2,647	57.0	2,627	54.0	--	--
8	2,623	57.0	2,653	52.0	2,589	52.0	1,091	49.0
Middle	7,979	54.0	7,967	53.0	7,952	51.0	2,550	47.0
Overall	15,917	53.0	13,454	53.0	13,480	51.0	4,177	49.0




**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 8 percentile points. In 2022, overall student growth was approaching state expectations and was below the geo. district. Overall student growth for the geo. district has decreased over time.


### CMAS 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)	26%	42%	38%	44%
Typical (35-65)	31%	32%	31%	32%
High (above 65)	43%	26%	32%	24%



CMAS ELA	ELA At/Below 50th %ile			
	%Students			
Category	2017	2018	2019	2022
At or Above 50	60%	41%	48%	40%
Below 50	40%	59%	52%	60%



**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 24% of students. The percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased from last year (48% to 40%). Since 2017, the percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased (60% to 40%).

## 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	61.0	43.0	45.5	36.0
	N	58.0	38.0	49.0	49.0
Minority	Y	59.0	42.0	47.0	38.0
	N	58.5	40.0	51.0	59.0
IEP	Y	39.0	38.0	43.0	43.0
	N	61.0	42.0	48.0	41.0
EL	Y	59.0	43.0	47.0	36.0
	N	59.0	38.0	48.5	48.0
GT	Y	62.5	47.0	56.0	n<20
	N	59.0	42.0	46.0	39.0
Schoolwide		59.0	42.0	48.0	40.0

CMAS ELA	2017	2018	2019	2022	
Student Subgroup	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP	
F/R Lunch	Y	50.0	48.0	48.0	44.0
	N	54.0	57.0	53.0	52.0
Minority	Y	51.0	51.0	50.0	48.0
	N	55.0	56.0	52.0	50.0
IEP	Y	42.0	44.0	44.0	32.0
	N	54.0	54.0	52.0	51.0
EL	Y	53.0	51.0	51.0	48.0
	N	53.0	54.0	51.0	50.0
GT	Y	58.0	64.0	56.0	58.0
	N	52.0	52.0	50.0	47.0
Geographic District		53.0	53.0	51.0	49.0

### 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): non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, IEP students outperformed their non-gen. ed. peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, overall, Adams 12 Five Star Schools outperformed the school. In 2022, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: FRL, minority, EL, - 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	162	722	165	719	149	726	162	726	143	714
4	153	717	164	728	164	722	165	721	163	711
5	167	719	163	717	167	726	169	722	157	723
Elementary	482	720	492	721	480	725	496	723	463	716
6	182	730	164	723	164	724	172	723	170	706
7	170	729	165	727	163	727	167	729	174	714
8	174	720	170	723	164	724	163	727	168	710
Middle	526	726	499	724	491	725	502	726	512	710
Overall	1,149	723	1,130	723	971	725	998	725	975	713

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	2,955	732	2,811	733	2,793	732	2,590	736	2,288	733
4	2,916	734	2,864	735	2,842	734	2,834	733	2,339	729
5	2,895	735	2,875	735	2,906	737	2,877	738	2,348	737
Elementary	8,766	734	8,550	735	8,541	735	8,301	736	6,975	733
6	2,848	736	2,816	737	2,809	736	2,843	734	2,118	728
7	2,826	734	2,827	735	2,786	735	2,760	737	2,106	729
8	2,772	735	2,785	737	2,814	738	2,693	739	1,929	734
Middle	8,494	735	8,428	736	8,409	736	8,296	737	6,153	730
Overall	19,701	735	19,593	735	16,950	735	16,597	736	13,128	732

**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 decreased by 10.7 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score decreased by 11.9 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district ( ) for the past five years. Overall, the school performs lower than their geo. district by 19.1 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	720.1	722.1	722.5	711.3	
	N		723.5	729.9	734.2	729.5	716.3
Minority	Y		721.9	721.2	723.0	723.1	711.1
	N		729.7	732.0	734.5	734.9	724.9
IEP	Y		701.0	697.7	700.5	701.2	693.7
	N		724.4	725.2	727.0	727.3	714.8
EL	Y		720.8	720.3	720.0	720.2	707.2
	N		726.6	726.9	730.8	730.3	720.3
GT	Y		760.0	764.7	768.4	775.6	756.9
	N		721.1	720.6	722.3	722.3	711.8
Schoolwide		723	723	725	725	713	

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		719.0	719.0	718.0	719.2	712.9
	N		744.7	746.2	747.8	748.7	743.1
Minority	Y		725.5	725.8	725.7	726.8	722.8
	N		743.4	744.9	745.5	746.4	742.8
IEP	Y		698.8	698.1	698.2	701.6	699.7
	N		738.7	739.8	739.5	740.1	735.5
EL	Y		724.1	723.5	719.8	720.4	713.7
	N		738.2	739.4	740.2	741.0	737.0
GT	Y		777.6	778.1	778.0	776.4	771.2
	N		729.4	729.8	729.4	729.6	723.6
Geographic District		735	735	735	736	732	

### 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, general education students outperformed their IEP peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, GT students outperformed their non-GT peers, overall, Adams 12 Five Star Schools outperformed the school. In 2022, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: FRL, minority, IEP, 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	163	64.0	158	49.0	162	43.5	--	--
5	158	43.0	166	45.0	165	47.0	91	56.0
Elementary	321	52.0	324	48.0	327	45.0	91	56.0
6	161	69.0	161	62.0	172	50.5	--	--
7	155	47.0	161	53.0	167	66.0	125	46.0
8	165	52.0	160	47.5	161	56.0	--	--
Middle	481	55.0	482	55.0	500	58.5	125	46.0
Overall	932	54.0	806	52.0	827	53.0	216	50.0



### 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	2017		2018		2019		2022	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	2,743	63.0	2,717	59.0	2,732	57.0	--	--
5	2,759	50.0	2,794	56.0	2,798	57.0	1,610	57.0
Elementary	5,502	56.0	5,511	58.0	5,530	57.0	1,610	57.0
6	2,668	62.0	2,686	58.0	2,744	57.0	--	--
7	2,681	50.0	2,630	48.0	2,658	50.0	1,265	50.0
8	2,625	58.0	2,650	51.0	2,569	55.0	--	--
Middle	7,974	56.0	7,966	52.0	7,971	54.0	1,265	50.0
Overall	15,872	54.0	13,477	54.0	13,501	55.0	2,875	54.0




**Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative**  
 The graphs show schoolwide growth on the Math 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 is flat.


### 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)	30%	30%	33%	35%
Typical (35-65)	31%	34%	28%	32%
High (above 65)	38%	36%	38%	33%



Math At/Below 50th %ile				
CMAS Math	%Students			
Category	2017	2018	2019	2022
At or Above 50	55%	52%	53%	50%
Below 50	45%	48%	47%	50%



**Levels of Growth Narrative**  
 Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 35% 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 33% of students. The percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased from last year (53% to 50%). Since 2017, the percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased (55% to 50%).

## 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	55.0	51.0	51.0	49.5
	N	53.0	53.0	57.0	50.5
Minority	Y	53.0	49.0	52.0	50.0
	N	59.0	58.0	56.5	54.0
IEP	Y	40.5	49.5	49.0	33.0
	N	55.0	52.0	53.0	51.0
EL	Y	53.0	51.0	51.0	51.0
	N	55.0	53.5	55.0	43.0
GT	Y	59.5	63.0	65.0	n<20
	N	54.0	51.0	52.0	50.0
Schoolwide		54.0	52.0	53.0	50.0

Subgroup Growth Gap Trends over Time in Math					
CMAS Math		2017	2018	2019	2022
Student Subgroup		MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	50.0	48.0	52.0	48.0
	N	57.0	59.0	57.0	57.0
Minority	Y	52.0	51.0	54.0	52.0
	N	57.0	58.0	56.0	56.0
IEP	Y	44.0	44.0	46.5	41.0
	N	55.0	56.0	56.0	55.5
EL	Y	52.0	52.0	56.0	49.5
	N	55.0	55.0	55.0	55.0
GT	Y	61.0	65.0	61.0	59.0
	N	53.0	53.0	54.0	53.0
Geographic District		54.0	54.0	55.0	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 growth 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, general education students outperformed their IEP peers, EL students outperformed their non-EL peers, overall, Adams 12 Five Star Schools outperformed the school. In 2022, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: minority, IEP, - 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		
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	% On Track
Elementary	--	--	--	--	297	57.0	321	37.0	345	41.0	53.3%
Middle	--	--	--	--	120	42.5	153	54.0	144	51.0	14.0%
High	--	--	--	--	60	47.0	88	68.0	89	51.0	32.1%
Overall	--	--	--	--	477	52.0	562	45.0	578	47.0	42.0%

Geographic District Growth over Time on ACCESS											
ACCESS	2018		2019		2020		2021		2022		
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	% On Track
Elementary	2186	54.0	2222	53.0	2145	50.0	1868	50.0	1709	52.0	59.0%
Middle	825	47.0	833	55.0	705	56.0	535	55.0	450	59.0	24.9%
High	777	58.0	837	55.0	695	60.0	509	51.0	452	56.0	25.9%
Overall	3,788	53.0	3892	54.0	3545	53.0	2912	51.0	2611	54.0	49.4%

^^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

The graphs above show schoolwide growth on the ACCESS for ELLs state assessment. In 2022, overall student growth was approaching state expectations and was below the geo. district. Additionally, 42% of students were reported as being on track to reach English language proficiency.

## 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)*	--	--	--	--	146	416	144	428	126	407
PSAT (10th)*	--	--	116	447	133	447	133	426	124	419
PSAT (9th&10th)	--	--	--	--	279	431	277	427	250	413
SAT (11th)	--	--	121	499	104	473	124	474	112	440
Overall	--	--	237	474	383	442	401	442	362	421

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)*	--	--	--	--	2,820	449	2,724	452	2,379	454
PSAT (10th)*	--	--	2,535	470	2,700	473	2,722	467	2,376	484
PSAT (9th&10th)	--	--	--	--	5,520	461	5,446	460	4,755	469
SAT (11th)	--	--	2,373	501	2,454	504	2,635	493	2,365	500
Overall	--	--	4,908	485	7,974	474	8,081	471	7,120	479

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


<sup>^</sup>CDE renamed 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 52.1 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score decreased by 20.2 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Adams 12 Five Star Schools) for the past five years. Overall, the school performs lower than their geo. district by 57.8 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	455	432	434	417
	N	507	467	455	428
Minority	Y	470	437	437	419
	N	494	470	466	451
IEP	Y	n<16	378	342	363
	N	477	446	448	425
EL	Y	472	412	399	386
	N	475	468	468	450
GT	Y	636	532	538	n<16
	N	459	436	434	417
Schoolwide		474	442	442	421

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	445	429	424	422
	N	498	493	491	504
Minority	Y	455	444	441	450
	N	513	504	502	515
IEP	Y	388	376	372	379
	N	494	483	479	487
EL	Y	447	403	394	386
	N	497	490	488	496
GT	Y	602	595	591	592
	N	470	459	454	456
Geographic District		485	474	471	479



#### 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, general education students outperformed their IEP peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, overall, District outperformed the school. In 2022, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: FRL, minority, IEP, EL, - 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 Grade/Level	2017		2018		2019		2022	
	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
CMAS 8 to PSAT 9 <sup>^</sup>	--	--	144	51.0	--	--	n < 20	--
PSAT 9 to PSAT 10	--	--	129	52.0	132	37.0	90	41.5
PSAT 10 to SAT 11	119	54.0	99	54.0	123	50.0	63	43.0
Overall	119	54	372	52.0	255	43.0	153	42.0

<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 Grade/Level	2017		2018		2019		2022	
	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
CMAS 8 to PSAT 9 <sup>^</sup>	--	--	2,573	52.0	--	--	n < 20	--
PSAT 9 to PSAT 10	--	--	2,381	52.0	2,622	47.0	1,977	52.0
PSAT 10 to SAT 11	2,223	47.0	2,298	48.0	2,532	45.0	2,002	48.0
Overall	2,223	47.0	7,252	50.0	5,154	47.0	3,979	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 decreased by 1 percentile points. In 2022, overall student growth was approaching state expectations. Overall student growth was below the geo. district. Overall student growth for the geo. district has increased 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 Category	%Students			
	2017	2018	2019	2022
Low (below 35)	34%	31%	43%	39%
Typical (35-65)	29%	34%	33%	40%
High (above 65)	37%	35%	25%	21%

EBRW At/Below 50th %ile				
PSAT/SAT EBRW Category	%Students			
	2017	2018	2019	2022
At or Above 50	53%	52%	45%	41%
Below 50	47%	48%	55%	59%



#### Levels of Growth Narrative

Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 39% of students with growth scores (students in fourth through eighth grades) while students with high growth rates, categorized as students with a MGP above 65, account for 21% of students. The percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased from last year (45% to 41%). Since 2017, the percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased (53% to 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?


PSAT/SAT		2017	2018	2019	2022
Student	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP
F/R	Y	48.0	50.0	44.5	42.0
Lunch	N	60.0	56.0	37.0	41.5
Minority	Y	53.5	50.0	43.0	41.5
	N	n<20	63.0	33.0	n<20
IEP	Y	n<20	50.0	n<20	n<20
	N	54.0	52.0	44.5	42.0
EL	Y	53.0	48.5	42.0	36.5
	N	55.0	56.0	46.0	43.0
GT	Y	n<20	60.0	56.5	n<20
	N	54.0	51.5	42.0	41.5
Schoolwide		54.0	52.0	43.0	42.0

PSAT/SAT EBRW		2017	2018	2019	2022
Student Subgroup	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP
F/R	Y	39.5	45.0	42.0	44.0
Lunch	N	49.0	53.0	50.0	52.0
Minority	Y	43.0	44.0	42.0	47.0
	N	53.0	57.0	51.0	54.0
IEP	Y	33.0	46.0	36.0	38.0
	N	47.5	51.0	48.0	51.0
EL	Y	45.0	43.0	37.0	38.0
	N	48.0	53.0	50.0	52.0
GT	Y	56.0	70.0	57.0	61.0
	N	46.0	48.0	45.0	49.0
Geographic District		47.0	50.0	47.0	50.0

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



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



### Growth Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show the growth of student subgroups on the EBRW state assessment over time. PSAT/SAT results show the following (if applicable): FRL students outperformed their non-FRL peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, overall, Adams 12 Five Star Schools outperformed the school. In 2022, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: FRL, minority, EL, - 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>	--	--	--	--	146	421	144	415	126	384
PSAT (10th) <sup>*</sup>	--	--	116	438	133	434	133	421	124	407
PSAT (9th&10th)	--	--	--	--	279	427	277	418	250	395
SAT (11th)	--	--	121	482	104	465	124	465	112	435
Overall	--	--	237	461	383	437	401	432	362	407

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>	--	--	--	--	2,827	450	2,731	456	2,394	446
PSAT (10th) <sup>*</sup>	--	--	2,535	468	2,713	462	2,722	463	2,385	464
PSAT (9th&10th)	--	--	--	--	5,540	456	5,453	460	4,779	455
SAT (11th)	--	--	2,373	501	2,454	495	2,635	490	2,370	488
Overall	--	--	4,908	484	7,994	468	8,088	469	7,149	466

<sup>\*</sup>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 53.5 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score decreased by 25 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Adams 12 Five Star Schools) for the past five years. Overall, the school performs lower than their geo. district by 58.6 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	444	428	423	403
	N	491	461	451	414
Minority	Y	457	432	426	406
	N	484	461	464	425
IEP	Y	n<16	363	338	360
	N	466	442	439	410
EL	Y	458	407	398	383
	N	465	463	454	427
GT	Y	616	547	522	n<16
	N	447	430	425	403
Schoolwide		461	437	432	407

PSAT/SAT Math		2017	2018	2019	2022
Student Subgroup		MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	441	420	421	409
	N	498	488	491	490
Minority	Y	455	438	441	439
	N	511	497	499	499
IEP	Y	382	355	364	367
	N	493	478	478	474
EL	Y	450	400	396	384
	N	495	483	486	481
GT	Y	607	595	594	582
	N	469	453	452	443
Geographic District		484	468	469	466



**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, general education students outperformed their IEP peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, overall, District outperformed the school. In 2022, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: FRL, minority, IEP, 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^	--	--	144	44.0	140	46.0	87	41.0
PSAT 9 to PSAT 10	--	--	128	45.5	132	35.0	90	41.5
PSAT 10 to SAT 11	119	52.0	99	54.0	123	50.0	63	39.0
Overall	119	52	371	46.0	395	45.0	240	40.0

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^	--	--	2,573	52.0	2,512	55.0	1,176	57.0
PSAT 9 to PSAT 10	--	--	2,353	56.0	2,622	55.0	1,977	48.0
PSAT 10 to SAT 11	2,223	49.0	2,298	48.0	2,532	50.0	2,002	51.0
Overall	2,223	49.0	7,224	52.0	7,666	54.0	5,155	52.0

### 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 5 percentile points. In 2022, overall student growth was approaching state expectations. Overall student growth was below the geo. district. Overall student growth for the geo. district has increased 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)	31%	37%	40%	39%
Typical (35-65)	34%	29%	31%	38%
High (above 65)	35%	34%	29%	23%

Math At/Below 50th %ile				
PSAT/SAT Math	%Students			
Category	2017	2018	2019	2022
At or Above 50	55%	48%	43%	40%
Below 50	45%	52%	57%	60%



#### Levels of Growth Narrative

Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 39% of students with growth scores (students in fourth through eighth grades) while students with high growth rates, categorized as students with a MGP above 65, account for 23% of students. The percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased from last year (43% to 40%). Since 2017, the percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased (55% to 43%).

## 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	50.0	46.0	44.0	39.0
	N	57.5	47.0	47.0	46.0
Minority	Y	53.0	45.5	43.0	40.0
	N	n<20	55.0	50.0	41.0
IEP	Y	n<20	20.0	36.5	n<20
	N	54.0	48.0	46.0	41.0
EL	Y	50.0	39.0	44.0	37.5
	N	54.0	56.0	45.5	46.0
GT	Y	n<20	71.0	47.0	n<20
	N	52.0	46.0	44.0	40.0
Schoolwide	52.0	46.0	45.0	40.0	

PSAT/SAT Math	2017	2018	2019	2022	
Student Subgroup	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP	
F/R Lunch	Y	39.0	47.0	48.0	42.0
	N	53.0	54.0	56.0	55.0
Minority	Y	45.0	48.0	50.0	47.0
	N	54.0	55.0	57.0	55.0
IEP	Y	31.0	41.0	48.0	35.0
	N	50.0	53.0	54.0	53.0
EL	Y	44.0	45.0	45.0	37.0
	N	50.0	54.0	56.0	54.0
GT	Y	61.0	60.0	57.0	61.0
	N	46.0	51.0	53.0	49.0
Geographic District	49.0	52.0	54.0	52.0	

### 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): non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, overall, Adams 12 Five Star Schools outperformed the school. In 2022, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: FRL, minority, - 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	5-year	6-year	7-year	
		Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate	
F/R Lunch	Y	7-year	95%	96%	95%	99%
	N	4-year	100%	97%	100%	94%
Minority	Y	6-year	96%	97%	97%	97%
	N	7-year	96%	95%	94%	100%
IEP	Y	5-year	80%	100%	83%	100%
	N	6-year	97%	96%	97%	97%
EL	Y	6-year	93%	95%	98%	97%
	N	4-year	97%	97%	96%	97%
GT	Y	4-year	100%	100%	100%	100%
	N	7-year	95%	96%	96%	97%
Schoolwide		7-year	96%	96%	97%	97%

Geographic District Graduation Gap Trends over Time						
Student Subgroup	Best Of	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year	
		Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate	
F/R Lunch	Y	6-year	75%	81%	84%	84%
	N	7-year	91%	93%	94%	95%
Minority	Y	7-year	79%	84%	87%	87%
	N	7-year	90%	93%	92%	93%
IEP	Y	7-year	63%	71%	77%	81%
	N	7-year	86%	90%	91%	91%
EL	Y	7-year	71%	78%	80%	83%
	N	7-year	87%	91%	92%	92%
GT	Y	7-year	97%	97%	98%	98%
	N	7-year	82%	87%	88%	89%
Geographic District		7-year	84%	88%	89%	90%

**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 7 year rate of 90%. The best of rate for students eligible for free or reduced price lunch is the 7 year rate of 99%. The best of rate for minority students is the 6 year rate of 97%. The best of rate for students with disabilities is the 5 year rate of 100%. The best of rate for English Learners is the 6 year rate of 98%. The best of rate for gifted students is the 4 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	0.3%	1.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.3%
	N	1.5%	0.6%	0.0%	0.3%	0.6%
Minority	Y	0.8%	1.0%	0.4%	0.1%	0.2%
	N	1.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
IEP	Y	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N	0.8%	1.0%	0.4%	0.1%	0.4%
EL	Y	1.5%	1.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%
	N	0.5%	1.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.6%
GT	Y	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N	0.9%	1.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.4%
Schoolwide		0.5%	1.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.4%

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	2.2%	2.0%	1.9%	1.9%	2.6%
	N	1.8%	1.5%	2.1%	2.0%	2.3%
Minority	Y	2.4%	2.0%	3.0%	2.6%	3.3%
	N	1.4%	1.4%	0.9%	1.2%	1.3%
IEP	Y	2.7%	2.4%	2.9%	2.3%	2.8%
	N	1.8%	1.6%	2.0%	1.9%	2.4%
EL	Y	2.6%	1.6%	3.5%	4.0%	6.0%
	N	1.8%	1.7%	1.8%	1.6%	1.8%
GT	Y	0.2%	0.4%	0.1%	0.5%	0.6%
	N	2.1%	1.8%	2.3%	2.1%	2.7%
Geographic District		1.9%	1.7%	--	2.0%	2.4%

### 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 increased, minority student dropout rates increased, 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 Category	2018		^2019		2020		2021		2022	
	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
2 year	102	17.6%	120	26.7%	100	16.0%	117	11.1%	129	10.1%
4 year	102	44.1%	120	32.5%	100	32.0%	117	41.9%	129	29.5%
CTE	102	2.9%	120	7.5%	100	10.0%	117	8.5%	129	22.5%
Schoolwide	102	64.7%	120	65.0%	100	57.0%	117	60.7%	129	50.4%

Geo. District Matriculation Rate Trends over Time										
Matriculation Category	2018		^2019		^^2020		2021		2022	
	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
2 year	2,492	14.4%	2,487	14.0%	--	--	2,772	9.7%	2,581	10.2%
4 year	2,492	34.0%	2,487	36.1%	--	--	2,772	32.6%	2,581	34.5%
CTE	2,492	7.8%	2,487	10.8%	--	--	2,772	16.1%	2,581	17.8%
Geo. District	2,492	53.9%	2,487	56.5%	--	--	2,772	53.0%	2,581	56.3%

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 Adams 12 Five Star Schools. In 2022, school matriculation rates and were below the geo. district. Since last year, schoolwide matriculation rates decreased from 61% to 50%.

**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	3.7%	4.8%	-6.8%	6.7%	1.3%
Months of Cash on Hand	4.80	5.10	3.50	5.10	4.20
Current Ratio	7.40	7.00	4.90	8.40	0.90
Months of Unassigned Fund Balance on Hand	4.00	4.30	2.80	4.60	3.55
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	-0.4%	2.7%	0.4%	5.3%	-1.8%
Change in FPC from Prior-Year	-0.4%	2.4%	2.1%	4.0%	0.3%

### 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	0.00	26.10	27.60	0.00	36.89
Current Ratio	0.10	2.60	2.50	13.70	8.75
Debt to Asset Ratio	1.10	1.10	1.00	1.00	1.01
Change in Net Position	\$399,413	\$502,819	\$523,228	\$59,092	(\$206,810)

### 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	1.78	1.81	1.70	1.33	1.14
Change in Net Position	(\$11,019,784)	\$4,535,021	(\$1,762,347)	\$10,560,962	\$366,437
Default	No	No	No	No	No

**Fiscal Years 2018-2022 Financial Results**

**Financial Performance Narrative**

Pinnacle Charter 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 -39 or -1.8 percent, and 6 students or 0.28 percent higher than the prior year. The school's governmental funds ended the year with 4.2 months of cash on hand and insufficient current assets to cover liabilities. The school experienced a positive operating margin of 1.31

**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

CSI was not made aware of any issues related to protecting the rights of all students in the 2021-22 school year.

### 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 strong operational performance in the 2021-22 school year. Organizational Submissions were submitted in a timely manner and feedback was appropriately addressed. No Notices of Concern were issued.

#### 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)