



Colorado Charter School Institute
Annual Review of Schools (CARS) Report
2022-2023

Colorado Early Colleges - Fort Collins



Expanding Frontiers in Public Education

1525 Sherman St. B76 Denver, CO 80203 • P: 303.866.3299 • F: 303.866.2530 • 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	
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	11
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 (ryanmarks@csi.state.co.us)

Financial Performance: Andi Denton (andradenton@csi.state.co.us)

Organizational Performance: Jess Welch (jessicawelch@csi.state.co.us) - State/Federal Programs
Stephanie Aragon (stephaniearagon@csi.state.co.us) - 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	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Enrollment Over Time	1,355	1,319	1,345	1,249	1,091
F/R Lunch	22.1%	20.8%	19.6%	15.5%	17.3%
Minority	21.2%	22.4%	22.0%	24.8%	24.9%
IEP	3.5%	3.4%	3.3%	4.1%	4.8%
EL	2.1%	1.7%	2.1%	3.0%	3.1%
Gifted	4.9%	8.6%	7.3%	5.0%	6.7%
504	8.6%	8.6%	8.3%	10.0%	10.8%

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
Academic	Performance
Elementary School Rating	--
Middle School Rating	Performance (Points Earned: 63.5%)
High School Rating	Performance (Points Earned: 83.4%)
Financial	Financial performance does not impact the school accreditation rating
Organizational	Organizational performance does not impact the school accreditation
Overall CARS Rating	Performance with Distinction

Participation

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

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

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

Assurance	
	Rating
Accountability Participation Rate	Meets 95%

Test Participation Rates (Ratings are based on Accountability Participation Rate)						
Subject	Total Records	Valid Scores	Participation Rate	Parent Excuses	Accountability Participation Rate	Rating
English Language Arts	711	538	75.7%	151	96.1%	Meets 95%
Math	711	537	75.5%	151	95.9%	Meets 95%
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Test Participation Rates - Disaggregated by Test						
Subject	Total Records	Valid Scores	Participation Rate	Parent Excuses	Accountability Participation Rate	Rating
CMAS English Language Arts	213	166	77.9%	46	99.4%	Meets 95%
CMAS Math	213	165	77.5%	46	98.8%	Meets 95%
CMAS Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PSAT/SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing	498	372	74.7%	105	94.7%	Meets 95%
PSAT/SAT Math	498	372	74.7%	105	94.7%	Meets 95%

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	2017		2018		2019		2022		2023	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elementary	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	67	749	74	742	75	747	33	744	45	736
7	61	760	89	758	95	743	41	748	55	738
8	69	757	82	743	112	761	44	744	54	750
Middle	197	755	245	748	282	751	118	746	154	742
Overall	300	759	245	748	282	751	118	746	154	742




Geographic District Achievement over Time in ELA										
CMAS ELA	2017		2018		2019		2022		2023	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	2,157	751	2,188	753	2,080	753	1,971	749	2,003	752
4	2,160	756	2,203	760	2,217	761	2,018	753	1,992	755
5	2,252	756	2,198	758	2,229	761	2,006	758	2,036	762
Elementary	6,569	754	6,591	757	6,526	759	5,998	753	6,032	756
6	2,009	750	2,179	753	2,173	754	1,866	753	1,937	753
7	1,925	751	1,957	755	2,105	755	1,819	752	1,721	757
8	1,697	754	1,849	754	1,801	756	1,613	756	1,643	757
Middle	5,631	752	5,983	754	6,079	755	5,295	753	5,300	756
Overall	13,269	753	12,574	755	12,605	757	11,293	753	11,332	756

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 2017 to 2023, overall student achievement decreased by 17.5 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score decreased by 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 (Poudre R-1) for the past five years. Overall, the school performs lower than their geo. district by 14.5 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	2017	2018	2019	2022	2023		
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS		
F/R Lunch	Y	n<16	746.8	743.8	737.5	729.0	
	N		759.1	748.3	754.8	748.2	749.4
Minority	Y		751.5	738.9	741.2	738.7	732.8
	N		761.1	751.0	755.4	748.7	746.3
IEP	Y	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16	
	N		760.4	749.8	752.2	748.6	744.6
EL	Y	n<16	733.1	732.7	720.3	710.0	
	N		759.4	749.3	753.5	749.4	746.2
GT	Y	n<16	774.4	775.9	n<16	n<16	
	N		759.0	743.6	749.3	742.8	737.7
Schoolwide			759	748	751	746	742

Geographic District Gap Trends over Time in ELA							
CMAS ELA	2017	2018	2019	2022	2023		
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS		
F/R Lunch	Y		730.5	731.8	733.5	725.8	728.8
	N		761.7	765.0	765.8	761.3	764.8
Minority	Y		739.0	740.5	742.1	738.6	741.9
	N		757.8	760.7	761.8	758.6	760.9
IEP	Y		700.5	703.4	705.0	701.2	704.7
	N		757.5	759.9	760.8	757.5	760.4
EL	Y		729.3	726.2	728.3	721.9	722.7
	N		755.5	758.3	759.5	756.2	758.7
GT	Y		788.4	792.5	791.9	790.7	794.8
	N		746.3	748.2	749.6	746.7	749.0
Geographic District			753	755	757	753	756

CMAS ELA: Subgroup Gap Trends Graphs



CMAS ELA: Subgroup Local Comparison Graphs



Achievement Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative


The graphs above show the performance of student subgroups on the 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 2023, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: minority, 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	2018		2019		2022		2023	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elementary	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	54	52.0	59	57.0	25	48.0	34	38.5
7	72	58.5	74	45.0	--	--	49	42.0
8	60	32.0	87	56.0	34	55.5	47	57.0
Middle	186	48.0	220	54.0	59	51.0	130	46.0
Overall	186	48.0	220	54.0	59	51.0	130	46.0



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	2018		2019		2022		2023	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	2,062	59.0	2,083	61.0	1,657	55.0	1,849	58.0
5	2,065	53.0	2,131	55.0	--	--	1,894	56.0
Elementary	4,129	56.0	4,214	58.0	1,657	55.0	3,743	57.0
6	2,045	48.0	2,042	46.0	1,557	47.0	1,803	47.0
7	1,780	48.0	1,965	45.0	--	--	1,573	49.0
8	1,647	50.0	1,665	47.0	1,318	55.0	1,480	54.0
Middle	5,472	49.0	5,672	46.0	2,875	50.0	4,856	50.0
Overall	1,647	50.0	9,886	51.0	4,532	52.0	8,599	53.0




Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative
 The graphs show schoolwide growth on the ELA state assessment. From 2018 to 2023, overall student growth decreased. Since last year, student growth decreased by 5 percentile points. In 2023, overall student growth was approaching state expectations and was below the geo. district. Overall student growth for the geo. district has increased over time.


CMAS ELA: Levels of Growth Tables and Graphs

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

ELA Levels of Growth				
CMAS ELA	%Students			
Category	2018	2019	2022	2023
Low (below 35)	35%	29%	37%	42%
Typical (35-65)	39%	32%	22%	32%
High (above 65)	26%	40%	42%	33%



ELA At/Below 50th %ile				
CMAS ELA	%Students			
Category	2018	2019	2022	2023
At or Above 50	48%	54%	53%	48%
Below 50	52%	46%	49%	58%



Levels of Growth Narrative
 Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 42% 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 48%). Since 2018, the percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has increased (48% to 48%).

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	2018	2019	2022	2023	
Student Subgroup	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP	
F/R Lunch	Y	47.0	50.5	n<20	44.5
	N	49.0	55.5	51.0	46.0
Minority	Y	57.0	46.5	68.5	43.0
	N	42.0	56.0	43.0	46.0
IEP	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	49.0	53.0	49.5	47.0
EL	Y	52.0	58.0	n<20	n<20
	N	46.0	52.0	55.5	48.0
GT	Y	54.0	55.0	n<20	n<20
	N	46.5	53.0	64.0	46.0
Schoolwide	48.0	54.0	51.0	46.0	

CMAS ELA	2018	2019	2022	2023	
Student Subgroup	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP	
F/R Lunch	Y	46.0	46.0	42.0	43.0
	N	53.0	53.0	55.0	56.0
Minority	Y	49.0	48.0	46.0	50.0
	N	51.0	52.0	54.0	54.0
IEP	Y	35.0	42.0	34.0	41.0
	N	50.5	52.0	54.0	54.0
EL	Y	52.0	50.0	41.0	45.0
	N	50.0	51.0	53.0	53.0
GT	Y	66.0	57.0	64.5	67.0
	N	49.0	49.0	49.0	50.0
Geographic District	50.0	51.0	52.0	53.0	

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, overall, Poudre R-1 outperformed the school. In 2023, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: minority, - 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	2017		2018		2019		2022		2023	
	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elementary	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	67	737	77	737	77	739	33	728	46	728
7	61	737	89	739	95	733	42	738	54	735
8	69	735	83	734	115	743	46	738	54	747
Middle	197	736	249	737	287	739	121	735	154	737
Overall	304	744	249	737	287	739	121	735	154	737

Geographic District Achievement over Time in Math										
CMAS Math	2017		2018		2019		2022		2023	
	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	2,160	755	2,193	753	2,089	753	1,978	749	2,024	752
4	2,165	750	2,204	750	2,219	750	2,029	746	2,003	747
5	2,251	749	2,213	752	2,234	754	2,010	751	2,058	752
Elementary	6,576	751	6,612	752	6,542	752	6,020	749	6,086	750
6	2,026	744	2,196	743	2,180	747	1,857	741	1,941	744
7	1,937	743	1,971	745	2,113	746	1,807	742	1,727	743
8	1,706	741	1,859	743	1,811	754	1,596	751	1,644	753
Middle	5,669	743	6,024	744	6,104	749	5,257	744	5,311	746
Overall	13,313	747	12,636	748	12,646	751	11,277	747	11,397	748

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 2017 to 2023, overall student achievement decreased by 7.1 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score increased 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 () for the past five years. Overall, the school performs lower than their geo. district by 11.4 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		2017	2018	2019	2022	2023
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	n<16	730.6	730.1	722.0	725.4
	N		744.2	738.8	742.5	739.6
Minority	Y		736.4	724.3	731.0	726.8
	N		746.1	741.0	741.5	739.0
IEP	Y	n<16	716.4	708.0	n<16	n<16
	N		745.2	738.2	740.6	738.5
EL	Y	n<16	721.5	725.8	713.5	713.9
	N		744.6	738.3	740.0	738.6
GT	Y	n<16	769.1	766.7	780.5	n<16
	N		744.0	731.6	736.3	728.2
Schoolwide		744	737	739	735	737

Geographic District Gap Trends over Time in Math						
CMAS Math		2017	2018	2019	2022	2023
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y		726.5	727.2	729.0	720.6
	N		754.7	756.2	759.0	754.1
Minority	Y		733.9	734.8	737.4	733.3
	N		751.2	752.4	755.2	751.4
IEP	Y		701.8	702.3	706.7	702.8
	N		750.6	751.7	754.1	750.1
EL	Y		727.3	725.1	728.2	720.1
	N		748.9	750.1	752.8	749.1
GT	Y		781.8	783.3	788.7	785.3
	N		740.3	741.0	742.9	739.8
Geographic District		747	748	751	747	748

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, overall, Poudre R-1 outperformed the school. In 2023, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: minority, EL, - 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	2018		2019		2022		2023	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elementary	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	54	50.0	62	53.0	--	--	35	37.0
7	73	63.0	74	42.0	30	63.5	49	55.0
8	61	47.0	89	45.0	--	--	47	58.0
Middle	188	55.5	225	45.0	30	63.5	131	52.0
Overall	188	55.5	225	45.0	30	63.5	131	52.0



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	2018		2019		2022		2023	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	2,076	58.0	2,111	61.0	--	--	1,878	57.0
5	2,074	57.0	2,129	55.0	1,656	53.0	1,922	53.0
Elementary	4,152	58.0	4,240	58.0	1,656	53.0	3,800	55.0
6	2,050	45.0	2,045	54.0	--	--	1,804	47.0
7	1,487	54.0	1,978	54.0	1,526	47.0	1,572	52.0
8	1,310	54.0	1,385	57.0	--	--	1,473	56.0
Middle	4,847	50.0	5,408	55.0	1,526	47.0	4,849	51.0
Overall	1,310	54.0	9,648	56.0	3,182	50.0	8,649	53.0




Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative
 The graphs show schoolwide growth on the Math state assessment. From 2018 to 2023, overall student growth decreased. Since last year, student growth decreased by 11.5 percentile points. In 2023, overall student growth met state expectations and was below 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	2018	2019	2022	2023
Low (below 35)	29%	37%	30%	36%
Typical (35-65)	32%	30%	27%	28%
High (above 65)	39%	33%	47%	42%



Math At/Below 50th %ile				
CMAS Math	%Students			
Category	2018	2019	2022	2023
At or Above 50	57%	47%	60%	57%
Below 50	43%	53%	43%	49%



Levels of Growth Narrative
 Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 36% 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 (60% to 57%). Since 2018, the percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has increased (57% to 57%).

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		2018	2019	2022	2023
Student Subgroup		MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	47.0	42.0	n<20	55.0
	N	59.5	47.5	67.5	51.5
Minority	Y	47.0	43.0	n<20	50.5
	N	60.0	46.0	64.0	53.0
IEP	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	55.5	44.0	71.0	52.5
EL	Y	43.0	52.0	n<20	48.0
	N	57.0	44.5	67.5	53.0
GT	Y	54.5	34.0	n<20	n<20
	N	56.5	47.0	63.5	51.0
Schoolwide		55.5	45.0	63.5	52.0

Subgroup Growth Gap Trends over Time in Math					
CMAS Math		2018	2019	2022	2023
Student Subgroup		MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	54.0	51.0	47.0	50.0
	N	54.0	58.0	51.0	57.0
Minority	Y	55.0	54.0	49.0	51.0
	N	53.0	57.0	51.0	57.0
IEP	Y	38.0	45.0	40.0	44.0
	N	54.0	57.0	51.0	56.0
EL	Y	59.0	55.0	52.0	51.0
	N	53.0	56.0	50.0	56.0
GT	Y	55.0	62.0	61.0	67.0
	N	53.0	55.0	48.0	54.0
Geographic District		54.0	56.0	50.0	53.0

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): FRL students outperformed their non-FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, overall, Poudre R-1 outperformed the school. In 2023, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: minority, EL, - 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	2019			2020			2021			2022			2023		
Grade/Level	N	MGP	% On Track	N	MGP	% On Track	N	MGP	% On Track	N	MGP	% On Track	N	MGP	% On Track
Elementary	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Middle	n<20	--	--	n<20	--	--	n<20	--	--	n<20	--	--	n<20	--	--
High	n<20	--	--	n<20	--	--	n<20	--	--	n<20	--	--	n<20	--	--
Overall	n<20	--	--	n<20	--	--	n<20	--	--	n<20	--	--	20	79.5	45.0%

Geographic District Growth over Time on ACCESS															
ACCESS	2019			2020			2021			2022			2023		
Grade/Level	N	MGP	% On Track	N	MGP	% On Track	N	MGP	% On Track	N	MGP	% On Track	N	MGP	% On Track
Elementary	720	53.0	72.1%	654	55.0	73.2%	583	52.0	50.2%	601	50.0	59.7%	632	54.0	65.9%
Middle	134	62.5	53.0%	101	55.0	29.4%	78	50.0	19.4%	103	58.0	23.1%	171	38.0	20.1%
High	94	68.0	50.5%	88	56.0	30.4%	85	53.0	22.7%	103	64.0	28.9%	153	49.0	22.8%
Overall	948	56.0	67.2%	843	55.0	63.3%	746	52.0	44.2%	807	53.0	52.2%	956	50.5	50.7%

^^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



Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show schoolwide growth on the ACCESS for ELLs state assessment. In 2023, overall student growth exceeded state expectations and was above the geo. district. Additionally, 45% 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	2017		2018		2019 [^]		2022		2023	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
PSAT (9th)*	--	--	151	485	183	502	129	488	78	496
PSAT (10th)*	106	515	154	549	167	525	146	532	119	515
PSAT (9th&10th)	--	--	305	517	350	513	275	511	197	507
SAT (11th)	161	576	155	573	203	574	168	570	151	557
Overall	267	552	460	536	553	535	443	534	348	529

Geographic District Achievement over Time in EBRW										
PSAT/SAT EBRW	2017		2018		2019 [^]		2022		2023	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
PSAT (9th)*	--	--	17	365	1,965	496	1,751	490	1,848	493
PSAT (10th)*	1,812	517	1,793	516	1,844	513	1,833	516	1,736	517
PSAT (9th&10th)	--	--	3,719	502	3,809	504	3,584	503	3,584	505
SAT (11th)	1,816	555	1,814	554	1,773	547	1,808	541	1,866	540
Overall	3,628	536	5,533	519	5,582	518	5,392	516	5,450	517

*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.


[^]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 2023, overall student achievement decreased by 7.1 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score decreased by 4.6 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 12.3 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	2023
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	n<16	502	503	494	489
	N	552	544	544	540	539
Minority	Y	526	504	523	497	493
	N	556	543	539	544	539
IEP	Y	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	554	538	538	535	534
EL	Y	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	552	537	537	538	533
GT	Y	n<16	574	578	587	593
	N	552	535	532	529	522
Schoolwide		552	536	535	534	529

Geographic District Gap Trends over Time in EBRW						
PSAT/SAT EBRW		2017	2018	2019	2022	2023
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	468	450	447	451	453
	N	553	539	536	529	530
Minority	Y	497	480	480	480	482
	N	548	532	530	527	528
IEP	Y	392	370	379	395	398
	N	544	528	525	522	522
EL	Y	470	405	395	386	382
	N	542	525	523	520	520
GT	Y	641	616	610	604	605
	N	516	499	495	492	494
Geographic District		536	519	518	516	517



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 2023, 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	2018		2019		2022		2023	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
CMAS 8 to PSAT 9^	110	66.0	--	--	n < 20	--	n < 20	--
PSAT 9 to PSAT 10	106	55.5	132	51.5	111	52.0	105	62.0
PSAT 10 to SAT 11	121	68.0	153	51.0	136	54.0	121	43.0
Overall	337	66	285	51.0	247	53.0	226	52.5

^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	2018		2019		2022		2023	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
CMAS 8 to PSAT 9^	1,458	55.0	--	--	n < 20	--	n < 20	--
PSAT 9 to PSAT 10	978	58.0	1,673	52.0	1,531	48.0	1,503	52.0
PSAT 10 to SAT 11	1,608	57.0	1,635	57.0	1,565	51.0	1,641	49.0
Overall	4,051	56.0	3,308	54.0	3,096	50.0	3,144	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 2018 to 2023, overall student growth decreased. Since last year, student growth decreased by 0.5 percentile points. In 2023, 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 EBRW: Levels of Growth Tables

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

EBRW Levels of Growth				
PSAT/SAT EBRW	%Students			
Category	2018	2019	2022	2023
Low (below 35)	26%	35%	32%	35%
Typical (35-65)	23%	25%	33%	27%
High (above 65)	50%	40%	35%	37%

EBRW At/Below 50th %ile				
PSAT/SAT EBRW	%Students			
Category	2018	2019	2022	2023
At or Above 50	61%	52%	55%	51%
Below 50	39%	48%	45%	49%



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 while students with high growth rates, categorized as students with a MGP above 65, account for 37% of students. The percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased from last year (55% to 51%). Since 2018, the percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased (61% to 51%).

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	2018	2019	2022	2023	
Student	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP	
F/R	Y	52.0	53.5	43.5	43.0
Lunch	N	66.0	51.0	54.0	54.0
Minority	Y	43.0	46.0	51.0	53.5
	N	67.0	52.0	54.0	51.5
IEP	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	66.0	51.0	52.0	52.5
EL	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	66.0	51.0	54.0	53.0
GT	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	64.5
	N	66.0	52.0	52.0	49.0
Schoolwide		66.0	51.0	53.0	52.5

PSAT/SAT EBRW	2018	2019	2022	2023	
Student Subgroup	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP	
F/R	Y	47.0	47.0	45.0	48.0
Lunch	N	59.0	56.0	51.0	50.0
Minority	Y	51.0	52.0	47.0	47.0
	N	58.0	55.0	50.0	51.0
IEP	Y	44.0	36.0	43.0	46.0
	N	57.0	55.0	50.0	50.0
EL	Y	50.0	49.0	36.0	38.0
	N	57.0	55.0	50.0	50.0
GT	Y	68.0	60.0	56.0	57.5
	N	53.0	53.0	48.0	49.0
Geographic District		56.0	54.0	50.0	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, minority students outperformed their non-minority peers, GT students outperformed their non-GT peers, overall, the school outperformed Poudre R-1. In 2023, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: minority, GT, - 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	2017		2018		2019 [*]		2022		2023	
	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
Grade/Level										
PSAT (9th) [*]	--	--	151	470	183	481	129	479	78	493
PSAT (10th) [*]	106	497	154	532	167	494	147	498	119	499
PSAT (9th&10th)	--	--	305	501	350	487	276	489	197	496
SAT (11th)	161	554	155	542	203	560	169	540	152	536
Overall	267	531	460	515	553	514	445	509	349	513

Geographic District Achievement over Time in Math										
PSAT/SAT Math	2017		2018		2019 [*]		2022		2023	
	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
Grade/Level										
PSAT (9th) [*]	--	--	17	344	1,966	483	1,751	476	1,856	484
PSAT (10th) [*]	1,812	508	1,795	507	1,844	501	1,834	491	1,745	490
PSAT (9th&10th)	--	--	3,723	493	3,810	492	3,585	484	3,601	487
SAT (11th)	1,816	544	1,814	541	1,773	543	1,809	521	1,872	522
Overall	3,628	526	5,537	509	5,583	508	5,394	496	5,473	499

*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.


^{*}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

Math - Schoolwide

Math - PSAT (9&10)

Math - SAT (11)



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 2023, overall student achievement decreased by 1.7 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score increased by 4.9 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 outperforms their geo. district by 14.6 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	2023	
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	
F/R Lunch	Y	n<16	489	483	471	484
	N	531	521	522	515	521
Minority	Y	510	497	507	489	484
	N	535	519	516	514	522
IEP	Y	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	532	516	516	509	518
EL	Y	n<16	n<16	n<16	414	n<16
	N	531	515	515	512	517
GT	Y	n<16	573	576	560	575
	N	531	513	509	504	507
Schoolwide	531	515	514	509	513	

PSAT/SAT Math	2017	2018	2019	2022	2023	
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	
F/R Lunch	Y	457	438	439	431	434
	N	543	529	526	509	513
Minority	Y	491	474	476	465	467
	N	536	520	518	506	509
IEP	Y	373	350	372	385	389
	N	534	518	515	501	504
EL	Y	480	412	402	408	387
	N	530	514	512	499	502
GT	Y	634	614	610	594	595
	N	505	487	482	470	475
Geographic District	526	509	508	496	499	



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, GT students outperformed their non-GT peers, overall, the school outperformed District. In 2023, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: FRL, minority, - 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	2018		2019		2022		2023	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
CMAS 8 to PSAT 9^	112	62.0	127	58.0	71	68.0	54	67.5
PSAT 9 to PSAT 10	107	78.0	132	58.5	111	52.0	105	62.0
PSAT 10 to SAT 11	121	61.0	153	60.0	136	52.5	121	48.0
Overall	340	65	412	58.0	318	58.0	280	55.0

Geographic District Growth over Time in Math								
PSAT/SAT Math	2018		2019		2022		2023	
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	1,382	50.0
PSAT 9 to PSAT 10	658	50.0	1,673	60.0	1,531	53.0	1,503	57.0
PSAT 10 to SAT 11	1,608	49.0	1,635	52.0	1,565	47.0	1,641	52.0
Overall	3,741	47.0	4,576	54.0	4,354	50.0	4,526	53.0

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 2018 to 2023, overall student growth decreased. Since last year, student growth decreased by 3 percentile points. In 2023, overall student growth met state expectations. Overall student growth was above 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	2018	2019	2022	2023
Low (below 35)	22%	23%	31%	29%
Typical (35-65)	29%	32%	28%	30%
High (above 65)	49%	45%	42%	41%

Math At/Below 50th %ile				
PSAT/SAT Math	%Students			
Category	2018	2019	2022	2023
At or Above 50	65%	61%	58%	56%
Below 50	35%	39%	42%	44%



Levels of Growth Narrative

Students with low growth rates, categorized as students with a median growth percentile (MGP) below 35, account for 29% of students with growth scores while students with high growth rates, categorized as students with a MGP above 65, account for 41% of students. The percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased from last year (58% to 56%). Since 2018, the percent of students at or above the 50th percentile has decreased (65% to 56%).

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?


Subgroup Growth Gap Trends over Time in Math					
PSAT/SAT Math		2018	2019	2022	2023
Student Subgroup		MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	65.0	53.5	60.0	51.0
	N	65.0	60.5	58.0	57.0
Minority	Y	72.5	57.0	57.0	53.5
	N	65.0	59.0	58.0	57.0
IEP	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	65.0	58.5	57.0	55.5
EL	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	65.0	58.0	58.0	55.0
GT	Y	n<20	53.0	54.0	59.5
	N	66.0	58.0	58.0	55.0
Schoolwide		65.0	58.0	58.0	55.0

Subgroup Growth Gap Trends over Time in Math					
PSAT/SAT Math		2018	2019	2022	2023
Student Subgroup		MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	44.0	46.0	43.0	46.0
	N	48.0	55.0	52.0	54.0
Minority	Y	47.0	53.0	48.0	48.0
	N	48.0	54.0	51.0	54.0
IEP	Y	37.5	40.0	34.0	40.0
	N	48.0	54.0	51.0	53.0
EL	Y	41.0	52.0	42.5	38.5
	N	48.0	54.0	51.0	53.0
GT	Y	49.0	56.0	52.0	58.0
	N	47.0	53.0	50.0	51.0
Geographic District		47.0	54.0	50.0	53.0

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, GT students outperformed their non-GT peers, overall, the school outperformed Poudre R-1. In 2023, 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						
Graduation Rate		Best Of	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Student Subgroup			Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate
F/R Lunch	Y	7-year	58%	86%	89%	97%
	N	7-year	73%	90%	96%	96%
Minority	Y	7-year	73%	88%	87%	94%
	N	6-year	69%	90%	97%	97%
IEP	Y	7-year	57%	57%	67%	100%
	N	7-year	70%	90%	95%	96%
EL	Y	5-year	50%	100%	50%	100%
	N	7-year	70%	89%	95%	96%
GT	Y	6-year	82%	96%	100%	86%
	N	7-year	68%	89%	94%	97%
Schoolwide		7-year	70%	89%	95%	96%

Geographic District Graduation Gap Trends over Time						
Graduation Rate		Best Of	4-year	5-year	6-year	7-year
Student Subgroup			Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate
F/R Lunch	Y	6-year	71%	70%	75%	73%
	N	6-year	94%	94%	95%	95%
Minority	Y	6-year	79%	80%	82%	79%
	N	6-year	90%	89%	91%	91%
IEP	Y	6-year	68%	72%	73%	66%
	N	6-year	89%	88%	90%	89%
EL	Y	7-year	64%	67%	72%	72%
	N	6-year	88%	87%	89%	88%
GT	Y	6-year	96%	96%	98%	96%
	N	6-year	85%	84%	86%	86%
Geographic District		6-year	87%	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 2022-23, 5-year represents the class of 2021-22, and so on. Best of rates are used for

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 96%. 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 7 year rate of 97%. The best of rate for minority students is the 7 year rate of 94%. The best of rate for students with disabilities is the 7 year rate of 100%. The best of rate for English Learners is the 5 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?

Dropout rates for CARS include students from 7th to 12th grade. State accountability dropout rates only include students from 9th to 12th grade.


Subgroup Dropout Gap Trends over Time						
Dropout Rate		2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Student Subgroup		Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate
F/R Lunch	Y	0.5%	0.4%	1.1%	0.8%	0.7%
	N	0.3%	0.2%	0.6%	0.4%	0.5%
Minority	Y	0.5%	0.0%	1.3%	0.7%	0.6%
	N	0.3%	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.5%
IEP	Y	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N	0.4%	0.2%	0.7%	0.5%	0.5%
EL	Y	--	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N	0.3%	0.2%	0.7%	0.5%	0.5%
GT	Y	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N	0.4%	0.2%	0.8%	0.5%	0.5%
Schoolwide		0.4%	0.2%	0.7%	0.5%	0.5%

Geographic District Subgroup Dropout Gap Trends over Time						
Dropout Rate		2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Student Subgroup		Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate
F/R Lunch	Y	2.4%	2.4%	1.6%	1.5%	2.6%
	N	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%
Minority	Y	1.8%	1.9%	1.3%	1.4%	2.1%
	N	1.0%	0.6%	0.5%	0.4%	0.6%
IEP	Y	2.3%	1.5%	1.2%	0.8%	1.4%
	N	0.9%	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%	1.0%
EL	Y	3.4%	1.6%	1.5%	4.3%	4.2%
	N	0.9%	1.0%	0.6%	0.6%	1.0%
GT	Y	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%
	N	1.2%	1.2%	0.8%	0.8%	1.2%
Geographic District		1.0%	1.0%	0.7%	0.7%	1.1%

Dropout Rate: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends Graphs



Dropout Rate: Subgroup Local Comparison Graphs



Dropout Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show dropout rates disaggregated by student group and dropout rates compared to the geographic district. From last year, FRL dropout rates decreased, minority student dropout rates 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	2019 [^]		2020 [*]		2021		2022		2023	
Category	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
2 year	110	55.8%	118	56.5%	128	53.6%	131	53.0%	120	44.3%
4 year	96	48.7%	89	42.6%	91	38.1%	103	41.7%	100	36.9%
CTE	12	6.1%	19	9.1%	42	17.6%	28	11.3%	25	9.2%
Schoolwide	148	75.1%	157	75.1%	184	77.0%	179	72.5%	172	63.5%

Geo. District Matriculation Rate Trends over Time										
Matriculation	2019 [^]		2020 [*]		2021		2022		2023	
Category	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
2 year	245	12.1%	--	--	212	11.0%	209	10.0%	204	8.9%
4 year	940	46.4%	--	--	728	37.8%	791	38.0%	825	36.1%
CTE	263	13.0%	--	--	281	14.6%	326	15.7%	219	9.6%
Geo. District	1,353	66.8%	--	--	1,132	58.8%	1,206	57.9%	1,122	49.1%


Matriculation rates, like graduation and dropout rates, are on a one-year lag. Therefore, data for the current reporting year (2022-23) represent outcomes for the class of 2021-22 and data for the 2021-22 reporting year represent outcomes for the class of 2020-21, and so on. Schoolwide matriculation rates are the only rates used for

[^] 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



4 Year Matriculation Rates



CTE Matriculation Rates



Matriculation Rates Status and Local Comparison

The graphs above show schoolwide matriculation rates compared to the matriculation rates for 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 73% to 64%.

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 2019-2023 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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Operating Margin	1.8%	1.0%	2.0%	2.0%	0.9%
Months of Cash on Hand	1.80	3.50	2.60	3.08	2.87
Current Ratio	2.10	2.80	6.60	5.23	5.29
Months of Unassigned Fund Balance on Hand	1.10	0.90	2.40	2.43	0.14
Positive Unassigned Fund Balance (TABOR)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES



Enrollment

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

Enrollment					
Metric	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Funded Pupil Count (FPC) Current-Year Variance	1.3%	-4.9%	-2.5%	-6.0%	-13.0%
Change in FPC from Prior-Year	17.1%	-2.5%	-1.0%	-6.3%	-12.5%

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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Months of Cash on Hand	17.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	N/A
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	\$0

Government-Wide Financial Statement Metrics

- What is the school's debt?
- What is the school's net asset position?
- Is the school in default with any financial covenants they have with loan agreements?

Government-Wide Financial Statement Metrics					
Metric	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Debt to Asset Ratio	1.29	1.46	1.42	0.19	0.19
Change in Net Position	(\$1,594,582)	(\$1,243,006)	\$2,501,257	\$271,442	\$0
Default	No	No	No	No	No

Fiscal Years 2019-2023 Financial Results

Financial Performance Narrative

Colorado Early Colleges Fort Collins ended the year with sufficient reserves to satisfy the TABOR reserve requirement and a negative change in net position. The school's funded-pupil count came in lower than budget by -13.0% and -12% lower than the prior year. The school's governmental funds ended the year with 2.87 months of cash on hand and sufficient current assets to cover liabilities. The school experienced a positive operating margin of 0.9%.

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 2022-23 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 an OCR Complaint (08-22-1397) for failure to respond to disability-related harassment.

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*
- *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 2022-23 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 2022-23 school year. However, the school reported one statutory violations in their Assurances for Financial Accreditation in the 2022-23 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 2022-23 school year. CSI was not made aware of any issues relating to facilities and transportation requirements in the 2022-23 school year. CSI was not made aware of any issues relating to employee credentialing and background check requirements in the 2022-23 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 2022-23 school year.

Organizational Performance Metrics

Organizational Performance Additional Narrative

Overall, the school exhibited moderate operational performance in the 2022-23 school year. Organizational Submissions were submitted in a timely manner and feedback was appropriately addressed. No Notices of Concern were issued. However, the school received an OCR Complaint (08-22-1397) for failure to respond to disability-related harassment.

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

1525 Sherman St. B76 Denver, CO 80203 ▪ P: 303.866.3299 ▪ F: 303.866.2530 ▪ www.csi.state.co.us