



Colorado Charter School Institute
Annual Review of Schools (CARS) Report
2023-2024

Ascent Classical Academy Douglas County



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: Dave Sever (davesever@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., NWEA). 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?

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?

3. Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

- a. How are students achieving on state assessments for postsecondary readiness?
- b. To what extent are students graduating high school?
- c. To what extent are students dropping out of high school?
- d. To what extent 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 2019 to 2024. 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.

CSI Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework

1. Enrollment

- a. How has the school's enrollment varied over time?

2. Debt

- a. How has the school been able to cover its debt obligations?
- b. To what extent has the school relied on borrowed funds to finance its operations?

3. Balance Sheet

- a. To what extent has the school maintained the appropriate unrestricted fund balance to provide for unexpected expenses?
- b. How has the school's unassigned fund balance changed over time?
- c. To what extent can the school pay its short-term obligations?

4. Operating Margin

- a. To what extent is the school living within their means?
- b. How has the school's operating margin changed over time?

Organizational Performance Framework

1. Governance

- a. Is the school complying with applicable education requirements?

2. Education Program

- a. How is the school fulfilling obligations and expectations relating to the educational program?
- b. How successful is the school producing positive academic outcomes? (see academic measures)

3. Diversity, Equity of Access, and Inclusion

- a. How is the school protecting the rights of all students?
- b. How is the school supporting students to read at grade-level?
- c. How is the school supporting students and families in preparing to make post-secondary enrollment accessible?

3. Financial Management

- a. How is the school satisfying financial reporting and compliance requirements?
- b. How accurately is the school able to project enrollment?
- c. How effectively is the school able to manage and spend grant funds?

4. School Operations and Environment

- a. How is the school fulfilling obligations and expectations relating to operational requirements?
- b. Is the school soliciting feedback from stakeholders and sharing with the community?
- c. How stable is the student population during the school year?
- d. To what extent are students returning to the school the following school year?

5. Additional Obligations

- a. How is the school complying with all other obligations?

Additional information about the CSI Performance Framework can be found at
<https://www.csi.state.co.us/about/school-accountability/>

Ascent Classical Academy Douglas County Overview

Year Opened/Transferred: 2020-2021

Town/City: Lone Tree

Grades Served: K-12








District of Residence: Douglas County

School Model: Classical

Original Application Type: Transfer

| Enrollment and Student Demographics over Time | | | | | |
|---|------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|
| October Student Counts | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |
| Enrollment Over Time | -- | 649 | 856 | 1,036 | 1,017 |
| F/R Lunch | -- | 4.3% | 6.4% | 5.3% | 10.4% |
| Minority | -- | 14.8% | 13.2% | 14.0% | 18.9% |
| IEP | -- | 6.3% | 7.8% | 5.4% | 6.7% |
| EL | -- | 2.6% | 1.1% | 1.2% | 3.0% |
| Gifted | -- | 2.8% | 1.9% | 1.2% | 1.1% |
| 504 | -- | 1.5% | 0.7% | 4.1% | 4.4% |

Enrollment over Time



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

*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 or equal to 71.8% Points Earned

Performance: Between 53% to 71.7% 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 (Points Earned: 72.1%) |
| Elementary School Rating | Performance (Points Earned: 73.1%) |
| Middle School Rating | Improvement (Points Earned: 51.5%) |
| High School Rating | Performance (Points Earned: 74.2%) |
| Financial | Financial performance does not impact the school accreditation rating |
| Organizational | Organizational performance does not impact the school accreditation |
| Overall CARS Rating | Performance |

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 | 592 | 528 | 89.2% | 38 | 95.3% | Meets 95% |
| Math | 592 | 527 | 89.0% | 38 | 95.1% | Meets 95% |
| Science | 175 | 146 | 83.4% | 21 | 94.8% | Meets 95% |

| Test Participation Rates - Disaggregated by Test | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Subject | Total Records | Valid Scores | Participation Rate | Parent Excuses | Accountability Participation Rate | Rating |
| CMAS English Language Arts | 481 | 432 | 89.8% | 38 | 97.5% | Meets 95% |
| CMAS Math | 481 | 431 | 89.6% | 38 | 97.3% | Meets 95% |
| CMAS Science | 175 | 146 | 83.4% | 21 | 94.8% | Meets 95% |
| PSAT/SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing | 111 | 96 | 86.5% | 0 | 86.5% | Does Not Meet 95% |
| PSAT/SAT Math | 111 | 96 | 86.5% | 0 | 86.5% | Does Not Meet 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 | 2018 | | 2019 | | 2022 | | 2023 | | 2024 | |
| Grade/Level | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS |
| 3 | -- | -- | 28 | 736 | 58 | 736 | 86 | 733 | 86 | 741 |
| 4 | -- | -- | 27 | 757 | 84 | 745 | 84 | 747 | 86 | 751 |
| 5 | -- | -- | 37 | 751 | 62 | 772 | 86 | 766 | 78 | 750 |
| Elementary | -- | -- | 92 | 748 | 204 | 751 | 256 | 749 | 250 | 747 |
| 6 | -- | -- | 22 | 758 | 47 | 750 | 58 | 754 | 80 | 743 |
| 7 | -- | -- | 31 | 750 | 62 | 748 | 53 | 751 | 53 | 763 |
| 8 | -- | -- | 21 | 766 | 52 | 749 | 54 | 743 | 46 | 746 |
| Middle | -- | -- | 74 | 757 | 161 | 749 | 165 | 750 | 179 | 750 |
| Overall | -- | -- | 166 | 752 | 365 | 750 | 421 | 749 | 429 | 748 |




| Geographic District Achievement over Time in ELA | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|
| CMAS ELA | 2018 | | 2019 | | 2022 | | 2023 | | 2024 | |
| Grade/Level | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS |
| 3 | 4,570 | 748 | 4,425 | 750 | 4,044 | 755 | 4,050 | 756 | 3,987 | 757 |
| 4 | 4,552 | 753 | 4,607 | 753 | 4,068 | 754 | 4,043 | 756 | 4,052 | 756 |
| 5 | 4,590 | 753 | 4,580 | 755 | 4,109 | 757 | 4,063 | 761 | 4,055 | 761 |
| Elementary | 15,910 | 752 | 15,791 | 753 | 13,931 | 756 | 13,948 | 758 | 13,837 | 759 |
| 6 | 4,599 | 754 | 4,565 | 756 | 4,062 | 758 | 3,997 | 759 | 4,056 | 762 |
| 7 | 4,342 | 751 | 4,471 | 754 | 4,004 | 756 | 3,836 | 761 | 3,853 | 763 |
| 8 | 3,990 | 748 | 4,068 | 750 | 3,445 | 757 | 3,640 | 757 | 3,525 | 756 |
| Middle | 10,733 | 750 | 10,925 | 753 | 9,801 | 756 | 9,681 | 758 | 9,691 | 759 |
| Overall | 26,643 | 751 | 26,716 | 753 | 23,732 | 756 | 23,629 | 758 | 23,528 | 759 |

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. Since last school year, overall mean scale score decreased by 0.7 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Douglas County) for the past five years. Overall, the school performs lower than their geo. district by 10.9 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 | 2018 | 2019 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | |
| Student Subgroup | MSS | MSS | MSS | MSS | MSS | |
| F/R Lunch | Y | -- | n<16 | 741.3 | 735.2 | 741.6 |
| | N | -- | 752.6 | 750.6 | 749.8 | 749.2 |
| Minority | Y | -- | 750.9 | 743.5 | 749.2 | 745.0 |
| | N | -- | 752.2 | 751.0 | 748.8 | 749.1 |
| IEP | Y | -- | n<16 | 720.6 | 727.9 | 723.2 |
| | N | -- | 753.7 | 753.3 | 752.9 | 750.1 |
| EL | Y | -- | n<16 | n<16 | n<16 | n<16 |
| | N | -- | 752.2 | 750.1 | 748.9 | 748.6 |
| GT | Y | -- | n<16 | n<16 | n<16 | n<16 |
| | N | -- | 750.1 | 748.0 | 747.8 | 747.9 |
| Schoolwide | -- | 752 | 750 | 749 | 748 | |

| Geographic District Gap Trends over Time in ELA | | | | | | |
|---|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| CMAS ELA | 2018 | 2019 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | |
| Student Subgroup | MSS | MSS | MSS | MSS | MSS | |
| F/R Lunch | Y | 729.1 | 731.0 | 733.2 | 734.2 | 739.8 |
| | N | 754.3 | 755.7 | 758.2 | 761.0 | 762.7 |
| Minority | Y | 745.9 | 747.6 | 752.4 | 755.2 | 755.4 |
| | N | 753.3 | 755.2 | 757.6 | 759.6 | 760.8 |
| IEP | Y | 714.4 | 713.8 | 720.1 | 722.0 | 723.5 |
| | N | 755.0 | 757.0 | 760.2 | 762.5 | 763.2 |
| EL | Y | 730.7 | 732.8 | 736.7 | 738.5 | 738.6 |
| | N | 752.9 | 754.7 | 757.4 | 759.7 | 760.6 |
| GT | Y | 785.1 | 786.4 | 790.8 | 790.6 | 790.8 |
| | N | 746.9 | 747.8 | 755.1 | 751.4 | 752.7 |
| Geographic District | 751 | 753 | 756 | 758 | 759 | |

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, general education students outperformed their IEP peers, overall, Douglas County outperformed the school. In 2024, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: minority, IEP, - 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 | | 2024 | |
| Grade/Level | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP |
| 4 | -- | -- | 21 | 56.0 | 65 | 58.0 | 70 | 49.0 | 74 | 68.0 |
| 5 | -- | -- | n < 20 | -- | -- | -- | 71 | 84.0 | 68 | 33.5 |
| Elementary | -- | -- | 40 | 46.5 | 65 | 58.0 | 141 | 65.0 | 142 | 55.0 |
| 6 | -- | -- | n < 20 | -- | 35 | 50.0 | 53 | 24.0 | 69 | 19.0 |
| 7 | -- | -- | n < 20 | -- | -- | -- | 41 | 44.0 | 46 | 37.5 |
| 8 | -- | -- | n < 20 | -- | 41 | 46.0 | 49 | 33.0 | 39 | 32.0 |
| Middle | -- | -- | 28 | 60.5 | 76 | 48.5 | 143 | 32.0 | 154 | 28.5 |
| Overall | -- | -- | 68 | 53.5 | 141 | 54.0 | 284 | 48.0 | 296 | 40.5 |



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 | | 2024 | |
| Grade/Level | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP |
| 4 | 4,143 | 52.0 | 4,358 | 49.0 | 3,506 | 54.0 | 3,809 | 53.0 | 3,825 | 53.0 |
| 5 | 4,155 | 54.0 | 4,272 | 52.0 | -- | -- | 3,804 | 52.0 | 3,817 | 54.0 |
| Elementary | 10,159 | 56.0 | 10,651 | 55.0 | 4,929 | 60.0 | 9,279 | 56.0 | 9,278 | 57.0 |
| 6 | 2,147 | 54.0 | 4,234 | 65.0 | 3,398 | 65.0 | 3,709 | 65.0 | 3,781 | 65.0 |
| 7 | 3,707 | 45.0 | 4,057 | 47.0 | -- | -- | 3,460 | 57.0 | 3,555 | 52.0 |
| 8 | 3,246 | 49.0 | 3,642 | 46.0 | 2,802 | 49.0 | 3,273 | 52.0 | 3,211 | 48.0 |
| Middle | 9,100 | 48.0 | 9,912 | 49.0 | 4,777 | 53.0 | 8,776 | 56.0 | 8,911 | 53.0 |
| Overall | 3,246 | 49.0 | 20,563 | 52.0 | 9,706 | 56.0 | 18,055 | 56.0 | 18,189 | 55.0 |



Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs show schoolwide growth on the ELA state assessment. Since last year, student growth decreased by -7.5 percentile points. In 2024, overall student growth was approaching state expectations and was below the geo. district. Overall student growth for the geo. district has increased over time.

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?


| Subgroup Growth Gap Trends over Time in ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|------|------|------|------|------|
| CMAS ELA | | 2018 | 2019 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| Student Subgroup | | MGP | MGP | MGP | MGP | MGP |
| F/R Lunch | Y | -- | n<20 | n<20 | 35.0 | 36.0 |
| | N | -- | 53.0 | 53.0 | 49.0 | 41.0 |
| Minority | Y | -- | n<20 | 53.0 | 54.0 | 32.5 |
| | N | -- | 56.0 | 54.0 | 45.0 | 42.5 |
| IEP | Y | -- | n<20 | n<20 | n<20 | 44.0 |
| | N | -- | 54.0 | 55.5 | 47.5 | 40.5 |
| EL | Y | -- | n<20 | n<20 | n<20 | n<20 |
| | N | -- | 53.0 | 55.5 | 48.0 | 41.0 |
| GT | Y | -- | n<20 | n<20 | n<20 | n<20 |
| | N | -- | 53.5 | 54.0 | 48.0 | 40.5 |
| Schoolwide | | -- | 53.5 | 54.0 | 48.0 | 40.5 |

| Subgroup Growth Gap Trends over Time in ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|------|------|------|------|------|
| CMAS ELA | | 2018 | 2019 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| Student Subgroup | | MGP | MGP | MGP | MGP | MGP |
| F/R Lunch | Y | 50.0 | 46.0 | 47.0 | 47.0 | 48.0 |
| | N | 48.5 | 53.0 | 57.0 | 57.0 | 56.0 |
| Minority | Y | 53.0 | 52.0 | 55.0 | 56.0 | 53.0 |
| | N | 47.0 | 52.0 | 57.0 | 56.0 | 55.0 |
| IEP | Y | 49.0 | 47.0 | 50.0 | 47.0 | 49.0 |
| | N | 49.0 | 52.0 | 57.0 | 57.0 | 55.0 |
| EL | Y | 54.0 | 52.0 | 52.0 | 54.0 | 52.5 |
| | N | 48.0 | 52.0 | 56.0 | 56.0 | 55.0 |
| GT | Y | 53.0 | 58.0 | 63.0 | 64.0 | 60.0 |
| | N | 48.0 | 51.0 | 56.0 | 54.0 | 53.0 |
| Geographic District | | 49.0 | 52.0 | 56.0 | 56.0 | 55.0 |

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, overall, Douglas County outperformed the school. In 2023, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: FRL, minority, IEP, - 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 | 2018 | | 2019 | | 2022 | | 2023 | | 2024 | |
| Grade/Level | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS |
| 3 | -- | -- | 30 | 737 | 57 | 744 | 87 | 746 | 85 | 747 |
| 4 | -- | -- | 27 | 746 | 83 | 743 | 85 | 736 | 85 | 751 |
| 5 | -- | -- | 37 | 729 | 62 | 759 | 85 | 751 | 78 | 747 |
| Elementary | -- | -- | 94 | 737 | 202 | 748 | 257 | 744 | 248 | 748 |
| 6 | -- | -- | 22 | 743 | 47 | 736 | 58 | 746 | 84 | 738 |
| 7 | -- | -- | 31 | 726 | 62 | 735 | 52 | 740 | 53 | 748 |
| 8 | -- | -- | 22 | 741 | 49 | 729 | 53 | 730 | 46 | 734 |
| Middle | -- | -- | 75 | 736 | 158 | 733 | 163 | 739 | 183 | 740 |
| Overall | -- | -- | 169 | 736 | 360 | 742 | 420 | 742 | 431 | 745 |

| Geographic District Achievement over Time in Math | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|
| CMAS Math | 2018 | | 2019 | | 2022 | | 2023 | | 2024 | |
| Grade/Level | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS |
| 3 | 4,559 | 747 | 4,445 | 751 | 4,040 | 756 | 4,081 | 758 | 4,007 | 759 |
| 4 | 4,537 | 744 | 4,623 | 745 | 4,065 | 747 | 4,084 | 748 | 4,082 | 751 |
| 5 | 4,604 | 744 | 4,603 | 745 | 4,118 | 750 | 4,095 | 752 | 4,082 | 754 |
| Elementary | 15,871 | 745 | 15,864 | 747 | 13,942 | 751 | 14,069 | 752 | 13,928 | 754 |
| 6 | 4,583 | 745 | 4,594 | 746 | 4,093 | 744 | 4,031 | 747 | 4,089 | 749 |
| 7 | 4,350 | 742 | 4,491 | 745 | 3,990 | 744 | 3,875 | 745 | 3,880 | 748 |
| 8 | 3,993 | 741 | 4,103 | 748 | 3,444 | 748 | 3,643 | 749 | 3,548 | 749 |
| Middle | 10,755 | 742 | 10,995 | 746 | 9,808 | 745 | 9,740 | 747 | 9,760 | 748 |
| Overall | 26,626 | 744 | 26,859 | 746 | 23,750 | 748 | 23,809 | 750 | 23,688 | 752 |

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. Since last school year, overall mean scale score increased by 2.5 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district () for the past five years. Overall, the school performs lower than their geo. district by 6.8 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 | | 2018 | 2019 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| Student Subgroup | MSS | MSS | MSS | MSS | MSS | MSS |
| F/R Lunch | Y | -- | n<16 | 732.6 | 729.0 | 735.8 |
| | N | -- | 736.6 | 742.5 | 743.1 | 746.0 |
| Minority | Y | -- | 739.2 | 730.7 | 735.2 | 740.3 |
| | N | -- | 735.4 | 743.9 | 743.4 | 745.9 |
| IEP | Y | -- | n<16 | 714.1 | 721.4 | 726.0 |
| | N | -- | 737.6 | 745.1 | 746.1 | 746.1 |
| EL | Y | -- | n<16 | n<16 | n<16 | 754.2 |
| | N | -- | 736.0 | 741.8 | 742.5 | 744.3 |
| GT | Y | -- | n<16 | n<16 | n<16 | n<16 |
| | N | -- | 733.5 | 740.0 | 740.9 | 744.2 |
| Schoolwide | -- | 736 | 742 | 742 | 745 | |

| Geographic District Gap Trends over Time in Math | | | | | | |
|--|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| CMAS Math | | 2018 | 2019 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| Student Subgroup | MSS | MSS | MSS | MSS | MSS | MSS |
| F/R Lunch | Y | 721.6 | 723.2 | 724.0 | 725.7 | 732.0 |
| | N | 746.7 | 749.0 | 750.7 | 752.7 | 755.2 |
| Minority | Y | 738.1 | 740.9 | 745.1 | 747.0 | 748.7 |
| | N | 745.8 | 748.4 | 749.7 | 751.2 | 752.8 |
| IEP | Y | 711.0 | 712.8 | 717.8 | 719.1 | 722.5 |
| | N | 747.0 | 749.6 | 751.9 | 753.5 | 754.9 |
| EL | Y | 725.8 | 729.3 | 733.3 | 735.0 | 736.6 |
| | N | 745.2 | 747.7 | 749.4 | 751.1 | 752.7 |
| GT | Y | 779.2 | 783.6 | 786.4 | 784.9 | 786.1 |
| | N | 739.2 | 740.3 | 747.3 | 742.5 | 744.6 |
| Geographic District | | 744 | 746 | 748 | 750 | 752 |

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, EL students outperformed their non-EL peers, overall, Douglas County outperformed the school. In 2023, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: minority, - 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 | | 2024 | |
| Grade/Level | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP |
| 4 | -- | -- | 21 | 69.0 | -- | -- | 70 | 43.5 | 75 | 65.0 |
| 5 | -- | -- | n < 20 | -- | 49 | 73.0 | 69 | 55.0 | 68 | 49.0 |
| Elementary | -- | -- | 39 | 37.0 | 49 | 73.0 | 139 | 51.0 | 143 | 60.0 |
| 6 | -- | -- | n < 20 | -- | -- | -- | 53 | 47.0 | 69 | 36.0 |
| 7 | -- | -- | n < 20 | -- | 48 | 30.0 | 40 | 62.5 | 46 | 48.0 |
| 8 | -- | -- | n < 20 | -- | -- | -- | 48 | 27.5 | 37 | 37.0 |
| Middle | -- | -- | 28 | 50.5 | 48 | 30.0 | 141 | 37.0 | 152 | 39.0 |
| Overall | -- | -- | 67 | 46.0 | 97 | 56.0 | 280 | 44.0 | 295 | 48.0 |



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 | | 2024 | |
| Grade/Level | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP |
| 4 | 4,115 | 58.0 | 4,342 | 60.0 | -- | -- | 3,800 | 51.0 | 3,841 | 51.0 |
| 5 | 4,151 | 48.0 | 4,251 | 49.0 | 3,538 | 53.0 | 3,785 | 48.0 | 3,826 | 52.0 |
| Elementary | 10,089 | 57.0 | 10,622 | 58.0 | 3,538 | 53.0 | 9,254 | 54.0 | 9,307 | 55.0 |
| 6 | 2,161 | 61.0 | 4,249 | 65.0 | -- | -- | 3,725 | 63.0 | 3,796 | 63.0 |
| 7 | 3,329 | 49.0 | 4,040 | 53.0 | 3,343 | 54.0 | 3,484 | 57.0 | 3,569 | 53.0 |
| 8 | 2,881 | 48.0 | 3,284 | 51.0 | -- | -- | 3,252 | 48.0 | 3,224 | 45.0 |
| Middle | 8,371 | 52.0 | 9,544 | 54.0 | 3,343 | 54.0 | 8,792 | 53.0 | 8,949 | 51.0 |
| Overall | 2,881 | 48.0 | 20,166 | 56.0 | 6,881 | 54.0 | 18,046 | 53.0 | 18,256 | 53.0 |



Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs show schoolwide growth on the Math state assessment. Since last year, student growth increased by 4 percentile points. In 2024, overall student growth was approaching state expectations and was below the geo. district. Overall student growth for the geo. district has increased over time.

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 | 2024 |
| Student Subgroup | | MGP | MGP | MGP | MGP | MGP |
| F/R Lunch | Y | -- | n<20 | n<20 | 42.5 | 38.5 |
| | N | -- | 45.0 | 56.5 | 44.0 | 49.0 |
| Minority | Y | -- | n<20 | n<20 | 46.0 | 52.0 |
| | N | -- | 47.0 | 54.5 | 43.0 | 47.0 |
| IEP | Y | -- | n<20 | n<20 | 39.5 | 64.0 |
| | N | -- | 48.0 | 59.0 | 45.5 | 48.0 |
| EL | Y | -- | n<20 | n<20 | n<20 | n<20 |
| | N | -- | 45.0 | 56.0 | 44.0 | 47.0 |
| GT | Y | -- | n<20 | n<20 | n<20 | n<20 |
| | N | -- | 49.0 | 54.5 | 44.0 | 48.0 |
| Schoolwide | | -- | 46.0 | 56.0 | 44.0 | 48.0 |

| Subgroup Growth Gap Trends over Time in Math | | | | | | |
|--|---|------|------|------|------|------|
| CMAS Math | | 2018 | 2019 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| Student Subgroup | | MGP | MGP | MGP | MGP | MGP |
| F/R Lunch | Y | 52.0 | 52.0 | 45.0 | 50.0 | 49.0 |
| | N | 48.0 | 57.0 | 54.0 | 54.0 | 54.0 |
| Minority | Y | 51.0 | 55.0 | 55.0 | 55.0 | 53.0 |
| | N | 48.0 | 56.0 | 53.0 | 52.0 | 53.0 |
| IEP | Y | 51.0 | 53.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 49.0 |
| | N | 48.0 | 56.0 | 54.0 | 54.0 | 53.0 |
| EL | Y | 51.0 | 57.0 | 53.0 | 54.0 | 53.0 |
| | N | 48.0 | 56.0 | 54.0 | 53.0 | 53.0 |
| GT | Y | 38.0 | 61.0 | 59.0 | 66.0 | 59.0 |
| | N | 49.0 | 55.0 | 53.0 | 52.0 | 52.0 |
| Geographic District | | 48.0 | 56.0 | 54.0 | 53.0 | 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): non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, minority students outperformed their non-minority peers, IEP students outperformed their non-gen. ed. peers, overall, Douglas County outperformed the school. In 2024, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: FRL, minority, - 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 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 | 2020 | | | 2021 | | | 2022 | | | 2023 | | | 2024 | | |
| Grade/Level | N | MGP | % On Track | N | MGP | % On Track | N | MGP | % On Track | N | MGP | % On Track | N | MGP | % On Track |
| Elementary | -- | -- | -- | n<20 | -- | -- | n<20 | -- | -- | n<20 | -- | -- | n < 20 | n<20 | - |
| Middle | -- | -- | -- | n<20 | -- | -- | n<20 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | n < 20 | n<20 | - |
| High | -- | -- | -- | n<20 | -- | -- | n<20 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | n < 20 | n<20 | - |
| Overall | -- | -- | -- | n<20 | -- | -- | n<20 | -- | -- | n<20 | -- | -- | n < 20 | - | - |

| Geographic District Growth over Time on ACCESS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|------|
| ACCESS | 2020 | | | 2021 | | | 2022 | | | 2023 | | | 2024 | | |
| Grade/Level | N | MGP | % On | N | MGP | % On | N | MGP | % On | N | MGP | % On | N | MGP | % On |
| Elementary | 1,148 | 58.0 | 75.5% | 796 | 65.0 | 67.4% | 812 | 66.0 | 73.5% | 90 | 59.0 | 60.4% | 928 | 62.0 | -- |
| Middle | 300 | 47.0 | 33.7% | 244 | 61.5 | 31.9% | 208 | 47.0 | 23.3% | 88 | 49.5 | 15.6% | 238 | 59.0 | -- |
| High | 227 | 60.0 | 32.4% | 247 | 51.0 | 34.2% | 243 | 56.0 | 25.5% | 44 | 58.5 | 20.0% | 288 | 59.0 | -- |
| Overall | 1,675 | 57.0 | 62.1% | 1,287 | 61.0 | 55.8% | 1,263 | 59.0 | 58.4% | 1,442 | 61.0 | 58.4% | 1,454 | 61.0 | -- |

^^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 2024, overall student growth exceeded state expectations and was above the geo. district. 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 | 2018 | | 2019 [^] | | 2022 | | 2023 | | 2024 | |
| | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS |
| PSAT (9th)* | -- | -- | n<16 | -- | 47 | 522 | 43 | 498 | 37 | 523 |
| PSAT (10th)* | -- | -- | 18 | 514 | 26 | 563 | 39 | 556 | 33 | 528 |
| PSAT (9th&10th) | -- | -- | 28 | 506 | 73 | 537 | 82 | 526 | 70 | 525 |
| SAT (11th) | -- | -- | -- | -- | 19 | 562 | 21 | 588 | 26 | 600 |
| Overall | -- | -- | 28 | 506 | 92 | 542 | 103 | 539 | 96 | 545 |

| Geographic District Achievement over Time in EBRW | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|------------|-------------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|
| PSAT/SAT EBRW | 2018 | | 2019 [^] | | 2022 | | 2023 | | 2024 | |
| | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS |
| PSAT (9th)* | 4,557 | 487 | 4,602 | 490 | 4,159 | 483 | 3,904 | 483 | 3,973 | 486 |
| PSAT (10th)* | 4,429 | 515 | 4,504 | 510 | 4,181 | 514 | 4,051 | 507 | 3,828 | 515 |
| PSAT (9th&10th) | 8,986 | 500 | 9,106 | 500 | 8,340 | 498 | 7,955 | 496 | 7,801 | 500 |
| SAT (11th) | 4,499 | 547 | 4,441 | 545 | 4,331 | 538 | 4,274 | 540 | 4,142 | 538 |
| Overall | 13,485 | 516 | 13,547 | 515 | 12,671 | 512 | 12,229 | 511 | 11,943 | 513 |

*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 2018 to 2024, overall student achievement increased by 39.3 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score increased by 6.9 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Douglas County) for the past five years. Overall, the school outperforms their geo. district by 32.2 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 | 2018 | 2019 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| Student Subgroup | MSS | MSS | MSS | MSS | MSS |
| F/R Lunch | Y | -- | n<16 | n<16 | n<16 |
| | N | -- | 506 | 542 | 538 |
| Minority | Y | -- | n<16 | n<16 | 531 |
| | N | -- | 498 | 544 | 540 |
| IEP | Y | -- | n<16 | n<16 | n<16 |
| | N | -- | 506 | 546 | 545 |
| EL | Y | -- | n<16 | n<16 | n<16 |
| | N | -- | 506 | 542 | 539 |
| GT | Y | -- | n<16 | n<16 | n<16 |
| | N | -- | 506 | 542 | 539 |
| Schoolwide | -- | 506 | 542 | 539 | 545 |

| Geographic District Gap Trends over Time in EBRW | | | | | |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|
| PSAT/SAT EBRW | 2018 | 2019 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| Student Subgroup | MSS | MSS | MSS | MSS | MSS |
| F/R Lunch | Y | 456 | 454 | 439 | 436 |
| | N | 522 | 521 | 519 | 519 |
| Minority | Y | 499 | 499 | 495 | 494 |
| | N | 521 | 520 | 518 | 518 |
| IEP | Y | 412 | 413 | 417 | 419 |
| | N | 525 | 523 | 519 | 519 |
| EL | Y | 423 | 415 | 415 | 404 |
| | N | 519 | 519 | 516 | 516 |
| GT | Y | 626 | 618 | 614 | 615 |
| | N | 507 | 504 | 493 | 492 |
| Geographic District | 516 | 515 | 512 | 511 | 513 |

PSAT/SAT EBRW: Subgroup Gap Trends Graphs



PSAT/SAT EBRW: 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. PSAT/SAT results show the following (if applicable): non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, overall, the school outperformed. In 2024, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: 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 | | 2024 | |
| | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP |
| CMAS 8 to PSAT 9^ | Not available | | | | | | | | | |
| PSAT 9 to PSAT 10 | -- | -- | n < 20 | -- | 21 | 39.0 | 36 | 47.5 | 30 | 42.0 |
| PSAT 10 to SAT 11 | -- | -- | -- | -- | n < 20 | -- | 20 | 41.5 | 26 | 73.0 |
| Overall | -- | -- | n < 20 | -- | 39 | 50.0 | 56 | 47.5 | 56 | 54.0 |

^To align with the state, the CARS report does not include 9th Grade CMAS to PSAT EBRW growth.

| Geographic District Growth over Time in EBRW | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|
| PSAT/SAT EBRW | 2018 | | 2019 | | 2022 | | 2023 | | 2024 | |
| | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP |
| CMAS 8 to PSAT 9^ | Not available | | | | | | | | | |
| PSAT 9 to PSAT 10 | 2,123 | 69.0 | 4,177 | 53.0 | 3,434 | 55.0 | 3,662 | 52.0 | 3,463 | 55.0 |
| PSAT 10 to SAT 11 | 4,150 | 58.0 | 4,103 | 57.0 | 3,650 | 57.0 | 3,834 | 52.0 | 3,713 | 54.0 |
| Overall | 9,131 | 65.0 | 8,280 | 55.0 | 7,084 | 57.0 | 7,496 | 52.0 | 7,176 | 55.0 |

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. Since last year, student growth increased by 6.5 percentile points. In 2024, 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.

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 | 2024 | |
|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Student | MGP | MGP | MGP | MGP | MGP | |
| F/R Lunch | Y | -- | n<20 | n<20 | n<20 | |
| Lunch | N | -- | n<20 | 51.5 | 48.0 | 61.0 |
| Minority | Y | -- | n<20 | n<20 | n<20 | |
| | N | -- | n<20 | 50.0 | 47.0 | 54.0 |
| IEP | Y | -- | n<20 | n<20 | n<20 | |
| | N | -- | n<20 | 49.5 | 47.0 | 54.0 |
| EL | Y | -- | n<20 | n<20 | n<20 | |
| | N | -- | n<20 | 50.0 | 47.5 | 54.0 |
| GT | Y | -- | n<20 | n<20 | n<20 | |
| | N | -- | n<20 | 50.0 | 47.5 | 54.0 |
| Schoolwide | -- | -- | 50.0 | 47.5 | 54.0 | |

| PSAT/SAT EBRW | 2018 | 2019 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Student Subgroup | MGP | MGP | MGP | MGP | MGP | |
| F/R Lunch | Y | 52.0 | 49.0 | 47.0 | 44.0 | 46.0 |
| Lunch | N | 65.0 | 56.0 | 57.0 | 53.0 | 56.0 |
| Minority | Y | 60.0 | 55.0 | 55.0 | 50.0 | 52.0 |
| | N | 66.0 | 56.0 | 57.0 | 53.0 | 56.0 |
| IEP | Y | 52.0 | 46.0 | 48.5 | 47.0 | 49.0 |
| | N | 65.0 | 56.0 | 57.0 | 52.0 | 55.0 |
| EL | Y | 51.0 | 47.0 | 46.0 | 44.5 | 36.0 |
| | N | 65.0 | 56.0 | 57.0 | 52.0 | 55.0 |
| GT | Y | 77.5 | 63.0 | 64.0 | 60.0 | 60.0 |
| | N | 63.0 | 54.5 | 55.0 | 50.0 | 54.0 |
| Geographic District | 65.0 | 55.0 | 57.0 | 52.0 | 55.0 | |

PSAT/SAT EBRW: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends Graphs



PSAT/SAT EBRW: Subgroup Local Comparison Graphs



Growth Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show the growth of student subgroups on the EBRW state assessment over time. PSAT/SAT results show the following (if applicable): non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, general education students outperformed their IEP peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, non-GT students outperformed their GT peers, overall, Douglas County outperformed the school.

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 | 2018 | | 2019 [^] | | 2022 | | 2023 | | 2024 | |
| | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS |
| PSAT (9th)* | -- | -- | n<16 | -- | 47 | 481 | 43 | 418 | 37 | 442 |
| PSAT (10th)* | -- | -- | 18 | 485 | 26 | 508 | 39 | 515 | 33 | 499 |
| PSAT (9th&10th) | -- | -- | 28 | 471 | 73 | 491 | 82 | 464 | 70 | 469 |
| SAT (11th) | -- | -- | -- | -- | 19 | 511 | 21 | 561 | 26 | 562 |
| Overall | -- | -- | 28 | 471 | 92 | 495 | 103 | 484 | 96 | 494 |

| Geographic District Achievement over Time in Math | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|------------|-------------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|
| PSAT/SAT Math | 2018 | | 2019 [^] | | 2022 | | 2023 | | 2024 | |
| | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS | N | MSS |
| PSAT (9th)* | 4,559 | 477 | 4,604 | 479 | 4,162 | 469 | 3,927 | 476 | 3,982 | 465 |
| PSAT (10th)* | 4,430 | 502 | 4,504 | 491 | 4,185 | 484 | 4,063 | 482 | 3,842 | 483 |
| PSAT (9th&10th) | 8,989 | 489 | 9,108 | 485 | 8,347 | 476 | 7,990 | 479 | 7,824 | 474 |
| SAT (11th) | 4,499 | 541 | 4,441 | 542 | 4,336 | 522 | 4,290 | 521 | 4,157 | 520 |
| Overall | 13,488 | 507 | 13,549 | 504 | 12,683 | 492 | 12,280 | 494 | 11,981 | 490 |

*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



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 2018 to 2024, overall student achievement increased by 22.8 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score increased by 10.4 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Douglas County) for the past five years. Overall, the school outperforms their geo. district by 4.4 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?

| Subgroup Achievement Gap Trends over Time in Math | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| PSAT/SAT Math | 2018 | 2019 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | |
| Student Subgroup | MSS | MSS | MSS | MSS | MSS | |
| F/R Lunch | Y | -- | n<16 | n<16 | n<16 | n<16 |
| | N | -- | 471 | 494 | 482 | 499 |
| Minority | Y | -- | n<16 | n<16 | 478 | 473 |
| | N | -- | 473 | 498 | 485 | 499 |
| IEP | Y | -- | n<16 | n<16 | n<16 | n<16 |
| | N | -- | 471 | 498 | 487 | 501 |
| EL | Y | -- | n<16 | n<16 | n<16 | n<16 |
| | N | -- | 471 | 495 | 484 | 494 |
| GT | Y | -- | n<16 | n<16 | n<16 | n<16 |
| | N | -- | 471 | 495 | 484 | 493 |
| Schoolwide | -- | 471 | 495 | 484 | 494 | |

| Geographic District Gap Trends over Time in Math | | | | | | |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|-----|
| PSAT/SAT Math | 2018 | 2019 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | |
| Student Subgroup | MSS | MSS | MSS | MSS | MSS | |
| F/R Lunch | Y | 445 | 439 | 418 | 419 | 430 |
| | N | 512 | 510 | 500 | 503 | 501 |
| Minority | Y | 493 | 489 | 478 | 479 | 477 |
| | N | 511 | 508 | 497 | 500 | 495 |
| IEP | Y | 394 | 401 | 398 | 408 | 395 |
| | N | 516 | 512 | 499 | 501 | 499 |
| EL | Y | 420 | 414 | 409 | 409 | 390 |
| | N | 510 | 507 | 496 | 498 | 494 |
| GT | Y | 625 | 614 | 603 | 603 | 600 |
| | N | 497 | 492 | 472 | 474 | 468 |
| Geographic District | 507 | 504 | 492 | 494 | 490 | |



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-minority students outperformed their minority peers, overall, the school outperformed District. In 2024, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: - 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 | | 2024 | |
| | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP |
| CMAS 8 to PSAT 9^ | -- | -- | n < 20 | -- | 29 | 77.0 | 27 | 45.0 | 27 | 50.0 |
| PSAT 9 to PSAT 10 | -- | -- | n < 20 | -- | 21 | 69.0 | 36 | 73.0 | 30 | 89.0 |
| PSAT 10 to SAT 11 | -- | -- | -- | -- | n < 20 | -- | 20 | 53.0 | 26 | 54.0 |
| Overall | -- | -- | n < 20 | -- | 68 | 71.0 | 83 | 62.0 | 83 | 63.0 |

| Geographic District Growth over Time in Math | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| PSAT/SAT Math | 2018 | | 2019 | | 2022 | | 2023 | | 2024 | |
| | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP | N | MGP |
| CMAS 8 to PSAT 9^ | 2,851 | 63.0 | 3,103 | 62.0 | 2,542 | 57.0 | 2,843 | 60.0 | 2,998 | 52.0 |
| PSAT 9 to PSAT 10 | 1,793 | 66.0 | 4,177 | 59.0 | 3,434 | 53.0 | 3,662 | 54.0 | 3,463 | 53.0 |
| PSAT 10 to SAT 11 | 4,150 | 60.0 | 4,103 | 61.0 | 3,650 | 57.0 | 3,834 | 55.0 | 3,713 | 57.0 |
| Overall | 8,794 | 62.0 | 11,383 | 60.0 | 9,626 | 56.0 | 10,339 | 56.0 | 10,174 | 54.0 |

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



Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show schoolwide growth on the EBRW state assessment. Since last year, student growth increased by 1 percentile points. In 2024, 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.

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 | 2018 | 2019 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Student Subgroup | MGP | MGP | MGP | MGP | MGP |
| F/R Lunch | Y | -- | n<20 | n<20 | n<20 |
| | N | -- | n<20 | 73.0 | 63.0 |
| Minority | Y | -- | n<20 | n<20 | n<20 |
| | N | -- | n<20 | 73.0 | 59.0 |
| IEP | Y | -- | n<20 | n<20 | n<20 |
| | N | -- | n<20 | 73.0 | 62.0 |
| EL | Y | -- | n<20 | n<20 | n<20 |
| | N | -- | n<20 | 71.0 | 62.0 |
| GT | Y | -- | n<20 | n<20 | n<20 |
| | N | -- | n<20 | 71.0 | 62.0 |
| Schoolwide | -- | -- | 71.0 | 62.0 | 63.0 |

| PSAT/SAT Math | 2018 | 2019 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Student Subgroup | MGP | MGP | MGP | MGP | MGP |
| F/R Lunch | Y | 56.0 | 52.0 | 43.5 | 43.0 |
| | N | 63.0 | 61.0 | 57.0 | 57.0 |
| Minority | Y | 60.0 | 60.0 | 52.0 | 53.0 |
| | N | 63.0 | 60.0 | 57.0 | 57.0 |
| IEP | Y | 51.0 | 52.0 | 41.0 | 50.0 |
| | N | 63.0 | 61.0 | 57.0 | 57.0 |
| EL | Y | 50.0 | 52.0 | 44.0 | 47.0 |
| | N | 63.0 | 61.0 | 56.0 | 57.0 |
| GT | Y | 64.0 | 62.0 | 65.0 | 61.0 |
| | N | 62.0 | 60.0 | 55.0 | 55.0 |
| Geographic District | 62.0 | 60.0 | 56.0 | 56.0 | 54.0 |

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, general education students outperformed their IEP peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, non-GT students outperformed their GT peers, overall, Douglas County outperformed the school.

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 | 4-year | 100% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | N | 6-year | 91% | 89% | 100% | N/A |
| Minority | Y | 4-year | 100% | 100% | 100% | N/A |
| | N | 6-year | 91% | 88% | 100% | N/A |
| IEP | Y | 6-year | 50% | N/A | 100% | N/A |
| | N | 4-year | 100% | 89% | 100% | N/A |
| EL | Y | 6-year | N/A | N/A | 100% | N/A |
| | N | 6-year | 92% | 89% | 100% | N/A |
| GT | Y | -- | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | N | 6-year | 92% | 89% | 100% | N/A |
| Schoolwide | | 6-year | 92% | 89% | 100% | N/A |

| 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 | 7-year | 72% | 74% | 75% | 78% |
| | N | 7-year | 95% | 96% | 96% | 97% |
| Minority | Y | 7-year | 86% | 86% | 87% | 89% |
| | N | 7-year | 93% | 94% | 94% | 96% |
| IEP | Y | 7-year | 82% | 82% | 80% | 87% |
| | N | 7-year | 92% | 93% | 94% | 95% |
| EL | Y | 6-year | 75% | 79% | 81% | 79% |
| | N | 7-year | 92% | 92% | 93% | 95% |
| GT | Y | 4-year | 98% | 97% | >= 98% | 98% |
| | N | 7-year | 90% | 91% | -- | 94% |
| Geographic District | | 7-year | 91% | 92% | 92% | 94% |

*CDE changed public reporting for graduation rate and dropout rate data for the 2023-24 school year. Non-numeric values may be reported for small student groups.



Graduation Rate: Subgroup Local Comparison Graphs



Graduation rates in Colorado are shown through anticipated graduation year cohort groups. 4-year represents the class of 2023-24. 5-year represents the class of 2022-23, 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 cannot be reported due to low student counts. The best of rate for the geo. district is the 7 year rate of 94%. The best of rate for students eligible for free or reduced price lunch is the 4 year rate of 100%. The best of rate for minority students is the 4 year rate of 100%. The best of rate for students with disabilities is the 6 year rate of 100%. The best of rate for English Learners is the 6 year rate of 100%.

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 | | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |
| Student Subgroup | | Rate | Rate | Rate | Rate | Rate |
| F/R Lunch | Y | -- | -- | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | N | -- | -- | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.3% |
| Minority | Y | -- | -- | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | N | -- | -- | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.3% |
| IEP | Y | -- | -- | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | N | -- | -- | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.3% |
| EL | Y | -- | -- | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | N | -- | -- | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.3% |
| GT | Y | -- | -- | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | N | -- | -- | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.3% |
| Schoolwide | | -- | -- | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.3% |

| Geographic District Subgroup Dropout Gap Trends over Time | | | | | | |
|---|---|------|------|------|------|---------|
| Dropout Rate | | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023* |
| Student Subgroup | | Rate | Rate | Rate | Rate | Rate |
| F/R Lunch | Y | 1.8% | 2.3% | 1.3% | 3.6% | 4.1% |
| | N | 0.4% | 0.3% | 0.5% | 0.5% | 0.6% |
| Minority | Y | 1.1% | 1.2% | 1.1% | 1.7% | -- |
| | N | 0.4% | 0.3% | 0.4% | 0.5% | <= 0.5% |
| IEP | Y | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.9% | 1.5% |
| | N | 0.5% | 0.5% | 0.6% | 0.9% | 0.9% |
| EL | Y | 2.1% | 2.2% | 3.1% | 2.4% | 3.3% |
| | N | 0.5% | 0.5% | 0.5% | 0.8% | 0.9% |
| GT | Y | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.1% | <= 0.5% |
| | N | 0.6% | 0.6% | 0.7% | 1.0% | -- |
| Geographic District | | 0.6% | 0.6% | 0.6% | 0.9% | 1.0% |

Dropout Rate: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends Graphs



Dropout Rate: Subgroup Local Comparison Graphs



*CDE changed public reporting for graduation rate and dropout rate data for the 2023-24 school year. Non-numeric values may be reported for small student groups.

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 had no change, minority student dropout rates had no change, 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, 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 | 2020* | | 2021 | | 2022 | | 2023 | | 2024 | |
| Category | N | Rate | N | Rate | N | Rate | N | Rate | N | Rate |
| 2 year | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | - | - |
| 4 year | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | - | - |
| CTE | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | - | - |
| Schoolwide | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | - | - |

Matriculation rates, like graduation and dropout rates, are on a one-year lag. Therefore, data for the current reporting year (2023-24) represent outcomes for the class of 2022-23. Schoolwide matriculation rates are the only rates used for accountability.


| Geo. District Matriculation Rate Trends over Time | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Matriculation | 2020* | | 2021 | | 2022 | | 2023 | | 2024 | |
| Category | N | Rate | N | Rate | N | Rate | N | Rate | N | Rate |
| 2 year | -- | -- | 396 | 8.4% | 382 | 8.0% | 488 | 9.8% | 512 | 10.4% |
| 4 year | -- | -- | 2,637 | 55.8% | 2,650 | 55.2% | 2,584 | 51.9% | 2,720 | 55.0% |
| CTE | -- | -- | 439 | 9.3% | 556 | 11.6% | 187 | 3.8% | 188 | 3.8% |
| Geo. District | -- | -- | 3,264 | 69.1% | 3,353 | 69.8% | 3,134 | 62.9% | 3,336 | 67.5% |

* 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 Douglas County. In 2024, school matriculation rates exceeded state expectations and were above the geo. district.

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.

Financial Performance Metrics

Enrollment

-How has the school's enrollment varied over time?

| Enrollment | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Metric | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| Actual Funded Pupil Count | 517.5 | 591.0 | 792.9 | 928.9 | 926.1 |
| One-Year Enrollment Variance | +100.0% | +14.2% | +34.2% | +17.2% | -0.3% |
| Three-Year Enrollment Variance | +0.0% | +0.0% | +53.2% | +57.2% | +16.8% |



Enrollment is the keystone of a school's financial viability. The greatest amount of unencumbered funds comes from PPR. These metrics demonstrate whether a school has the ability to maintain or grow enrollment in a sustainable way that supports financial health. This report calculates the 1-year and 3-year changes as a

Debt

-How has the school been able to cover its debt obligations?

-To what extent has the school relied on borrowed funds to finance its operations?

| Debt | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Metric | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| Debt Service Coverage | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.0494 | 21.327 |
| Debt to Asset Ratio | 0 | 0.3944 | 0.3881 | 0.2976 | 0.2648 |

Controlling occupancy related debt is critical to a sustainable budget. This section considers if the school is in default of debt, has a healthy debt service coverage score, and a Debt to Asset Ratio that is within reasonable range.

Debt service coverage = (Net change in FB) / (Annual Prin, int & Lease), should be equal to or better than 1.1

Debt to Asset Ratio = (total liabilities /


Balance Sheet

-Has the school maintained the appropriate unrestricted fund balance to provide for unexpected changes in revenue or expenses?

-How has the school's unassigned fund balance changed over time?

-To what extent can the school pay its short-term obligations?

| Balance Sheet | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|---------|--------|--------|
| Metric | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| Months of Unassigned Fund Balance on Hand | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.64 | 3.21 | 4.03 |
| Change in Unassigned Fund Balance from Prior Year | +0.0% | +0.0% | +670.8% | +64.3% | +37.8% |
| Current Ratio | 0.00 | 2.54 | 2.58 | 3.36 | 3.78 |




The balance sheet is a snapshot of how much cash or how much debt a school has. From this we can assess if a school has met reserve requirements, has adequate cash to manage expenses, and a healthy current ratio which measures the balance between assets and liabilities. Months of unassigned fund balance on hand to a degree that ensures near term liabilities will be met. A trend of positive growth in unassigned fund balance year over year. As well as, the current ratio = (total liabilities / total assets), should be equal to or greater than 1.1

Operating Margin

-To what extent is the school living within their means?

-How has the school's operating margin changed over time?

| Operating Margin | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| Metric | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| Operating Margin | 0.0% | 0.0% | 17.0% | 9.3% | 8.6% |
| 3-Year Average Operating Margin | 0.0% | 5.3% | 12.3% | 11.0% | 11.2% |



Operating margin measures whether a school can manage expenses and spend less than the revenue received. The ability to control spending and maintain established reserves is key to sustaining financial health.

Operating margin = Net Change in Fund Balance / total revenue, this value should be positive.
3-year average = Total 3 yr Net Inc / Total 3 yr Rev.,

Financial Performance Narrative

Ascent Classical Academy Douglas County ended the year with sufficient reserves to satisfy the TABOR reserve requirement. The school's funded-pupil count came in higher than the prior year and the school ended the year with 4.02 months of cash on hand and sufficient current assets to cover liabilities. The school experienced a positive operating margin of 8.63%.


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 Narrative

CSI was not made aware of any issues related to the organizational performance of Ascent Classical Academy Douglas County in the 2023-2024 school year. Ascent Classical Academy Douglas County had no organizational performance issues in the prior school year. Current year results show similar organizational performance compared to prior year.

| Trends in Non-Compliance | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Category | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| Governance | | | | | |
| "Is the school complying with applicable governance requirements?" | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Education Program | | | | | |
| "Is the school fulfilling obligations and expectations relating to the educational program?" | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Diversity, Equity of Access, and Inclusion | | | | | |
| "Is the school protecting the rights of all students?" | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Financial Management | | | | | |
| "Is the school satisfying financial reporting and compliance requirements?" | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| School Operations and Environment | | | | | |
| "Is the school fulfilling obligations and expectations relating to the operational requirements?" | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Additional Obligations | | | | | |
| "Is the school complying with all other obligations?" | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Overall | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |




| Instances of Non-Compliance | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------|------|-----------|
| Year | Category | Type | Narrative |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Organizational Performance Metrics


Diversity, Equity of Access, and Inclusion Metrics

- Is the school supporting students in reading at grade-level? (*only reported for schools serving K-3)
- Is the school supporting students and families in making post-secondary enrollment accessible? (*only reported for schools serving 9-12)

| Diversity, Equity of Access, and Inclusion | | | | | |
|--|------|------|-------|------|------|
| | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| READ Plan Exit Rate* | -- | -- | 11.1% | 6.2% | 8.6% |
| FAFSA Completion Rate* | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |



READ Plan Exit Rate is based on the unduplicated number of students who were on a READ plan the previous school year and were no longer on a READ plan the following year divided by the total number of students who were on a READ plan the previous year.





FAFSA Completion Rate is based on the number of students who filed a FAFSA by the fall following high school graduation. The year in the table above corresponds with the reporting year.

The 2024 data reflects the FAFSA completion rate

Financial Management Metrics

- Is the school accurately projecting enrollment?
- Is the school effectively managing and spending grant funds?

| Financial Management | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| Funded Pupil Count (FPC) Current-Year Variance (%) | -- | -6.8% | -0.4% | 5.8% | -2.2% |
| <i>Estimated Pupil Count</i> | 0.0 | 633.8 | 796.0 | 878.0 | 947.0 |
| <i>Actual Pupil Count</i> | 517.5 | 591.0 | 792.9 | 928.9 | 926.1 |
| Overall Grant Spend Down (%) | -- | -- | -- | 100% | 100% |
| <i>Total Grant Funds Unrecoverable (\$)</i> | -- | -- | -- | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| TABOR | N/A | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| Debt Default | N/A | NO | NO | NO | NO |




These measures are linked to financial health and stability but driven by comprehensive oversight. They appear at the organizational level because of this correlation. **FPC** should be within +/- 10% of adopted budget. Expected outcome for **Debt Default** is NO. **TABOR** met is a reserve of 3% of annual operating expenses as required by Colorado statute.

School Operations and Environment Metrics

- Is the student population stable during the school year?
- Are students returning to the school the following school year?
- Is the school soliciting feedback from stakeholders and sharing it with the community?

| School Operations and Environment | | | | | |
|--|------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |
| Student Stability Rate | -- | -- | 94.2% | 94.1% | 95.5% |
| Returning Student Rate | -- | -- | -- | 78.9% | 85.2% |
| Survey Administration and Dissemination* | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |



Student Stability Rate is defined by CDE as the unduplicated count of students who remained in a school divided by the total number of students that were part of the school at any time during a given school year.

Returning Student Rate is based on EOY data where the unduplicated number of students who did not exit the previous school year and returned for the following school year is divided by the total number of students who did not exit the previous year.

Both of these measures are lagged. The 2023 reporting year reflects the stability rate for 2022-23 and the returning student rate reflects students who completed the 2021-22 school year and returned for the 2022-23 school year.

Organizational 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.



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