



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

**Colorado Early Colleges - Colorado Springs**



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](http://www.csi.state.co.us)



## Table of Contents

CSI Annual Review of Schools (CARS) Summary	4
How to Use the CARS Report	5
CSI Performance Frameworks	6
School Overview	8
CSI Annual Review of Schools (CARS) Rating	9
Participation	10
Academic Performance	
CMAS English Language Arts	11
CMAS Math	
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](mailto:ryanmarks@csi.state.co.us))

**Financial Performance:** Dave Sever ([davesever@csi.state.co.us](mailto:davesever@csi.state.co.us))

**Organizational Performance:** Jess Welch ([jessicawelch@csi.state.co.us](mailto:jessicawelch@csi.state.co.us)) - State/Federal Programs  
Stephanie Aragon ([stephaniearagon@csi.state.co.us](mailto: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/>

## Colorado Early Colleges - Colorado Springs Overview

Year Opened/Transferred: 2007-2008

Grades Served: 6-12

School Model: Early College








Town/City: Colorado Springs

District of Residence: Colorado Springs 11

Original Application Type: New School

Enrollment and Student Demographics over Time					
October Student Counts	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
<b>Enrollment Over Time</b>	<b>579</b>	<b>552</b>	<b>644</b>	<b>642</b>	<b>965</b>
F/R Lunch	20.2%	23.9%	20.3%	26.9%	37.3%
Minority	39.2%	40.0%	42.2%	42.1%	37.8%
IEP	2.8%	3.1%	5.0%	6.9%	5.8%
EL	5.0%	4.3%	3.6%	4.4%	2.7%
Gifted	3.3%	2.5%	2.5%	1.6%	4.1%
504	7.1%	8.5%	7.6%	7.5%	5.4%

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
<b>Academic</b>	Performance (Points Earned: 65.4%)
Elementary School Rating	--
Middle School Rating	Performance (Points Earned: 55%)
High School Rating	Performance (Points Earned: 70.8%)
<b>Financial</b>	Financial performance does not impact the school accreditation rating
<b>Organizational</b>	Organizational performance does not impact the school accreditation
<b>Overall CARS Rating</b>	<b>Performance</b>

## Participation

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

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

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

Assurance	
	Rating
Accountability Participation Rate	<b>Meets 95%</b>

Test Participation Rates (Ratings are based on Accountability Participation Rate)						
Subject	Total Records	Valid Scores	Participation Rate	Parent Excuses	Accountability Participation Rate	Rating
English Language Arts	476	359	75.4%	116	99.7%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
Math	476	359	75.4%	116	99.7%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
Science	192	118	61.5%	74	100.0%	<b>Meets 95%</b>

Test Participation Rates - Disaggregated by Test						
Subject	Total Records	Valid Scores	Participation Rate	Parent Excuses	Accountability Participation Rate	Rating
CMAS English Language Arts	154	103	66.9%	51	100.0%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
CMAS Math	154	103	66.9%	51	100.0%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
CMAS Science	192	118	61.5%	74	100.0%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
PSAT/SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing	322	256	79.5%	65	99.6%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
PSAT/SAT Math	322	256	79.5%	65	99.6%	<b>Meets 95%</b>

## English Language Arts Achievement

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

-How are students achieving on state assessments in English Language Arts over time?


-How are students achieving on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?

Achievement over Time in ELA										
CMAS ELA	2018		2019		2022		2023		2024	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elementary	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	--	--	--	--	33	732	26	750	22	731
7	--	--	--	--	25	744	37	740	21	750
8	--	--	--	--	23	754	24	745	49	732
Middle	--	--	--	--	81	742	87	744	92	736
<b>Overall</b>	--	--	--	--	<b>81</b>	<b>742</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>744</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>736</b>


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	1,854	736	1,809	733	1,546	728	1,456	729	1,436	730
4	1,945	741	1,779	741	1,537	733	1,514	733	1,490	735
5	1,912	742	1,831	743	1,572	741	1,473	743	1,493	742
Elementary	5,727	740	5,430	739	4,660	734	4,453	735	4,419	736
6	1,808	737	1,696	737	1,348	731	1,329	737	1,293	739
7	1,634	737	1,738	743	1,372	735	1,305	738	1,276	745
8	1,630	736	1,609	739	1,416	735	1,306	737	1,215	736
Middle	5,056	737	5,032	740	4,131	734	3,930	737	3,784	740
<b>Overall</b>	<b>10,783</b>	<b>738</b>	<b>10,462</b>	<b>739</b>	<b>8,791</b>	<b>734</b>	<b>8,383</b>	<b>736</b>	<b>8,203</b>	<b>738</b>

### 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 8.4 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Colorado Springs 11) for the past five years. Overall, the school performs lower than their geo. district by 2 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	--	--	735.3	731.4	725.2
	N	--	--	743.7	751.1	744.2
Minority	Y	--	--	730.5	731.3	721.1
	N	--	--	753.0	755.5	746.5
IEP	Y	--	--	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	--	--	745.4	749.2	740.6
EL	Y	--	--	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	--	--	743.5	746.1	737.2
GT	Y	--	--	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	--	--	741.0	743.4	733.8
Schoolwide	--	--	742	744	736	

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	730.2	730.6	724.8	725.9	729.1
	N	749.6	752.1	745.3	750.4	750.2
Minority	Y	730.8	731.6	726.2	727.9	728.9
	N	745.1	746.8	742.5	745.1	747.5
IEP	Y	701.5	698.1	698.1	702.3	704.0
	N	742.4	743.4	737.8	740.6	741.6
EL	Y	721.1	721.1	713.5	714.7	710.6
	N	740.3	741.3	736.2	738.3	740.6
GT	Y	779.2	781.2	777.5	781.0	783.2
	N	733.0	734.1	729.8	731.5	732.6
Geographic District	738	739	734	736	738	

### 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, overall, Colorado Springs 11 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 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	
	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elementary	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	--	--	--	--	n < 20	--	25	58.0	20	28.5
7	--	--	--	--	--	--	36	53.5	n < 20	-
8	--	--	--	--	n < 20	--	21	62.0	43	50.0
Middle	--	--	--	--	27	33.0	82	58.5	81	41.0
<b>Overall</b>	--	--	--	--	27	33.0	82	58.5	81	41.0



**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		2024	
	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	1,792	50.0	1,656	46.0	1,182	46.0	1,413	45.0	1,373	52.0
5	1,754	48.0	1,727	49.0	--	--	1,389	49.0	1,400	54.0
Elementary	3,561	49.0	3,394	48.0	1,186	46.0	2,811	47.0	2,773	53.0
6	1,652	44.0	1,584	47.0	1,006	39.5	1,259	48.0	1,208	47.0
7	1,498	50.0	1,639	56.0	--	--	1,215	56.0	1,186	56.0
8	1,465	51.0	1,494	53.0	947	47.0	1,203	49.0	1,125	52.0
Middle	4,615	48.0	4,706	52.0	1,949	43.0	3,668	50.0	3,519	52.0
<b>Overall</b>	1,465	51.0	8,100	50.0	3,135	44.0	6,479	49.0	6,292	52.0



**Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative**

The graphs show schoolwide growth on the ELA state assessment. Since last year, student growth decreased by -17.5 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	55.0	48.0
	N	--	--	n<20	61.0	37.5
Minority	Y	--	--	n<20	50.0	40.5
	N	--	--	n<20	63.0	41.0
IEP	Y	--	--	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	--	--	33.0	60.5	42.0
EL	Y	--	--	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	--	--	33.0	59.0	41.0
GT	Y	--	--	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	--	--	32.0	58.0	44.5
Schoolwide		--	--	33.0	58.5	41.0

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	46.0	47.0	42.0	44.0	50.0
	N	51.0	54.0	47.0	56.0	56.0
Minority	Y	50.0	47.0	42.0	46.0	50.0
	N	52.0	53.0	46.0	52.0	55.0
IEP	Y	49.0	41.0	32.0	37.0	46.0
	N	51.0	51.0	46.0	51.0	53.0
EL	Y	48.5	52.0	38.0	45.0	47.0
	N	50.0	50.0	45.0	49.0	53.0
GT	Y	59.5	59.0	60.0	58.0	62.0
	N	50.0	49.0	43.0	48.0	51.0
Geographic District		51.0	50.0	44.0	49.0	52.0

### CMAS ELA: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends Graphs



### CMAS ELA: Subgroup Local Comparison Graphs



### Growth Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show the growth of student subgroups on the ELA state assessment over time. CMAS results show the following (if applicable): FRL students outperformed their non-FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, overall, Colorado Springs 11 outperformed the school. In 2023, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: FRL, 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	2018		2019		2022		2023		2024	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elementary	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	--	--	--	--	34	717	26	742	22	729
7	--	--	--	--	25	737	37	732	21	749
8	--	--	--	--	23	723	24	732	49	729
Middle	--	--	--	--	82	725	87	735	92	734
<b>Overall</b>	--	--	--	--	<b>82</b>	<b>725</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>735</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>734</b>

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	1,854	740	1,811	739	1,546	731	1,474	735	1,443	737
4	1,951	733	1,789	734	1,537	728	1,522	729	1,486	732
5	1,924	735	1,835	737	1,566	734	1,480	735	1,507	737
Elementary	5,745	736	5,446	737	4,654	731	4,486	733	4,436	736
6	1,814	727	1,708	726	1,350	718	1,341	724	1,306	728
7	1,640	727	1,748	730	1,366	725	1,325	725	1,281	729
8	1,639	724	1,622	726	1,425	721	1,325	723	1,217	723
Middle	5,077	726	5,067	727	4,136	721	3,981	724	3,804	727
<b>Overall</b>	<b>10,822</b>	<b>731</b>	<b>10,513</b>	<b>732</b>	<b>8,790</b>	<b>727</b>	<b>8,467</b>	<b>729</b>	<b>8,240</b>	<b>732</b>

**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 decreased by 1.3 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 outperforms their geo. district by 2.1 scale score points.

## Mathematics Subgroup Achievement


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

- How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments in Mathematics over time?
- How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments compared to their peers over time?
- How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?


Subgroup Achievement Gap Trends over Time in Math						
CMAS Math		2018	2019	2022	2023	2024
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	--	--	718.9	722.5	722.7
	N	--	--	726.5	741.9	742.5
Minority	Y	--	--	718.2	727.5	721.4
	N	--	--	731.7	741.7	742.8
IEP	Y	--	--	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	--	--	727.6	739.4	738.2
EL	Y	--	--	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	--	--	725.8	736.7	735.3
GT	Y	--	--	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	--	--	723.7	734.5	731.4
Schoolwide		--	--	725	735	734

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	723.5	724.1	717.8	719.1	723.4
	N	742.5	743.7	737.2	741.6	743.3
Minority	Y	723.8	724.9	719.0	720.3	723.0
	N	738.4	739.0	734.7	737.5	741.2
IEP	Y	699.6	699.7	701.1	704.3	707.2
	N	734.9	735.2	729.2	731.6	734.3
EL	Y	719.1	719.0	712.1	711.4	711.2
	N	732.8	733.5	728.2	730.4	733.9
GT	Y	775.6	776.4	769.2	773.8	776.0
	N	725.9	726.6	722.4	723.9	726.6
Geographic District		731	732	727	729	732

### CMAS Math: Subgroup Gap Trends Graphs



### CMAS Math: Subgroup Local Comparison Graphs



### Achievement Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative


The graphs above show the performance of student subgroups on the Math state assessment over time. CMAS results show the following (if applicable): non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, overall, the school outperformed Colorado Springs 11. In 2024, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: - 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	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Elementary	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6	--	--	--	--	--	--	24	55.5	n < 20	-
7	--	--	--	--	n < 20	--	36	57.0	n < 20	-
8	--	--	--	--	--	--	21	62.0	43	43.0
Middle	--	--	--	--	n < 20	--	81	57.0	80	43.0
<b>Overall</b>	--	--	--	--	n < 20	--	<b>81</b>	<b>57.0</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>43.0</b>



**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	1,802	53.0	1,667	48.0	--	--	1,415	52.0	1,385	52.0
5	1,778	51.0	1,738	54.5	1,180	55.0	1,385	51.0	1,403	54.0
Elementary	3,595	52.0	3,416	51.0	1,180	55.0	2,809	51.0	2,788	53.0
6	1,655	39.0	1,597	42.0	--	--	1,260	44.0	1,207	48.0
7	1,497	46.0	1,642	45.0	936	49.0	1,222	50.0	1,189	47.0
8	1,365	43.0	1,499	49.0	--	--	1,204	46.0	1,127	48.0
Middle	4,517	43.0	4,727	45.0	936	49.0	3,677	47.0	3,523	48.0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>1,365</b>	<b>43.0</b>	<b>8,143</b>	<b>48.0</b>	<b>2,116</b>	<b>52.0</b>	<b>6,486</b>	<b>48.0</b>	<b>6,311</b>	<b>50.0</b>



**Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative**

The graphs show schoolwide growth on the Math state assessment. Since last year, student growth decreased by 14 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	40.0	39.5
	N	--	--	n<20	66.5	43.0
Minority	Y	--	--	n<20	49.0	37.0
	N	--	--	n<20	68.0	43.0
IEP	Y	--	--	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	--	--	n<20	62.0	43.0
EL	Y	--	--	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	--	--	n<20	63.0	43.0
GT	Y	--	--	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	--	--	n<20	57.0	43.0
Schoolwide		--	--	--	57.0	43.0

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	40.0	46.0	50.0	47.0	48.0
	N	47.0	50.0	55.0	57.0	54.0
Minority	Y	42.0	46.0	51.0	49.0	48.0
	N	46.5	49.0	53.0	53.0	52.0
IEP	Y	41.0	43.0	43.5	51.0	45.0
	N	43.0	48.0	53.0	51.0	50.0
EL	Y	38.5	47.0	52.0	46.0	43.0
	N	43.0	48.0	52.0	52.0	50.0
GT	Y	56.0	57.0	59.0	60.0	57.0
	N	42.0	46.0	51.0	51.0	49.0
Geographic District		43.0	48.0	52.0	48.0	50.0

### CMAS Math: Subgroup Status and Gap Trends Graphs



### CMAS Math: Subgroup Local Comparison Graphs



### Growth Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show the growth of student subgroups on the Math state assessment over time. CMAS results show the following (if applicable): non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, overall, Colorado Springs 11 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	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Middle	--	--	--	--	--	--	n<20	--	--	n<20	--	--	n < 20	n<20	-
High	n<20	--	--	n<20	--	--	n<20	--	--	n<20	--	--	n < 20	n<20	-
<b>Overall</b>	<b>n&lt;20</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>n&lt;20</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>n&lt;20</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>n&lt;20</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>n &lt; 20</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>

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	678	51.0	73.2%	537	49.0	51.7%	432	49.0	56.3%	61	61.0	55.7%	548	53.0	--
Middle	147	50.0	34.7%	118	50.5	25.0%	68	54.0	27.0%	28	42.0	25.0%	117	57.0	--
High	140	52.0	29.8%	57	49.0	35.2%	61	47.0	13.1%	24	54.5	12.0%	154	53.0	--
<b>Overall</b>	<b>965</b>	<b>51.0</b>	<b>61.2%</b>	<b>712</b>	<b>49.0</b>	<b>46.2%</b>	<b>561</b>	<b>49.0</b>	<b>48.4%</b>	<b>721</b>	<b>53.0</b>	<b>48.4%</b>	<b>819</b>	<b>53.0</b>	<b>--</b>

^^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 <sup>^</sup>		2022		2023		2024	
	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
PSAT (9th)*	77	487	78	486	60	481	73	470	76	486
PSAT (10th)*	116	517	100	520	87	504	72	504	74	502
PSAT (9th&10th)	193	505	178	505	147	495	145	487	150	494
SAT (11th)	140	567	134	541	96	549	85	530	91	533
<b>Overall</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>516</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>508</b>

Geographic District Achievement over Time in EBRW										
PSAT/SAT EBRW	2018		2019 <sup>^</sup>		2022		2023		2024	
	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
PSAT (9th)*	1,606	435	1,590	438	1,357	429	1,332	431	1,312	429
PSAT (10th)*	1,634	463	1,582	459	1,398	461	1,289	456	1,312	448
PSAT (9th&10th)	3,240	449	3,172	448	2,755	445	2,621	443	2,624	439
SAT (11th)	1,544	497	1,525	484	1,273	476	1,301	486	1,252	467
<b>Overall</b>	<b>4,784</b>	<b>465</b>	<b>4,697</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>4,028</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>3,922</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>3,876</b>	<b>448</b>

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


<sup>^</sup>CDE renormed SAT benchmarks in 2019. Therefore, benchmarks from 2016-2018 do not look the same as benchmarks from 2019.

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

EBRW - Schoolwide

EBRW - PSAT (9&10)

EBRW - SAT (11)



### Achievement Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show schoolwide performance on the EBRW state assessment over time disaggregated by test and grade level. From 2018 to 2024, overall student achievement decreased by 12 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score increased by 5.8 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Colorado Springs 11) for the past five years. Overall, the school outperforms their geo. district by 60.7 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	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	498	477	476	462	484
	N	540	537	526	517	526
Minority	Y	492	487	500	486	491
	N	555	542	528	515	522
IEP	Y	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	533	523	521	511	515
EL	Y	405	393	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	540	527	522	509	513
GT	Y	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16	573
	N	530	515	512	498	502
Schoolwide		<b>531</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>516</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>508</b>

Geographic District Gap Trends over Time in EBRW						
PSAT/SAT EBRW		2018	2019	2022	2023	2024
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	437	433	427	427	422
	N	493	485	478	485	478
Minority	Y	440	439	428	432	422
	N	488	480	483	483	477
IEP	Y	362	358	364	364	343
	N	474	468	462	465	455
EL	Y	386	380	360	366	327
	N	471	465	462	462	454
GT	Y	580	580	581	582	580
	N	448	444	438	439	429
Geographic District		<b>465</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>448</b>

### 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-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, GT students outperformed their non-GT peers, overall, the school outperformed. In 2024, 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		2024	
	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
CMAS 8 to PSAT 9 <sup>^</sup>	Not available									
PSAT 9 to PSAT 10	78	61.0	85	58.0	65	44.0	53	48.0	62	46.0
PSAT 10 to SAT 11	125	51.0	117	47.0	75	49.0	74	30.5	72	42.5
<b>Overall</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>55.5</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>48.0</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>47.0</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>40.0</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>45.0</b>

<sup>^</sup>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 <sup>^</sup>	Not available									
PSAT 9 to PSAT 10	1,252	55.0	1,478	51.0	881	48.0	1,186	49.5	1,179	42.0
PSAT 10 to SAT 11	1,400	47.0	1,420	43.0	828	42.0	1,174	43.0	1,145	38.0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3,985</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>2,898</b>	<b>47.0</b>	<b>1,709</b>	<b>46.0</b>	<b>2,360</b>	<b>46.5</b>	<b>2,324</b>	<b>41.0</b>

### 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 2024, overall student growth decreased. Since last year, student growth increased by 5 percentile points. In 2024, overall student growth was approaching state expectations. Overall student growth was below 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	40.0	35.5	42.5	39.0	38.0
	N	57.0	54.0	47.5	40.0	50.0
Minority	Y	49.0	53.0	50.0	36.0	50.0
	N	58.0	45.0	47.0	40.5	43.5
IEP	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	55.5	48.0	47.0	39.5	46.0
EL	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	57.0	48.0	47.5	40.0	46.0
GT	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	55.0	48.0	45.0	39.5	46.5
Schoolwide		55.5	48.0	47.0	40.0	45.0

PSAT/SAT EBRW		2018	2019	2022	2023	2024
Student Subgroup		MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP
F/R Lunch	Y	46.0	43.0	39.0	42.0	37.0
	N	56.0	50.0	48.0	50.0	44.0
Minority	Y	45.0	44.0	40.0	44.0	37.0
	N	56.0	49.0	48.0	49.0	46.0
IEP	Y	34.0	26.0	44.0	34.0	32.0
	N	51.0	49.0	46.0	48.0	42.0
EL	Y	36.0	37.0	30.0	41.0	23.0
	N	52.0	48.0	47.0	47.0	42.0
GT	Y	68.0	55.0	54.0	56.0	51.0
	N	48.0	45.0	43.0	45.0	39.0
Geographic District		50.0	47.0	46.0	46.5	41.0

### 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, Colorado Springs 11 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 <sup>^</sup>		2022		2023		2024	
	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
PSAT (9th)*	77	478	78	463	60	456	75	435	76	464
PSAT (10th)*	116	496	100	500	87	471	73	472	74	464
PSAT (9th&10th)	193	489	178	484	147	465	148	453	150	464
SAT (11th)	140	547	134	535	96	520	86	494	91	488
<b>Overall</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>513</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>487</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>468</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>473</b>

Geographic District Achievement over Time in Math										
PSAT/SAT Math	2018		2019 <sup>^</sup>		2022		2023		2024	
	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
PSAT (9th)*	1,610	424	1,592	424	1,370	405	1,355	411	1,324	404
PSAT (10th)*	1,644	444	1,582	438	1,406	432	1,322	432	1,329	410
PSAT (9th&10th)	3,254	434	3,174	431	2,776	419	2,677	422	2,653	407
SAT (11th)	1,545	480	1,525	469	1,277	454	1,327	458	1,270	437
<b>Overall</b>	<b>4,799</b>	<b>449</b>	<b>4,699</b>	<b>443</b>	<b>4,053</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>4,004</b>	<b>433</b>	<b>3,923</b>	<b>417</b>

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

<sup>^</sup>CDE renormed SAT benchmarks in 2019. Therefore, benchmarks from 2016-2018 do not look the same as benchmarks from 2019.

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



#### Achievement Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show schoolwide performance on the Math state assessment over time disaggregated by test and grade level. From 2018 to 2024, overall student achievement decreased by 33 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score increased by 4.8 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Colorado Springs 11) for the past five years. Overall, the school outperforms their geo. district by 56.1 scale score points.







## Math Subgroup Achievement

### PSAT/SAT Math: Subgroup Status, Gap Trends, and Local Comparison Tables

- How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments in Math over time?
- How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments compared to their peers over time?
- How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?

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	470	476	446	426	450
	N	525	517	497	483	489
Minority	Y	483	478	471	452	462
	N	532	524	499	481	481
IEP	Y	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	514	508	492	475	479
EL	Y	418	426	n<16	388	n<16
	N	520	510	490	474	476
GT	Y	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16	551
	N	512	501	483	464	465
Schoolwide		513	506	487	468	473

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	423	418	404	409	395
	N	475	467	451	457	443
Minority	Y	429	424	405	412	396
	N	468	462	454	456	441
IEP	Y	340	354	350	361	323
	N	458	450	436	439	423
EL	Y	388	382	356	365	337
	N	454	447	435	439	422
GT	Y	566	568	554	548	541
	N	432	426	413	417	399
Geographic District		449	443	430	433	417



**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 2024, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: FRL, minority, GT, - 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^	58	63.5	60	59.5	24	77.5	59	57.0	51	62.0
PSAT 9 to PSAT 10	76	63.5	85	64.0	65	48.0	53	70.0	62	51.0
PSAT 10 to SAT 11	125	51.0	117	49.0	75	48.0	74	52.5	72	46.0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>57.0</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>48.0</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>60.0</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>50.0</b>

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^	1,328	47.5	1,443	48.0	807	48.0	1,160	43.0	1,126	39.0
PSAT 9 to PSAT 10	1,178	53.0	1,478	49.0	881	48.0	1,186	47.0	1,179	41.0
PSAT 10 to SAT 11	1,400	49.0	1,420	46.0	828	47.0	1,174	46.0	1,145	37.0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3,906</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>4,341</b>	<b>48.0</b>	<b>2,516</b>	<b>48.0</b>	<b>3,520</b>	<b>46.0</b>	<b>3,450</b>	<b>39.0</b>

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



#### Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show schoolwide growth on the EBRW state assessment. From 2018 to 2024, overall student growth decreased. Since last year, student growth decreased by 10 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	41.0	58.0	51.0	61.0	48.5
	N	62.0	55.5	48.0	56.5	52.0
Minority	Y	55.0	58.0	52.0	60.5	53.0
	N	60.0	55.5	47.0	56.5	50.0
IEP	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	56.0	57.0	48.0	60.0	53.5
EL	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	58.5	56.5	49.0	60.0	52.0
GT	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	57.5	57.5	48.0	60.0	51.0
Schoolwide		57.0	57.0	48.0	60.0	50.0

PSAT/SAT Math	2018	2019	2022	2023	2024	
Student Subgroup	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP	MGP	
F/R Lunch	Y	47.0	46.0	41.0	43.0	37.0
	N	52.5	49.0	51.5	47.0	42.0
Minority	Y	48.0	47.0	42.0	43.0	37.0
	N	52.0	49.0	52.0	48.0	42.0
IEP	Y	34.0	41.0	28.0	37.0	22.0
	N	51.0	48.0	48.0	46.0	41.0
EL	Y	43.5	44.5	35.0	34.0	27.0
	N	50.0	48.0	48.0	46.0	40.0
GT	Y	54.0	55.0	59.0	52.0	46.0
	N	49.0	46.0	46.0	45.0	39.0
Geographic District		50.0	48.0	48.0	46.0	39.0

### 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, Colorado Springs 11 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						
Student Subgroup	Best Of	4-year Rate	5-year Rate	6-year Rate	7-year Rate	Graduation Rate
						Rate
F/R Lunch	Y	6-year	57%	64%	84%	83%
	N	7-year	67%	85%	93%	95%
Minority	Y	7-year	60%	71%	88%	91%
	N	7-year	66%	84%	91%	92%
IEP	Y	7-year	20%	67%	67%	100%
	N	6-year	65%	79%	91%	91%
EL	Y	7-year	25%	56%	91%	100%
	N	7-year	65%	81%	90%	91%
GT	Y	6-year	75%	90%	100%	100%
	N	7-year	62%	78%	89%	91%
Schoolwide		7-year	64%	79%	90%	92%

Geographic District Graduation Gap Trends over Time						
Student Subgroup	Best Of	4-year Rate	5-year Rate	6-year Rate	7-year Rate	Graduation Rate
						Rate
F/R Lunch	Y	7-year	64%	71%	71%	76%
	N	7-year	80%	86%	87%	90%
Minority	Y	7-year	66%	75%	74%	79%
	N	7-year	74%	81%	81%	83%
IEP	Y	7-year	62%	68%	73%	77%
	N	7-year	71%	79%	78%	82%
EL	Y	7-year	50%	66%	66%	68%
	N	7-year	72%	78%	79%	82%
GT	Y	5-year	89%	96%	90%	93%
	N	7-year	68%	75%	76%	80%
Geographic District		7-year	70%	78%	78%	81%

\*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 is the 7 year rate of 92%. The best of rate for the geo. district is the 7 year rate of 81%. The best of rate for students eligible for free or reduced price lunch is the 6 year rate of 84%. The best of rate for minority students is the 7 year rate of 91%. The best of rate for students with disabilities is the 7 year rate of 100%. The best of rate for English Learners is the 7 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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	
Student Subgroup	Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate	
F/R Lunch	Y	2.3%	0.0%	1.0%	6.0%	1.6%
	N	2.0%	0.8%	0.8%	1.5%	1.3%
Minority	Y	2.2%	0.7%	0.8%	3.1%	1.4%
	N	2.1%	0.5%	0.8%	2.0%	1.4%
IEP	Y	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%
	N	2.2%	0.6%	0.9%	2.6%	1.3%
EL	Y	3.2%	0.0%	3.7%	3.7%	5.9%
	N	2.0%	0.6%	0.7%	2.4%	1.2%
GT	Y	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	N	2.2%	0.6%	0.9%	2.5%	1.5%
Schoolwide		2.1%	0.6%	0.8%	2.4%	1.4%

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	2.0%	1.8%	2.2%	4.8%	2.8%
	N	3.9%	3.8%	3.2%	4.9%	4.7%
Minority	Y	3.6%	3.3%	3.3%	5.6%	4.2%
	N	2.4%	2.0%	2.0%	4.0%	3.1%
IEP	Y	2.4%	1.5%	1.4%	4.7%	1.7%
	N	3.0%	2.8%	2.8%	4.9%	3.9%
EL	Y	3.6%	5.5%	5.6%	8.9%	7.8%
	N	2.9%	2.5%	2.5%	4.7%	3.5%
GT	Y	0.6%	0.8%	0.7%	0.3%	0.6%
	N	3.2%	2.9%	2.8%	5.3%	4.0%
Geographic District		3.0%	2.7%	2.6%	4.9%	3.7%

**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 decreased, minority student dropout rates decreased, IEP dropout rates increased, EL dropout rates increased, 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, EL, GT, - additional details are available in the graphs above.

**Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Additional Indicators**

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

- Are high school graduates adequately prepared for post-secondary academic success?
- How are the matriculation rates changing over time?
- What is the matriculation rate in comparison to the geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?


School Matriculation Rate Trends over Time										
Matriculation Category	2020*		2021		2022		2023		2024	
	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
2 year	87	45.8%	63	43.2%	52	34.4%	47	33.8%	14	10.0%
4 year	63	33.2%	49	33.6%	53	35.1%	33	23.7%	49	35.0%
CTE	23	12.1%	27	18.5%	45	29.8%	40	28.8%	66	47.1%
Schoolwide	<b>130</b>	<b>68.4%</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>69.9%</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>70.2%</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>65.5%</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>72.9%</b>

Geo. District Matriculation Rate Trends over Time										
Matriculation Category	2020*		2021		2022		2023		2024	
	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate	N	Rate
2 year	--	--	200	12.4%	158	10.0%	233	15.8%	209	14.7%
4 year	--	--	328	20.3%	350	22.3%	297	20.2%	309	21.8%
CTE	--	--	238	14.7%	235	14.9%	64	4.3%	53	3.7%
Geo. District	--	--	<b>712</b>	<b>44.1%</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>43.9%</b>	<b>548</b>	<b>37.2%</b>	<b>549</b>	<b>38.7%</b>

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.

\* 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**



**Matriculation Rates Status and Local Comparison**

The graphs above show schoolwide matriculation rates compared to the matriculation rates for Colorado Springs 11. In 2024, school matriculation rates met state expectations and were above the geo. district. Since last year, schoolwide matriculation rates increased from 66% to 73%.

**Academic Performance Metrics**

School Observations


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

## Financial Performance Metrics

### Enrollment

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

Enrollment					
Metric	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Actual Funded Pupil Count	568.5	540.0	626.0	635.5	800.7
One-Year Enrollment Variance	-13.4%	-5.0%	+15.9%	+1.5%	+26.0%
Three-Year Enrollment Variance	-13.1%	-17.7%	+10.1%	+17.7%	+27.9%



**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	8.4207	0.609	18.416
Debt to Asset Ratio	1.5152	1.3761	0.1249	0.2784	0.2078

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	2.06	1.21	1.78	0.27	1.16
Change in Unassigned Fund Balance from Prior Year	+39.0%	-39.5%	-16.8%	-82.8%	+460.3%
Current Ratio	7.75	4.02	8.01	5.13	4.81




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	7.1%	-9.5%	6.3%	0.1%	1.8%
3-Year Average Operating Margin	0.0%	-0.9%	1.0%	-2.2%	2.6%



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

Colorado Early Colleges - Colorado Springs 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 1.16 months of cash on hand and sufficient current assets to cover liabilities. The school experienced a positive operating margin of 1.77%.


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 Colorado Early Colleges - Colorado Springs in the 2023-2024 school year. Colorado Early Colleges - Colorado Springs 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
<b>Governance</b>					
"Is the school complying with applicable governance requirements?"	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Education Program</b>					
"Is the school fulfilling obligations and expectations relating to the educational program?"	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Diversity, Equity of Access, and Inclusion</b>					
"Is the school protecting the rights of all students?"	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Financial Management</b>					
"Is the school satisfying financial reporting and compliance requirements?"	0	0	0	0	0
<b>School Operations and Environment</b>					
"Is the school fulfilling obligations and expectations relating to the operational requirements?"	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Additional Obligations</b>					
"Is the school complying with all other obligations?"	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>




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*	--	--	N/A	N/A	N/A
FAFSA Completion Rate*	74.2%	78.6%	82.0%	77.8%	75.6%



**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 (%)	-13.9%	-1.8%	-4.6%	-1.8%	19.5%
<i>Estimated Pupil Count</i>	660.0	550.0	656.0	647.0	670.0
<i>Actual Pupil Count</i>	568.5	540.0	626.0	635.5	800.7
Overall Grant Spend Down (%)	--	--	--	97%	100%
<i>Total Grant Funds Unrecoverable (\$)</i>	--	--	--	\$16,225.07	\$445.51
TABOR	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Debt Default	NO	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	92.0%	91.8%	91.7%	88.1%	91.6%
Returning Student Rate	87.5%	87.5%	90.8%	86.0%	79.6%
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](http://www.csi.state.co.us)