



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

**Montessori del Mundo**



**Montessori  
del Mundo**

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	15
English Language Proficiency (ACCESS)	16
School Observations (if applicable)	20
Financial Performance	21
Organizational Performance	23

### 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/>

# Montessori del Mundo Overview

Year Opened/Transferred: 2014-2015

Grades Served: PK-6

School Model: Dual-Language Montessori








Town/City: Aurora

District of Residence: Adams-Arapahoe 28J

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>359</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>317</b>	<b>357</b>
F/R Lunch	55.2%	55.2%	52.1%	41.0%	69.2%
Minority	86.9%	88.6%	90.2%	89.6%	91.6%
IEP	11.7%	11.7%	10.2%	12.3%	12.0%
EL	38.4%	35.4%	39.0%	36.0%	44.8%
Gifted	1.4%	1.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
504	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

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>	Improvement (Points Earned: 44%)
Elementary School Rating	Improvement (Points Earned: 44%)
Middle School Rating	--
High School Rating	--
<b>Financial</b>	Financial performance does not impact the school accreditation rating
<b>Organizational</b>	Organizational performance does not impact the school accreditation
<b>Overall CARS Rating</b>	<b>Improvement</b>

## Participation

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

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

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

Assurance	
	Rating
Accountability Participation Rate	<b>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	108	107	99.1%	1	100.0%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
Math	108	107	99.1%	1	100.0%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
Science	29	28	96.6%	1	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	108	107	99.1%	1	100.0%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
CMAS Math	108	107	99.1%	1	100.0%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
CMAS Science	29	28	96.6%	1	100.0%	<b>Meets 95%</b>
PSAT/SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<b>N/A</b>
PSAT/SAT Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<b>N/A</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	33	717	46	712	32	708	34	697	28	699
4	29	715	31	714	30	710	28	721	34	706
5	16	725	27	721	23	714	27	722	26	723
Elementary	78	718	115	717	104	712	105	715	103	711
6	--	--	n<16	--	19	721	16	730	n < 16	n < 16
7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Middle	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Overall</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>718</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>717</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>712</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>715</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>711</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	3,055	718	2,729	720	2,481	711	2,492	714	2,560	712
4	2,876	728	2,939	727	2,498	720	2,502	723	2,550	720
5	2,953	731	2,743	731	2,462	728	2,465	730	2,490	730
Elementary	8,884	726	8,466	726	7,441	720	7,459	722	7,678	721
6	2,661	725	2,758	729	2,466	726	2,273	727	2,377	728
7	2,592	726	2,561	726	2,606	722	2,296	727	2,217	730
8	2,491	728	2,476	729	2,450	727	2,304	723	2,286	723
Middle	7,744	727	7,740	728	7,522	725	6,873	726	6,802	727
<b>Overall</b>	<b>16,628</b>	<b>726</b>	<b>16,206</b>	<b>727</b>	<b>14,963</b>	<b>722</b>	<b>14,332</b>	<b>724</b>	<b>14,480</b>	<b>724</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. From 2018 to 2024, overall student achievement decreased by 7 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score decreased by 4.2 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Adams-Arapahoe 28J) for the past five years. Overall, the school performs lower than their geo. district by 12.8 scale score points.

## English Language Arts Subgroup Achievement


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

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


Subgroup Achievement Gap Trends over Time in ELA						
CMAS ELA	2018	2019	2022	2023	2024	
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	
F/R Lunch	Y	714.8	715.6	705.6	708.0	707.3
	N	724.2	719.0	722.3	722.7	728.0
Minority	Y	718.5	716.3	710.9	713.1	708.5
	N	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16
IEP	Y	n<16	693.8	699.0	693.6	685.6
	N	719.5	720.9	715.2	721.2	717.6
EL	Y	714.3	710.0	703.8	704.6	704.7
	N	726.3	732.5	724.5	725.7	721.5
GT	Y	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	717.7	716.6	711.3	714.9	710.7
Schoolwide	718	717	712	715	711	

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	720.8	721.8	717.1	719.3	719.0
	N	742.2	743.3	735.5	740.6	740.3
Minority	Y	723.1	724.3	719.4	721.3	720.9
	N	743.3	744.7	740.9	741.4	741.6
IEP	Y	694.3	693.6	692.6	694.7	696.5
	N	731.0	731.9	726.9	728.8	728.0
EL	Y	719.3	720.2	714.4	716.7	714.8
	N	733.7	734.8	731.5	731.9	733.5
GT	Y	776.4	776.5	770.4	770.2	770.8
	N	723.2	723.7	716.7	717.4	717.6
Geographic District	726	727	722	724	724	

### 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, general education students outperformed their IEP peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, overall, Adams-Arapahoe 2&J outperformed the school. In 2024, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: FRL, minority, IEP, EL, - additional details are available in the graphs.

**English Language Arts Growth**

**CMAS ELA: School Status and Trends Tables and Graphs**

-Are students making sufficient growth on state assessments over time?



Growth over Time in ELA										
CMAS ELA	2018		2019		2022		2023		2024	
	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	23	43.0	25	31.0	n < 20	--	n < 20	--	22	30.5
5	n < 20	--	22	57.5	--	--	22	58.5	n < 20	-
Elementary	38	44.0	58	48.5	20	48.5	56	61.5	54	41.5
6	--	--	n < 20	--	n < 20	--	n < 20	--	n < 20	-
7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Middle	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Overall</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>44.0</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>48.5</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>48.5</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>61.5</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>41.5</b>



**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	2,766	47.0	2,871	45.0	1,687	46.0	2,341	47.0	2,378	43.0
5	2,834	50.0	2,679	49.0	--	--	2,369	46.0	2,338	49.0
Elementary	5,600	49.0	5,603	47.0	1,687	46.0	4,710	46.0	4,789	46.0
6	2,561	44.0	2,708	50.5	1,619	49.0	2,198	46.0	2,303	50.0
7	2,485	49.0	2,504	50.0	--	--	2,200	49.0	2,107	51.0
8	2,382	56.0	2,413	53.0	1,393	51.0	2,174	45.0	2,108	52.0
Middle	7,428	50.0	7,572	51.0	3,012	50.0	6,572	46.5	6,445	51.0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>2,382</b>	<b>56.0</b>	<b>13,175</b>	<b>49.0</b>	<b>4,699</b>	<b>48.0</b>	<b>11,282</b>	<b>46.0</b>	<b>11,234</b>	<b>49.0</b>



**Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative**  
 The graphs show schoolwide growth on the ELA state assessment. From 2018 to 2024, overall student growth decreased. Since last year, student growth decreased by -20 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 decreased 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	46.5	48.0	n<20	63.0	40.0
	N	n<20	n<20	n<20	60.0	n<20
Minority	Y	46.0	48.0	n<20	64.0	41.0
	N	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
IEP	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	43.5	56.0	n<20	65.0	57.0
EL	Y	51.5	46.0	n<20	59.5	40.5
	N	n<20	n<20	n<20	65.0	47.0
GT	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	44.0	49.0	48.5	61.5	41.5
Schoolwide		44.0	48.5	48.5	61.5	41.5

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	55.0	48.0	47.0	46.0	48.0
	N	59.0	53.0	51.0	51.0	54.0
Minority	Y	56.0	49.0	47.0	46.0	48.0
	N	56.0	53.0	56.0	53.0	53.5
IEP	Y	48.0	40.0	34.0	35.0	41.0
	N	57.0	51.0	51.0	49.0	50.0
EL	Y	56.0	50.0	46.0	46.0	48.0
	N	49.0	48.0	52.0	47.0	50.0
GT	Y	57.0	59.5	61.0	58.0	58.0
	N	56.0	48.0	47.0	45.0	48.0
Geographic District		56.0	49.0	48.0	46.0	49.0

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



### CMAS ELA: Subgroup Local Comparison Graphs



### Growth Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show the growth of student subgroups on the ELA state assessment over time. CMAS results show the following (if applicable): non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, overall, Adams-Arapahoe 28J outperformed the school. In 2023, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: FRL, minority, EL, - additional details are available in the graphs.

**Mathematics Achievement**


**CMAS Math: School Status, Trends, and Local Comparison Tables**

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

Achievement over Time in Math										
CMAS Math	2018		2019		2022		2023		2024	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	33	706	46	708	32	682	34	683	28	698
4	30	700	31	702	30	699	28	701	34	693
5	16	700	27	711	23	696	27	699	27	711
Elementary	79	702	115	708	104	693	105	695	106	701
6	--	--	n<16	--	19	701	16	706	17	707
7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Middle	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Overall</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>702</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>708</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>693</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>695</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>701</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	3,086	721	2,762	723	2,509	714	2,603	715	2,687	718
4	2,922	718	2,987	720	2,532	713	2,597	717	2,678	716
5	3,007	720	2,814	723	2,488	715	2,608	718	2,615	722
Elementary	9,015	720	8,620	722	7,529	714	7,808	717	8,064	718
6	2,745	716	2,817	719	2,489	713	2,382	713	2,529	717
7	2,674	718	2,638	721	2,621	718	2,412	718	2,361	720
8	2,550	715	2,527	716	2,485	714	2,406	714	2,424	714
Middle	7,969	716	7,925	718	7,595	715	7,200	715	7,230	717
<b>Overall</b>	<b>16,984</b>	<b>718</b>	<b>16,545</b>	<b>720</b>	<b>15,124</b>	<b>714</b>	<b>15,008</b>	<b>716</b>	<b>15,294</b>	<b>718</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. From 2018 to 2024, overall student achievement decreased by 1.4 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score increased by 5.7 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district ( ) for the past five years. Overall, the school performs lower than their geo. district by 16.8 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	
F/R Lunch	Y	699.9	703.1	691.1	691.5	697.9
	N	708.0	715.8	696.6	699.5	717.6
Minority	Y	702.3	707.6	690.9	692.6	699.1
	N	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16
IEP	Y	n<16	680.1	691.1	683.7	690.7
	N	703.3	712.7	693.8	698.7	703.7
EL	Y	697.3	701.4	685.1	685.6	697.0
	N	715.5	722.7	704.9	705.5	708.5
GT	Y	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	702.4	707.8	692.6	695.3	701.0
Schoolwide	702	708	693	695	701	

Geographic District Gap Trends over Time in Math						
CMAS Math	2018	2019	2022	2023	2024	
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	
F/R Lunch	Y	713.9	715.7	710.0	711.6	713.9
	N	731.5	734.1	725.6	731.0	732.2
Minority	Y	715.6	717.5	711.8	713.2	715.3
	N	733.9	737.3	731.2	732.3	736.0
IEP	Y	690.7	693.6	693.4	695.1	698.7
	N	722.4	723.9	717.6	719.0	720.8
EL	Y	713.2	715.3	708.9	710.1	711.2
	N	724.1	725.9	720.9	722.4	726.1
GT	Y	768.5	768.6	758.5	759.2	763.4
	N	715.6	716.9	709.3	709.8	712.4
Geographic District	718	720	714	716	718	

### 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, general education students outperformed their IEP peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, overall, Adams-Arapahoe 28J outperformed the school. In 2023, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: FRL, minority, IEP, EL, - additional details are available in the graphs.

**Mathematics Growth**

**CMAS Math: School Status and Trends Tables and Graphs**

-Are students making sufficient growth on state assessments over time?



Growth over Time in Math										
CMAS Math	2018		2019		2022		2023		2024	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	30	36.5	30	28.5	--	--	26	65.5	33	50.0
5	n < 20	--	27	57.0	n < 20	--	25	26.0	25	58.0
Elementary	45	38.0	68	50.0	n < 20	--	67	42.0	73	57.0
6	--	--	n < 20	--	--	--	n < 20	--	n < 20	-
7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Middle	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Overall</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>38.0</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>n &lt; 20</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>42.0</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>57.0</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	2,790	45.0	2,890	47.0	--	--	2,388	49.0	2,463	47.0
5	2,857	50.0	2,691	53.0	1,602	47.0	2,408	49.0	2,417	49.0
Elementary	5,647	48.0	5,634	50.0	1,602	47.0	4,796	49.0	4,958	48.0
6	2,560	48.0	2,715	53.0	--	--	2,209	52.0	2,339	52.0
7	2,485	50.0	2,504	51.0	1,516	49.0	2,181	45.0	2,149	53.0
8	2,355	51.0	2,398	51.0	--	--	2,175	48.0	2,135	51.0
Middle	7,400	50.0	7,564	51.0	1,516	49.0	6,565	48.0	6,545	52.0
<b>Overall</b>	<b>2,355</b>	<b>51.0</b>	<b>13,198</b>	<b>51.0</b>	<b>3,118</b>	<b>48.0</b>	<b>11,361</b>	<b>49.0</b>	<b>11,503</b>	<b>50.0</b>



**Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative**  
 The graphs show schoolwide growth on the Math state assessment. From 2018 to 2024, overall student growth increased. Since last year, student growth increased by 15 percentile points. In 2024, overall student growth met state expectations and was above the geo. district. Overall student growth for the geo. district has decreased 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	45.0	48.0	n<20	42.0	55.5
	N	n<20	n<20	n<20	48.5	n<20
Minority	Y	39.0	50.0	n<20	42.0	56.5
	N	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
IEP	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	26.5	n<20
	N	38.0	52.0	n<20	65.0	60.0
EL	Y	41.0	50.0	n<20	35.0	57.0
	N	n<20	n<20	n<20	56.0	53.0
GT	Y	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	38.0	52.0	n<20	42.0	57.0
Schoolwide	38.0	50.0	--	42.0	57.0	

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	47.0	50.0	47.0	48.0	49.0
	N	60.0	54.0	50.0	52.0	56.0
Minority	Y	51.0	50.0	47.5	48.0	49.0
	N	56.0	57.0	50.0	56.0	58.0
IEP	Y	38.0	44.0	37.0	40.5	44.0
	N	53.0	52.0	50.0	50.0	51.0
EL	Y	48.0	52.0	46.5	47.0	49.0
	N	49.0	50.0	49.0	51.0	51.0
GT	Y	61.0	65.0	63.0	61.0	63.0
	N	50.0	50.0	46.0	47.0	49.0
Geographic District	51.0	51.0	48.0	49.0	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): EL students outperformed their non-EL peers, overall, the school outperformed Adams-Arapahoe 28J. In 2024, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: FRL, minority, EL, - additional details are available in the graphs.

**English Language Proficiency (ELP) Growth**  
**ACCESS for ELLs: School Status and Trends**

- Are students making sufficient growth on state assessments over time?
- How are students growing on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students 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	98	32.5	48.5%	82	44.0	40.2%	59	44.0	28.1%	69	50.0	37.7%	84	29.0	23.9%
Middle	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
High	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Overall</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>32.5</b>	<b>48.5%</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>44.0</b>	<b>40.2%</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>44.0</b>	<b>28.1%</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>37.7%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>15.0%</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	5,819	51.0	69.0%	5,100	42.0	46.5%	4,949	50.0	58.8%	904	54.0	57.6%	5,756	52.0	--
Middle	2,105	55.0	32.7%	1,760	47.0	18.1%	1,928	55.0	27.6%	687	55.0	22.6%	2,402	53.0	--
High	1,891	52.0	29.2%	1,070	49.0	28.1%	1,042	50.0	24.3%	289	50.0	13.1%	2,058	47.0	--
<b>Overall</b>	<b>9,815</b>	<b>52.0</b>	<b>53.4%</b>	<b>7,930</b>	<b>44.0</b>	<b>38.4%</b>	<b>7,919</b>	<b>51.0</b>	<b>48.1%</b>	<b>9,464</b>	<b>51.0</b>	<b>48.1%</b>	<b>10,216</b>	<b>51.0</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 did not meet state expectations and was below the geo. district. Additionally, 15% of students were reported as being on track to reach English language proficiency.*

**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	308.0	289.0	272.5	270.5	268.0
One-Year Enrollment Variance	-7.0%	-6.2%	-5.7%	-0.7%	-0.9%
Three-Year Enrollment Variance	+21.7%	-12.8%	-11.5%	-6.4%	-1.7%



**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	-20.48	0.6097
Debt to Asset Ratio	1.9325	1.3728	1.4906	1.8186	1.5603

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	3.86	5.44	3.40	1.86	1.85
Change in Unassigned Fund Balance from Prior Year	+31.7%	+37.4%	-23.9%	-38.0%	+4.5%
Current Ratio	3.54	4.97	0.72	3.17	3.11




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	10.1%	8.5%	-9.5%	-8.1%	1.7%
3-Year Average Operating Margin	0.0%	10.6%	3.1%	-3.3%	-4.8%



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 Metrics**

**Financial Performance Narrative**

Montessori del Mundo 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 1.85 months of cash on hand and sufficient current assets to cover liabilities. The school experienced a positive operating margin of 1.66%.


**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 Montessori del Mundo in the 2023-2024 school year. Montessori del Mundo 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*	--	--	16.7%	5.3%	41.7%
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 (%)	-15.8%	-10.2%	5.6%	10.4%	-0.7%
<i>Estimated Pupil Count</i>	366.0	322.0	258.0	245.0	270.0
<i>Actual Pupil Count</i>	308.0	289.0	272.5	270.5	268.0
Overall Grant Spend Down (%)	--	--	--	100%	99%
<i>Total Grant Funds Unrecoverable (\$)</i>	--	--	--	\$484.33	\$3,481.64
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	93.0%	96.1%	90.5%	91.2%	92.2%
Returning Student Rate	95.3%	73.9%	75.4%	72.9%	72.9%
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)