



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

Stone Creek Charter School



Expanding Frontiers in Public Education

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



Table of Contents

CSI Annual Review of Schools (CARS) Summary	4
How to Use the CARS Report	5
CSI Performance Frameworks	6
School Overview	8
CSI Annual Review of Schools (CARS) Rating	9
Participation	10
Academic Performance	
CMAS English Language Arts	11
CMAS Math	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)

Financial Performance: Dave Sever (davesever@csi.state.co.us)

Organizational Performance: Jess Welch (jessicawelch@csi.state.co.us) - State/Federal Programs
Stephanie Aragon (stephaniearagon@csi.state.co.us) - Compliance Monitoring

Once all data have been reviewed (and where applicable incorporated into the report), CSI will send each school a final report in **November**. This final version will also contain financial information that is unavailable during the preliminary drafting process. You may use the tables, graphs and narrative of this final report in your UIP.

Please note: Interim and formative assessment data submitted by schools as supplemental evidence should be presented in the form of official reports generated by the test vendor, or in the case of locally developed assessments, generated through the official reporting system (e.g., NWEA). Where this is not possible, exported flat files must be provided. Criteria for submitting additional assessment data include:

- Testing administration date(s), total number of test takers, and total number of enrolled students at the time of administration should be noted with each report.
- Growth data should reflect gains made using the beginning of the year as baseline and the end of the academic year as compared to national, state or pre-approved norms. If seasonal gains are submitted, these must also be accompanied with norms recognized by the nation, state or pre-approved by CSI.
- Regarding other supplemental evidence you wish to submit, any outputs or outcomes submitted that are not calculated and reported by CSI or the State must be accompanied by a Mission-Specific Measures Form, specifying how you quantify the measure (including methodology used to determine, document and calculate your measure).

1. Academic Achievement

- a. How are students achieving on state assessments?
- b. How are students achieving on state assessments over time?
- c. How are students achieving on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?
- d. Have students demonstrated readiness for the next grade level/course, and, ultimately, are they on track for college and careers?

2. Academic Growth

- a. Are students making sufficient growth on state assessments?
- b. Are students making sufficient growth on state assessments over time?
- c. How are students growing on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?
- d. How is student growth distributed across growth levels?

3. Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

- a. How are students achieving on state assessments for postsecondary readiness?
- b. To what extent are students graduating high school?
- c. To what extent are students dropping out of high school?
- d. To what extent are high school graduates adequately prepared for post-secondary academic success?
- e. What is the school’s post-completion success rate?

***Data Notes:**

- Data sources include achievement, growth, and postsecondary and workforce readiness state files from 2019 to 2024. To protect student privacy, achievement data N counts less than 16 and growth data N counts less than 20 have been hidden. For more information regarding data privacy, please consult: <https://www.cde.state.co.us/dataprivacyandsecurity>

• Data symbols:

Symbol	Meaning
--	Used when data is not reported by the state.
n<16	Used for achievement measures. Indicates that student counts were too low to show the data publicly.
n<20	Used for growth measures. Indicates that student counts were too low to show the data publicly.

- Traditionally underserved populations include minority, special education, free or reduced price lunch, non-English proficient/limited English proficient (English learners), and gifted & talented students.

CSI Performance Framework

Financial Performance Framework

1. Enrollment

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

2. Debt

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

3. Balance Sheet

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

4. Operating Margin

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

Organizational Performance Framework

1. Governance

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

2. Education Program

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

3. Diversity, Equity of Access, and Inclusion

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

3. Financial Management

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

4. School Operations and Environment

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

5. Additional Obligations

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

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

Stone Creek Charter School Overview

Year Opened/Transferred: 2006-2007

Grades Served: K-8

School Model: Core Knowledge








Town/City: Avon/Gypsum

District of Residence: Eagle County RE 50

Original Application Type: New School

Enrollment and Student Demographics over Time					
October Student Counts	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Enrollment Over Time	321	310	314	295	299
F/R Lunch	14.0%	18.4%	17.5%	16.9%	31.4%
Minority	30.5%	29.7%	29.3%	31.5%	33.1%
IEP	19.0%	17.1%	16.6%	13.9%	15.7%
EL	18.4%	17.7%	16.9%	18.0%	22.7%
Gifted	8.7%	5.5%	2.9%	2.4%	4.0%
504	4.7%	3.5%	4.8%	4.7%	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
Academic	Improvement (Points Earned: 46.8%)
Elementary School Rating	Improvement (Points Earned: 46.2%)
Middle School Rating	Improvement (Points Earned: 47.3%)
High School Rating	--
Financial	Financial performance does not impact the school accreditation rating
Organizational	Organizational performance does not impact the school accreditation
Overall CARS Rating	Improvement

Participation

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

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

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

Assurance	
	Rating
Accountability Participation Rate	Meets 95%

Test Participation Rates (Ratings are based on Accountability Participation Rate)						
Subject	Total Records	Valid Scores	Participation Rate	Parent Excuses	Accountability Participation Rate	Rating
English Language Arts	225	207	92.0%	15	98.6%	Meets 95%
Math	225	207	92.0%	18	100.0%	Meets 95%
Science	71	68	95.8%	3	100.0%	Meets 95%

Test Participation Rates - Disaggregated by Test						
Subject	Total Records	Valid Scores	Participation Rate	Parent Excuses	Accountability Participation Rate	Rating
CMAS English Language Arts	225	207	92.0%	15	98.6%	Meets 95%
CMAS Math	225	207	92.0%	18	100.0%	Meets 95%
CMAS Science	71	68	95.8%	3	100.0%	Meets 95%
PSAT/SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PSAT/SAT Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	38	739	35	733	34	736	31	742	38	726
4	29	749	40	738	25	727	40	737	33	730
5	35	745	36	739	39	743	26	738	39	740
Elementary	102	744	111	737	98	736	97	739	110	732
6	42	747	42	747	26	741	31	737	29	734
7	36	757	36	753	35	748	22	738	33	733
8	35	755	35	753	33	738	25	745	25	728
Middle	113	753	113	751	94	743	78	740	87	732
Overall	215	749	224	744	192	739	175	739	197	732




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	470	730	444	735	371	733	409	732	409	733
4	470	742	474	741	463	735	371	738	406	737
5	532	743	466	748	407	739	460	742	373	740
Elementary	1,496	739	1,399	741	1,263	736	1,274	738	1,222	736
6	498	742	529	742	412	738	399	743	441	738
7	429	743	504	750	465	744	424	743	410	743
8	493	743	432	750	450	746	455	748	411	739
Middle	1,396	742	1,450	747	1,305	743	1,244	745	1,228	740
Overall	2,892	741	2,849	744	2,568	739	2,518	741	2,450	738

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 16.7 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score decreased by 7.3 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Eagle County RE 50) for the past five years. Overall, the school performs lower than their geo. district by 6.2 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	733.4	720.9	724.9	731.9	714.6
	N	751.4	746.3	743.4	741.2	741.4
Minority	Y	736.7	731.1	723.3	729.2	716.3
	N	755.1	750.3	747.2	743.1	737.9
IEP	Y	728.9	720.6	709.9	713.8	709.2
	N	753.4	749.4	746.1	743.9	734.3
EL	Y	726.9	724.1	715.3	721.1	702.6
	N	756.3	749.7	745.5	743.1	739.6
GT	Y	782.8	780.6	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	742.7	737.9	738.4	738.4	729.2
Schoolwide	749	744	739	739	732	

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	723.9	726.5	722.4	722.6	723.5
	N	750.8	755.1	746.8	752.4	748.5
Minority	Y	728.0	730.4	724.8	726.7	725.3
	N	755.4	761.1	756.7	758.1	754.3
IEP	Y	699.6	701.9	707.4	704.6	703.3
	N	746.0	749.9	743.9	746.2	743.5
EL	Y	722.8	725.8	720.6	720.6	719.6
	N	752.8	757.8	752.4	754.7	751.5
GT	Y	777.7	784.1	780.4	784.0	781.1
	N	734.8	738.1	734.6	736.4	733.5
Geographic District	741	744	739	741	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, general education students outperformed their IEP peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, overall, Eagle County RE 50 outperformed the school. In 2024, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: FRL, minority, EL, - additional details are available in the graphs.

English Language Arts Growth

CMAS ELA: School Status and Trends Tables and Graphs

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


Growth over Time in ELA										
CMAS ELA	2018		2019		2022		2023		2024	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	28	42.0	39	38.0	21	34.0	38	38.0	31	22.0
5	35	31.0	36	28.5	--	--	23	27.0	38	33.0
Elementary	63	37.0	75	31.0	21	34.0	61	36.0	69	28.0
6	40	49.5	40	61.0	26	76.5	31	51.0	25	42.0
7	33	52.0	34	48.5	--	--	n < 20	--	27	35.0
8	35	44.0	34	50.0	30	56.5	24	43.5	24	39.0
Middle	108	49.0	108	50.0	56	71.0	74	47.5	76	39.0
Overall	171	44.0	183	43.0	77	59.0	135	42.0	145	35.0




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	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	450	51.5	417	59.0	417	49.0	330	52.0	362	51.5
5	499	51.0	443	55.0	--	--	434	50.0	330	46.0
Elementary	960	51.0	873	56.0	437	48.0	792	50.0	724	48.0
6	457	48.0	508	55.0	396	53.5	382	55.5	426	50.0
7	391	51.0	474	62.0	--	--	404	57.0	386	48.0
8	451	47.0	407	60.0	419	53.0	440	57.5	392	52.0
Middle	1,299	49.0	1,376	59.0	795	54.0	1,198	57.0	1,172	51.0
Overall	391	51.0	2,249	59.0	1,232	51.0	1,990	54.0	1,896	49.0



Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative	
<p>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 -7 percentile points. In 2024, overall student growth did not meet state expectations and was below the geo. district. Overall student growth for the geo. district has decreased over time.</p>	



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	34.0	n<20	n<20	43.0	39.0
	N	48.0	43.0	62.0	40.5	33.0
Minority	Y	48.0	48.0	57.0	51.0	34.5
	N	42.5	41.5	62.5	37.0	35.0
IEP	Y	44.0	33.0	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	44.5	44.5	59.0	43.0	35.0
EL	Y	45.0	53.0	n<20	52.0	30.5
	N	44.0	40.5	64.0	38.5	36.0
GT	Y	70.0	45.0	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	44.0	42.5	59.0	43.0	35.0
Schoolwide		44.0	43.0	59.0	42.0	35.0

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	48.0	54.0	48.0	50.0	49.0
	N	52.0	61.0	53.0	56.0	50.0
Minority	Y	53.0	56.0	50.0	52.0	50.0
	N	49.0	61.0	53.0	56.0	49.0
IEP	Y	35.0	45.0	39.5	40.0	39.0
	N	52.5	60.0	53.0	56.0	51.0
EL	Y	41.0	56.0	49.0	50.0	48.0
	N	51.5	60.0	53.0	56.0	50.0
GT	Y	62.0	66.0	64.0	62.5	58.0
	N	50.0	57.0	49.5	53.0	49.0
Geographic District		51.0	59.0	51.0	54.0	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): FRL students outperformed their non-FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, overall, Eagle County RE 50 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	38	730	36	726	34	732	32	745	39	746
4	29	726	40	721	25	715	41	728	33	732
5	36	727	36	727	36	725	26	726	39	734
Elementary	103	728	112	724	95	725	99	733	111	738
6	42	730	42	733	26	725	30	722	29	716
7	37	749	36	740	34	728	22	731	31	726
8	35	750	35	747	32	711	25	723	26	727
Middle	114	742	113	739	92	721	77	725	86	723
Overall	217	735	225	732	187	723	176	729	197	731

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	470	731	447	735	378	736	422	734	410	734
4	477	726	472	729	471	723	377	728	408	728
5	537	729	475	733	413	733	474	729	378	731
Elementary	1,509	729	1,409	732	1,284	730	1,309	731	1,230	731
6	506	728	535	725	423	721	423	726	447	729
7	435	731	507	735	476	730	431	729	418	732
8	498	731	434	735	456	731	478	734	424	730
Middle	1,414	729	1,461	731	1,333	727	1,296	729	1,255	730
Overall	2,923	729	2,870	732	2,617	729	2,605	730	2,485	731

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 4.1 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score increased by 1.9 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district () for the past five years. Overall, the school outperforms their geo. district by 0.8 scale score points.

Mathematics Subgroup Achievement


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

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


Subgroup Achievement Gap Trends over Time in Math						
CMAS Math		2018	2019	2022	2023	2024
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y	728.5	711.1	712.2	714.8	713.7
	N	736.7	734.2	726.3	733.3	740.7
Minority	Y	726.9	723.5	713.8	720.9	716.6
	N	740.2	736.2	727.7	732.9	736.9
IEP	Y	715.9	712.7	695.3	702.9	707.6
	N	740.1	736.7	729.5	734.2	733.9
EL	Y	719.1	714.7	705.8	714.2	707.6
	N	741.4	737.2	727.5	732.9	737.7
GT	Y	770.2	769.5	n<16	n<16	n<16
	N	729.2	725.9	722.3	728.0	728.0
Schoolwide		735	732	723	729	731

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	712.8	715.3	715.0	713.7	717.8
	N	739.5	741.7	734.7	740.7	739.6
Minority	Y	716.1	718.5	716.1	717.3	718.9
	N	745.0	747.9	744.3	746.2	745.5
IEP	Y	696.4	698.7	705.9	706.0	708.0
	N	733.6	736.1	731.9	733.4	734.0
EL	Y	712.1	714.7	712.9	712.4	714.7
	N	741.4	744.3	740.2	742.9	742.3
GT	Y	766.1	770.0	768.2	774.1	772.9
	N	723.7	725.8	724.2	725.4	726.0
Geographic District		729	732	729	730	731

CMAS Math: Subgroup Gap Trends Graphs



CMAS Math: Subgroup Local Comparison Graphs



Achievement Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative


The graphs above show the performance of student subgroups on the Math state assessment over time. CMAS results show the following (if applicable): non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, general education students outperformed their IEP peers, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, overall, the school outperformed Eagle County RE 50. 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	28	39.0	39	33.0	--	--	38	35.0	31	45.0
5	35	13.0	36	29.0	35	36.0	23	47.0	38	35.5
Elementary	63	23.0	75	33.0	35	36.0	61	38.0	69	43.0
6	40	55.5	40	55.5	--	--	28	54.0	25	35.0
7	33	72.0	34	58.5	34	59.0	n < 20	--	24	55.0
8	35	50.0	34	47.0	--	--	23	49.0	24	56.5
Middle	108	65.0	108	53.5	34	59.0	70	52.0	73	44.0
Overall	171	46.0	183	44.0	69	43.0	131	48.0	142	43.0



CMAS Math: Local Comparison Tables and Graphs

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

Geographic District Growth over Time in Math										
CMAS Math	2018		2019		2022		2023		2024	
Grade/Level	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP	N	MGP
4	457	45.0	448	49.0	--	--	354	38.0	397	44.0
5	506	47.0	452	56.0	391	60.0	450	52.0	360	42.0
Elementary	974	46.5	913	52.0	391	60.0	831	45.0	789	44.0
6	460	49.0	512	48.5	--	--	392	53.0	433	62.0
7	389	51.0	479	63.0	437	47.0	406	59.0	392	54.5
8	317	42.0	397	56.0	--	--	454	53.0	396	59.0
Middle	1,166	48.0	1,375	56.0	437	47.0	1,225	55.0	1,189	58.0
Overall	317	42.0	2,288	54.0	828	54.0	2,056	51.0	1,978	52.0



Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs show schoolwide growth on the Math state assessment. From 2018 to 2024, overall student growth decreased. Since last year, student growth decreased by 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.

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	38.0	n<20	n<20	34.0	36.0
	N	46.0	44.0	41.0	51.5	47.0
Minority	Y	51.0	54.0	36.0	47.0	36.0
	N	42.0	37.5	52.0	50.0	45.0
IEP	Y	23.0	42.0	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	50.5	45.0	60.0	50.0	44.5
EL	Y	48.0	51.0	n<20	34.0	36.0
	N	44.0	42.0	47.0	51.0	44.5
GT	Y	64.0	42.0	n<20	n<20	n<20
	N	42.0	45.0	57.0	47.0	37.0
Schoolwide		46.0	44.0	43.0	48.0	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	41.0	51.0	58.0	43.0	51.0
	N	43.0	57.0	53.0	47.0	54.0
Minority	Y	49.0	52.0	53.0	44.0	52.0
	N	48.0	56.0	56.0	47.0	54.0
IEP	Y	41.0	43.0	42.0	43.0	48.0
	N	43.0	56.0	55.0	46.0	53.0
EL	Y	41.0	51.0	54.0	45.0	51.0
	N	44.0	56.0	54.0	45.5	54.0
GT	Y	56.0	60.0	59.5	72.5	61.0
	N	42.0	53.0	53.0	44.0	52.0
Geographic District		42.0	54.0	54.0	51.0	52.0

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, non-EL students outperformed their EL peers, overall, Eagle County RE 50 outperformed the school. In 2024, the following geo. district subgroups outperformed subgroups in the school: 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	22	50.5	59.1%	20	51.5	50.0%	n<20	--	--	20	51.0	75.0%	24	48.0	72.0%
Middle	n<20	--	--	n<20	--	--	n<20	--	--	n<20	--	--	n < 20	n<20	-
High	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Overall	36	58.0	58.3%	31	45.0	34.5%	29	15.0	15.4%	37	53.0	45.9%	n < 20	-	-

Geographic District Growth over Time on ACCESS															
ACCESS	2020			2021			2022			2023			2024		
Grade/Level	N	MGP	% On	N	MGP	% On	N	MGP	% On	N	MGP	% On	N	MGP	% On
Elementary	813	45.0	69.6%	775	52.0	57.1%	741	50.0	65.5%	124	56.0	68.5%	738	49.0	--
Middle	309	44.0	25.6%	268	57.0	22.8%	243	47.0	20.2%	78	47.5	14.1%	249	49.0	--
High	204	45.5	22.0%	223	49.0	26.5%	219	53.0	16.3%	35	47.0	12.8%	266	54.0	--
Overall	1,326	45.0	52.0%	1,266	52.0	45.6%	1,203	49.0	49.7%	1,229	48.0	49.7%	1,253	50.0	--

^^ACCESS subgroup status and gap trends are not available due to low student counts. CSI can provide this data to schools if requested.

What is On Track Growth? This metric reports whether students are on-track to achieve language proficiency. As CDE states, "The Colorado growth model calculates projected targets that indicate how much growth would be required for an individual student to achieve a specified level of proficiency within 1, 2, or 3 years. These projected targets can then be compared against the student's observed growth percentile to determine whether the student is on-track to meet their proficiency goal within the allotted timeline".

ACCESS: School Local Comparison Graphs



Growth Status and Local Comparison Narrative
The graphs above show schoolwide growth on the ACCESS for ELLs state assessment. In 2024, overall student growth exceeded state expectations and was above the geo. district. of students were reported as being on track to reach English language proficiency.

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	321.0	309.0	314.0	295.0	307.0
One-Year Enrollment Variance	+2.9%	-3.7%	+1.6%	-6.1%	+4.1%
Three-Year Enrollment Variance	+7.3%	-1.0%	-2.2%	-4.5%	-2.2%



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	0.0098	0.3497
Debt to Asset Ratio	2.777	2.076	1.6359	1.3239	1.2152

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	4.59	5.79	5.64	5.89	4.29
Change in Unassigned Fund Balance from Prior Year	+21.2%	+19.8%	+12.1%	+12.3%	+4.9%
Current Ratio	5.57	40.30	82.20	5.71	41.53




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	7.4%	8.1%	4.7%	4.5%	7.5%
3-Year Average Operating Margin	0.0%	8.0%	6.7%	5.7%	5.8%



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

Stone Creek Charter School ended the year with sufficient reserves to satisfy the TABOR reserve requirement. The school's funded-pupil count came in higher than the prior year and the school ended the year with 4.28 months of cash on hand and sufficient current assets to cover liabilities. The school experienced a positive operating margin of 7.48%.


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 Stone Creek Charter School in the 2023-2024 school year. Stone Creek Charter School had no organizational performance issues in the prior school year. Current year results show similar organizational performance compared to prior year.

Trends in Non-Compliance					
Category	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Governance					
"Is the school complying with applicable governance requirements?"	0	0	0	0	0
Education Program					
"Is the school fulfilling obligations and expectations relating to the educational program?"	0	0	0	0	0
Diversity, Equity of Access, and Inclusion					
"Is the school protecting the rights of all students?"	1	0	0	0	0
Financial Management					
"Is the school satisfying financial reporting and compliance requirements?"	0	0	0	0	0
School Operations and Environment					
"Is the school fulfilling obligations and expectations relating to the operational requirements?"	0	0	0	0	0
Additional Obligations					
"Is the school complying with all other obligations?"	0	0	0	0	0
Overall	1	0	0	0	0




Instances of Non-Compliance			
Year	Category	Type	Narrative
2019-2020	Diversity, Equity of Access, and Inclusion	Notice of Concern	The school received a Notice of Concern in the 2019-20 school year for failure to accurately document a student's qualifications for Early Access. The Notice was appropriately remedied in a timely manner.

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*	--	--	52.2%	11.1%	37.5%
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 (%)	-2.7%	-1.9%	-1.6%	-6.6%	0.3%
<i>Estimated Pupil Count</i>	330.0	315.0	319.0	316.0	306.0
<i>Actual Pupil Count</i>	321.0	309.0	314.0	295.0	307.0
Overall Grant Spend Down (%)	--	--	--	88%	100%
<i>Total Grant Funds Unrecoverable (\$)</i>	--	--	--	\$36,254.46	\$1,508.79
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	93.5%	93.4%	91.0%	92.3%	87.7%
Returning Student Rate	79.3%	77.7%	75.2%	78.1%	74.4%
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