

Annual Report Case Study



Colorado Charter School Institute



Agenda

- Introduction
- Annual Reporting as a Quality Authorizer Practice
- Critical Practices
 - Communication
 - Transparency
 - Body of Evidence
- CSI Annual Reporting Overview
 - Why CARS?
 - Performance Frameworks
 - Sample Report
 - Accreditation
 - Tiered Supports and Interventions
 - Process and Timeline
- Annual Report Development
- Resources



Introduction



Ryan Marks

Director of Evaluation
and Assessment


Colorado Charter
School Institute



What is CSI?


Our Schools

CSI oversees 42 charter schools that serve 20,000+ students and offer 16 unique educational models, including AEC, Early College, and Montessori.




Our Students

CSI continues to increase service to students with special needs and remains comparable to the state for enrollment of students of color, English Learners, and students with 504 plans.



Our Outcomes

CSI holds schools accountable for their performance. Three out of four CSI schools earned the state's highest academic rating this past year.





Why Annual Reports?

An annual public report provides clear, accurate performance data.

Evaluates progress toward meeting the standards and targets stated in the charter contract, including essential compliance requirements.

Charter schools are built around the promise of greater autonomy in exchange for greater accountability, and the annual report provides an opportunity to review the charter school's prior performance.



A comprehensive annual reporting process is critical to protect charter school autonomy, student rights, and the public interest, and ensures that schools are held to high standards.



Quality Authorizer Practice

A quality authorizer designs and implements an annual report to support effective oversight, communication with charter schools, and public accountability and transparency.



NACSA Practices and Standards

- Annual reporting is a NACSA Essential Practice
- The NACSA Quality Standards include several that focus on performance frameworks and annual reporting



Quality Authorizer Practice

1

Communication

Quality annual reporting practices are essential for effective oversight, communication with charter schools, and public accountability and transparency.

2

Transparency

Quality annual reporting practices help establish expectations, guide practice, assess progress, and inform decision making.

3

Body of Evidence

Quality annual reporting practices build a comprehensive body of evidence that support the authorizer's decision.



NACSA Quality Practice Project Finding

A strong feedback loops exist between the authorizer's monitoring system and schools, which gives schools clarity on where they stand relative to authorizer expectations.



Critical Practice - Communication

Improvement

The annual report can be used by schools to 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).

- **Continuous improvement plan**
- **Supplemental reports**
- **CARS dashboard**

Expectations

The annual 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.

- **Performance frameworks**
- **Comprehensive handbook**
- **Board trainings**
- **Alignment with renewal**



NACSA Quality Standard

Provides an annual written report to each school, summarizing its performance and compliance to date and identifying areas of strength and areas needing improvement.



Critical Practice – Transparency

Review

The annual reports provides the school a meaningful opportunity to review and respond to the cumulative report, to correct the record, if needed, and to present additional evidence regarding the school's performance.

- **Draft report**
- **School observations**

Public Record

The annual report is critical to protect charter school autonomy, student rights, and the public interest. The annual report is a part of the public record.

- **Board-approved**
- **Published on website**



NACSA Quality Standard

Defines and communicates to schools the process, methods, and timing of gathering and reporting school performance and compliance data.

Critical Practice – Body of Evidence



Evidence

The majority of the renewal evaluation is based on the evidence of school performance over the charter term and the primary driver of the renewal evaluation is the CSI Annual Review of Schools.

- **Performance frameworks**
- **School observations**
- **Aligned with renewal**

Evaluation

Well-developed protocols and tools are used in decision-making. These tools assist, but do not dictate, decision-making. Renewal decisions are grounded in facts, data, and expertise from a robust body of evidence.

- **Protocols and tools**
- **Collaborative review**




NACSA Quality Practice Project Finding

Authorizer publishes, at least annually, individual school performance reports aligned to framework expectations on at least academics, operations, and finances.



Annual Accountability Overview

CSI Annual Review of Schools (CARS) is the system used to annually evaluate and accredit its schools based on the CSI Performance Frameworks






Why CARS?

- Fulfill the statutory requirement to accredit schools
- To align with authorizer best practice by providing an annual evaluation for schools to check their record and drive improvements





Objectives of CARS





CARS & State Accountability

CARS

SPF

Multi-year - Trends over time

Geographic district comparisons

Service to at-risk students (including GT)

Single year

School data only (no GT)



The CSI Performance Framework




CSI Performance Frameworks

- The CSI Performance Framework provides the basis for the CSI Annual Review of Schools (CARS).
- The Performance Framework explicitly defines the measures by which CSI holds schools accountable with regards to academic, financial, and organizational performance.



CSI Performance Framework






In each of these three areas, the frameworks ask a fundamental question: how did the school perform last year?



Academic Framework

1. Academic Achievement
a. How are students achieving on state assessments?
b. How are students achieving on state assessments over time?
c. How are students achieving on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?
d. Have students demonstrated readiness for the next grade level/course, and, ultimately, are they on track for college and careers?
e. How are students achieving in comparison to similar schools statewide?
2. Academic Growth
a. Are students making sufficient growth on state assessments?
b. Are students making sufficient growth on state assessments over time?
c. How are students growing on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?
d. How is student growth distributed across growth levels?
e. How are students growing in comparison to similar schools statewide?
3. Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness
a. How are students achieving on state assessments for postsecondary readiness?
b. Are students graduating high school?
c. Are students dropping out of high school?
d. Are high school graduates adequately prepared for post-secondary academic success?
e. What is the school's post-completion success rate?





Financial Framework

1. Near Term

- a. Has the school met the statutory TABOR emergency reserve requirement?
- b. What is the school's current ratio?
- c. What is the school's days of cash on hand?
- d. Is the school in default with any financial covenants they have with loan agreements?
- e. What is the school's funded pupil count variance?

2. Sustainability

- a. What is the school's aggregate 3-year total margin?
- b. What is the school's net asset position?
- c. What is the school's debt?
- d. What is the school's cash flow?

Academic

Achievement

Growth

Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness

Financial

Near Term

Sustainability

Organizational

Education Program

Diversity, Equity of Access & Inclusion


Governance & Financial Management

School Operations & Environment



Organizational Framework

1. Education Program
a. Is the school complying with applicable education requirements?
2. Diversity, Equity of Access, and Inclusion
a. Is the school protecting the rights of all students?
3. Governance and Financial Management
a. Is the school complying with governance requirements?
b. Is the school satisfying financial reporting and compliance requirements?
4. School Operations and Environment
a. Is the school complying with health and safety requirements?
b. Is the school complying with facilities and transportation requirements?
c. Is the school complying with employee credentialing and background check requirements?
5. Additional Obligations
a. Is the school complying with all other obligations?



The CARS Report



Academic Performance

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	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
Grade/Level										
3	69	760	81	757	72	757	71	759	71	745
4	62	741	78	751	80	746	78	753	76	750
5	52	740	62	744	75	753	75	744	80	754
Elementary	183	748	221	751	227	752	224	752	227	750
6	43	741	55	748	71	749	77	740	66	747
7	42	748	56	743	51	747	76	743	70	749
8	22	723	46	761	62	750	41	743	65	743
Middle	107	740	157	750	184	749	194	742	201	747
Overall	318	746	399	749	449	751	418	747	428	748

Geographic District Achievement over Time in ELA										
CMAS ELA	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
Grade/Level										
3	1,426	730	1,509	730	1,568	732	1,494	730	1,537	733
4	1,462	738	1,361	738	1,575	736	1,597	739	1,474	741
5	1,419	738	1,377	735	1,411	739	1,635	740	1,583	743
Elementary	4,307	735	4,247	734	4,554	736	4,726	737	4,594	739
6	1,239	735	1,330	734	1,491	733	1,495	733	1,617	736
7	1,154	739	1,136	731	1,418	738	1,498	731	1,446	735
8	995	738	1,128	734	1,286	732	1,422	734	1,447	733
Middle	3,544	738	3,766	733	4,584	734	4,415	733	4,510	735
Overall	8,487	737	8,616	734	10,000	735	9,141	735	9,104	737

CMAS ELA: School Status, Trends, and Local Comparison Graphs



Achievement Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show schoolwide performance on the English Language Arts state assessment over time disaggregated by grade and class level. From 2015 to 2019, overall student achievement increased by 2.4 scale score points. Since last school year, overall mean scale score increased by 0.8 scale score points. The graphs on the bottom half of the page show the performance of the school in comparison to the geographic district (Mesa County Valley 51) for the past five years. Overall, the school outperforms their geo. district by 11 scale score points.

Academic

Achievement

Growth

Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness

Financial

Near Term

Sustainability

Organizational

Education Program

Diversity, Equity of Access & Inclusion

Governance & Financial Management

School Operations & Environment




Financial Performance

Fiscal Years 2015-2019 Financial Results

Governmental Funds Financial Statement Metrics

- Has the school met the statutory TABOR emergency reserve requirement?
- What is the school's months of cash on hand?
- What is the school's unassigned fund balance on hand?
- What is the school's current ratio?
- What is the school's aggregate 3-year total margin?

Governmental Funds Financial Statement Metrics					
Metric	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Operating Margin	1.8%	2.8%	0.6%	6.0%	34.1%
Months of Cash on Hand	3.12	3.98	3.05	3.90	1.40
Current Ratio	8.74	26.02	7.59	8.70	8.50
Months of Unassigned Fund Balance on Hand	2.29	1.91	2.16	3.00	0.20
Positive Unassigned Fund Balance (TABOR)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES



Enrollment

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

Enrollment					
Metric	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Funded Pupil Count (FPC) Current-Year Variance	-10.0%	7.1%	2.0%	0.8%	-1.3%
Change in FPC from Prior-Year	-9.4%	12.6%	4.6%	4.2%	0.8%

Proprietary Funds Financial Statement Metrics

- What is the school's months of cash on hand?
- What is the school's current ratio?
- What is the school's debt?
- What is the school's net asset position?

Proprietary Funds Financial Statement Metrics					
Metric	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Months of Cash on Hand	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Current Ratio	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Debt to Asset Ratio	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Change in Net Position	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Government-Wide Financial Statement Metrics

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

Government-Wide Financial Statement Metrics					
Metric	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Debt to Asset Ratio	1.79	1.71	1.61	1.86	1.55
Change in Net Position	(\$123,883)	(\$340,731)	(\$3,055,091)	(\$3,967,258)	\$216,812
Default	NO	NO	NO	NO	0

Academic

Achievement

Growth

Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness

Financial

Near Term

Sustainability

Organizational

Education Program

Diversity, Equity of Access & Inclusion
Governance & Financial Management

School Operations & Environment



Organizational Performance

Organizational Performance Metrics

Education Program

- Is the school complying with applicable education requirements?
The essential delivery of the education program in all material respects and operation reflects the essential terms of the program as defined in the charter agreement. Includes:
 - Instructional days or minutes requirements
 - Graduation and promotion requirements
 - Alignment with content standards, including Common Core
 - State-required assessments
 - Implementation of mandated programming as a result of state or federal funding

CSI Review

CSI was not made aware of any issues relating to applicable education requirements for the 2017-18 school year.

Diversity, Equity of Access, and Inclusion

- Is the school protecting the rights of all students?
Protecting student rights pursuant to:
 - Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Americans with Disabilities Act relating to the treatment of students with identified disabilities and those suspected of having a disability, consistent with the school's status and responsibilities as a school in a district LEA
 - Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and US Department of Education authorities relating to English Language Learner requirements
 - Law, policies and practices related to admissions, lottery, waiting lists, fair and open recruitment, enrollment, the collection and protection of student information
 - Conduct of discipline procedures, including discipline hearings and suspension and expulsion policies and practices, in compliance with CRS 22-33-105 and 22-33-106
 - Recognition of due process protections, privacy, civil rights and student liberties requirements, including 1st Amendment protections and the Establishment Clause restrictions prohibiting public schools from engaging in religious instruction

CSI Review

CSI was not made aware of any issues related to protecting the rights of all students.

Governance Management

- Is the school complying with governance requirements?
Includes:
 - Adequate Board policies and by laws, including those related to oversight of an education service provider, if applicable (CRS 22-30.5-509(s)), and those regarding conflicts of interest, anti-nepotism, excessive compensation, and board composition
 - Compliance with State open meetings law
 - Maintaining authority over management, holding it accountable for performance as agreed under a written performance
 - Requiring annual financial reports of the education service provider (CRS 22-30.5-509(s)), if applicable

CSI Review

CSI was not made aware of any issues relating to governance requirements for the 2017-18 school year.

Academic

Achievement

Growth

Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness

Financial

Near Term

Sustainability

Organizational

Education Program

Diversity, Equity of Access & Inclusion


Governance & Financial Management

School Operations & Environment

Determination of Accreditation Rating



Assigning School Ratings



Framework	CARS Rating
Academic	Performance Plan
Elementary School Rating	Performance (Points Earned: 57.1%)
Middle School Rating	Performance (Points Earned: 53.9%)
High School Rating	Performance with Distinction (Points Earned: 77.4%)
Financial	Financial performance does not impact the school accreditation rating
Organizational	Organizational performance does not impact the school accreditation rating
Overall CARS Rating	Performance Plan



Accreditation Ratings



Awarded to any CSI school in the top 25% of schools in Colorado – *this rating is unique to CSI*



Schools in these categories are not mandated to receive the level of supports as the rating categories below. However, schools with declining performance may be required to receive additional supports.



Any school in these rating categories are placed on performance watch and receive additional supports and interventions, required by both CSI and the state.

Tiered Supports and Interventions




Tiered Supports

- All schools within the CSI portfolio have access to the standard supports provided by CSI.
- Schools that are lower performing across one or more areas have access to, and are many times required to, receive additional supports or interventions.



Tiered Supports & Interventions


- Sample standard supports:





Tiered Supports & Interventions

- Sample tiered supports:






Additional Services and Supports


- Improvement planning support
- Supplemental reports
- Student Services Screener
- Regional meetings
- Board trainings
- School Improvement Fellowship
- MTSS Cohort
- Relay Denver Sponsorship



CARS Dashboard



COLORADO CHARTER SCHOOL INSTITUTE



Current Rating (2018-19)

- Performance with Distinction
- Performance Plan
- Improvement Plan
- AEC: Improvement
- Priority Improvement Plan
- Turnaround
- Insufficient State Data

School Performance Data

To the left is a map of all Colorado Charter School Institute schools and their corresponding school performance rating for the most recent school year.

Highlight a School


ACADEMY OF CHARTER SCHOOL... ▾

☞


What makes up this rating?

Once you've highlighted a school above, click the buttons below to investigate your selected school's CMAS, PSAT/SAT, and ACCESS for ELLs data. If not available, the graphs will show your school's geographic district results.


CMAS English Language Arts & Math




CMAS Science



PSAT/SAT EBRW & Math



ACCESS for ELLs



© 2020 Mapbox © OpenStreetMap

CARS Process and Timeline



CARS Process Overview

Data Collection (Prior School Year)

- Data are collected from a variety of sources, including assessment results, state reporting, financial and organizational submissions and audits.

Review Against Performance Frameworks (Fall)

- Data are then reviewed against each of the measures within the CSI Performance Frameworks.


Data Reporting (Winter)

- Data are analyzed and shared with stakeholders through CARS reporting tools.

*Accreditation rating of Year 1 schools is based off of level of risk identified in new school recommendation and fulfillment of milestones to date.




CARS Timeline



Annual Report Development





*From NACSA's Annual Reports Made Easy

Identify the performance expectations and measures that will form the basis of the renewal decision for each charter school.

1. Academic Achievement
a. How are students achieving on state assessments?
b. How are students achieving on state assessments over time?
c. How are students achieving on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?
d. Have students demonstrated readiness for the next grade level/course, and, ultimately, are they on track for college and careers?
e. How are students achieving in comparison to similar schools statewide?
2. Academic Growth
a. Are students making sufficient growth on state assessments?
b. Are students making sufficient growth on state assessments over time?
c. How are students growing on state assessments in comparison to other schools in their geographic home district or schools that students might otherwise attend?
d. How is student growth distributed across growth levels?
e. How are students growing in comparison to similar schools statewide?
3. Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness
a. How are students achieving on state assessments for postsecondary readiness?
b. Are students graduating high school?
c. Are students dropping out of high school?
d. Are high school graduates adequately prepared for post-secondary academic success?
e. What is the school's post-completion success rate?

1. Near Term
a. Has the school met the statutory TABOR emergency reserve requirement?
b. What is the school's current ratio?
c. What is the school's days of cash on hand?
d. Is the school in default with any financial covenants they have with loan agreements?
e. What is the school's funded pupil count variance?
2. Sustainability
a. What is the school's aggregate 3-year total margin?
b. What is the school's net asset position?
c. What is the school's debt?
d. What is the school's cash flow?

1. Education Program
a. Is the school complying with applicable education requirements?
2. Diversity, Equity of Access, and Inclusion
a. Is the school protecting the rights of all students?
3. Governance and Financial Management
a. Is the school complying with governance requirements?
b. Is the school satisfying financial reporting and compliance requirements?
4. School Operations and Environment
a. Is the school complying with health and safety requirements?
b. Is the school complying with facilities and transportation requirements?
c. Is the school complying with employee credentialing and background check requirements?
5. Additional Obligations
a. Is the school complying with all other obligations?



Collect needed information and data.

State Accountability Data Files

Overview

This page provides access to a repository of files containing information related to the annual School and District Performance Frameworks. The repository includes spreadsheets containing current and historical performance framework results, along with copies of PowerPoint presentations and other reports presented to the State Board of Education. Detailed information about the content and format of each file appears below.

Quick Links

- [School and District Performance Framework reports](#)
- [Performance Framework Data Files from prior years](#)

Data Files

Format: XLS files

Includes: preliminary rating releases, most recent final rating release, prior year releases

Updated: annually September - December

Performance Framework Flat Files

Final Files

Please note that accreditation ratings and plan types have been rolled over from 2019. More information can be found on the accountability pause web-page, [click here](#).

- [CDE 2020 Final District Accreditation Ratings \(XLS\)](#) - Nov 11, 2020
 - Final District Ratings (Including prior year ratings & years on accountability clock)
 - [Printer friendly version here](#)
- [CDE 2020 Final School Ratings \(XLS\)](#) - Nov 11, 2020
 - Final School Ratings (Including prior year ratings & years on accountability clock)
 - [Printer friendly version here](#)

Additional Flat Files

Achievement

- [2019 Achievement Percentiles within Subgroups \(XLS\)](#) - August 26, 2019
District and school-level achievement percentile rankings on CMAS & PSAT/SAT for all students and within subgroups. Also, 2019 On-Track percentages for CMAS ELA & Math. All now available via the Data Explorer tool.

Growth

- [2019 CMAS_PSAT/SAT Growth Percentiles \(XLS\)](#) - August 26, 2019
State-level CMAS and PSAT/SAT median growth percentiles (MGP) by subgroup; district and school-level MGPs for all students by level (E,M,H).
- [2019 Growth Percentiles within Subgroups \(XLS\)](#) - August 26, 2019
State, district, and school-level CMAS and PSAT/SAT median growth percentiles (MGP) for all students and by subgroups.
- [2020 ACCESS Growth Percentiles \(XLS\)](#) - July 17, 2020
State, district, and school-level median growth percentiles (MGP) on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0[®] assessment.



INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT

To the Board of Directors

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the governmental activities, the business-type activities, and each major fund of [redacted], as of and for the year ended June 30, 2019, and the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise the School's basic financial statements as listed in the table of contents.

Management's Responsibility for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America; this includes the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditors' Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express opinions on these financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditor's judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the entity's preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity's internal control. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinions.

Opinions

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the respective financial position of the governmental activities, the business-type activities, and each major fund of the [redacted] as of June 30, 2019, and the respective changes in financial position and, where applicable, cash flows thereof for the year then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.



*From NACSA's Annual Reports Made Easy



Organize the information and data into four content areas.

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
CMAS Science	19
English Language Proficiency	21
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	22
School Observations	33
Financial Performance	34
Organizational Performance	36



*From NACSA's Annual Reports Made Easy

Explain the standards that apply to each measure, and the rating system to assess school performance on each measure.

Achievement - Status

1.a. How are students achieving on state assessments?

Description	Evaluating the performance of all students on state assessments in English Language Arts, mathematics and science
Metric/Source	Mean scale score/CMAS assessment data
Rating Scale	Rating scale will align to the state rating scale for ELA, math, and science

1.a.i. How are traditionally underserved* students achieving on state assessments?

Description	Evaluating the performance of student subgroups on state assessments in English Language Arts, mathematics and science (gap to standard)
Metric/Source	Mean scale score/CMAS assessment data
Rating Scale	Rating scale will align to the state rating scale for ELA, math, and science

1.a.ii. How are traditionally underserved students achieving on state assessments compared to their peers?

Description	Evaluating the performance of student subgroups compared to their peers on state assessments in English Language Arts, mathematics and science (gap to peers)
Metric/Source	Mean scale score/CMAS assessment data
Rating Scale	Rating scale will compare the gap between subgroups and their peers relative to the state achievement gap

*traditionally underserved include: minority, SpEd, FRL, NEP/LEP, and GT

Fund Type: Governmental

Financial Indicator	Does Not Meet Value	Approaching Value	Meets Value	Exceeds Value	Measure Notes
Operating Margin	Less Than or Equal to -3%	Between -2.9% and -0.1%	Between 0% and 2.9%	Greater Than or Equal to 3%	Demonstrates whether a school spent more than they brought in during a fiscal year.
Months of Cash on Hand	Less than or equal to 1	Between 1.1 and 1.9	Between 2 and 2.9	Greater than or equal to 3	Critical to ensure liquid assets are sufficient to meet current obligations. Schools with less than 2 months of cash on hand may have difficulty making facility and payroll expenses if/when receipts are delayed or less than expected.
Months of Unassigned Fund Balance on Hand	Less than or equal to 0.6	Between 0.7 and 0.9	Between 1 and 1.4	1.5	Unassigned fund balance ensures that the school can weather unexpected expenses or decreased revenues with little to no operational impact. The higher the fund balance, the more insulated the operations (teacher pay, rent, instructional supplies) are from unexpected negative events.
Positive Unassigned Fund Balance (TABOR)	NO	N/A	YES	N/A	Unassigned fund balance is equal to total fund balance less restrictions imposed by state law, board policy, lenders, authorizers, or assigned for specific use by staff. If this indicator is negative, it signals that the school does not have an adequate fund balance to comply with law, policy, or other regulations.



*From NACSA's Annual Reports Made Easy

Clearly report performance results for each measure.

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 area or schools that students might otherwise attend?

Achievement over Time in ELA										
CMAS ELA	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	69	760	81	757	72	757	71	759	71	745
4	62	741	78	751	80	746	78	753	76	750
5	52	740	62	744	75	753	75	744	80	754
Elementary	183	748	221	751	227	752	224	752	227	750
6	43	741	55	748	71	749	77	740	66	747
7	42	748	56	743	51	747	76	743	70	749
8	22	723	46	761	62	750	41	743	65	743
Middle	107	740	157	750	184	749	194	742	201	747
Overall	318	746	399	749	449	751	418	747	428	748


Geographic District Achievement over Time in ELA										
CMAS ELA	2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
Grade/Level	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS	N	MSS
3	1,426	730	1,509	730	1,568	732	1,494	730	1,537	733
4	1,462	738	1,361	738	1,575	736	1,597	739	1,474	741
5	1,419	738	1,377	735	1,411	739	1,635	740	1,583	743
Elementary	4,307	735	4,247	734	4,554	736	4,726	737	4,594	739
6	1,239	735	1,330	734	1,491	733	1,495	733	1,617	736
7	1,154	739	1,136	731	1,418	738	1,498	731	1,446	735
8	995	738	1,128	734	1,286	732	1,422	734	1,447	733
Middle	3,544	738	3,766	733	4,584	734	4,415	733	4,510	735
Overall	8,487	737	8,616	734	10,000	735	9,141	735	9,104	737

Fiscal Years 2015-2019 Financial Results

Governmental Funds Financial Statement Metrics

- Has the school met the statutory TABOR emergency reserve requirement?
- What is the school's months of cash on hand?
- What is the school's unassigned fund balance on hand?
- What is the school's current ratio?
- What is the school's aggregate 3-year total margin?

Metric	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Operating Margin	1.8%	2.8%	0.6%	6.0%	34.1%
Months of Cash on Hand	3.12	3.98	3.05	3.90	1.40
Current Ratio	8.74	26.02	7.59	8.70	8.50
Months of Unassigned Fund Balance on Hand	2.29	1.91	2.16	3.00	0.20
Positive Unassigned Fund Balance (TABOR)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES



*From NACSA's Annual Reports Made Easy

Highlight areas of strong performance, and areas for improvement—without prescribing solutions.

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?


Geographic Achievement Group	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
CMAS ELA					
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y 736.4	739.6	745.9	739.4	743.6
	N 745.1	752.8	752.2	749.3	749.1
Minority	Y 742.8	745.6	748.3	749.4	747.8
	N 746.4	750.1	751.3	747.0	748.3
IEP	Y 710.2	710.5	709.0	711.2	703.6
	N 748.9	753.0	754.1	750.2	750.9
EL	Y --	--	--	--	--
	N 746.6	749.6	750.9	747.3	748.2
GT	Y 776.3	780.6	--	787.9	779.4
	N 744.2	747.6	750.8	744.9	746.4
Schoolwide	745.8	749.4	750.8	747.4	748.2

Geographic District	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
CMAS ELA					
Student Subgroup	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS	MSS
F/R Lunch	Y 726.4	724.6	725.1	725.2	726.7
	N 745.8	739.4	743.5	744.0	746.6
Minority	Y 729.1	726.2	727.1	726.7	727.7
	N 739.9	737.1	738.0	738.1	740.8
IEP	Y 705.9	705.8	703.0	704.5	704.4
	N 741.7	738.5	739.2	739.9	740.3
EL	Y 719.6	721.0	722.2	720.1	718.1
	N 738.1	734.8	735.6	735.6	738.0
GT	Y 744.2	779.6	780.3	780.2	784.7
	N 736.4	731.9	733.1	732.4	734.2
Geographic District	736.6	733.7	734.7	734.7	736.9

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 English Language Arts state assessment over time. CMAS results show non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, general education students outperformed their IEP peers, GT students outperformed their non-GT peers, overall, the school outperformed Mesa County Valley 51. In 2019, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: FRL, minority, - additional details are available in the graphs.

Achievement Subgroup Status and Local Comparison Narrative

The graphs above show the performance of student subgroups on the English Language Arts state assessment over time. CMAS results show non-FRL students outperformed their FRL peers, non-minority students outperformed their minority peers, general education students outperformed their IEP peers, GT students outperformed their non-GT peers, overall, the school outperformed Mesa County Valley 51. In 2019, the following subgroups outperformed the geo. district: FRL, minority, - additional details are available in the graphs.

Fiscal Years 2015-2019 Financial Results

Financial Performance Narrative

ended the year with sufficient reserves to satisfy the TABOR reserve requirement, an increase in net position, and reported no statutory violations in their Assurances for Financial Accreditation. The school's funded-pupil count came in lower than budget by 10.9 pupils (1 percent), and 6.1 pupils (1 percent) higher than the prior year. As expected of all PERA employers, the school has a high debt to asset ratio due to the inclusion of the PERA Net Pension Liability per GASB No. 68. The school's governmental funds ended the year with 1.4 months of cash on hand and sufficient current assets to cover current liabilities. The school experienced a positive operating margin of 34 percent and a decrease in their unassigned fund balance.

Identify the performance expectations and measures that will form the basis of the renewal decision for each charter school.

Collect needed information and data.

Organize the information and data into four content areas.

Explain the standards that apply to each measure, and the rating system to assess school performance on each measure.

Clearly report performance results for each measure.

Highlight areas of strong performance, and areas for improvement—without prescribing solutions.

Summarize the school's ratings in key areas at the front of the report.

Provide each school the opportunity to review and respond to its draft report.

Publish the annual report online and make it available to the public.

Summarize the school's ratings in key areas at the front of the report.

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 71.3% Points Earned

Performance: Between 53% to 71.3% Points Earned

Improvement: Between 42% to 52.9% Points Earned

Priority Improvement: Between 34% and 41.9% Points Earned

Turnaround: Below 34% Points Earned

Framework	CARS Rating
Academic	Performance Plan
Elementary School Rating	Performance (Points Earned: 57.1%)
Middle School Rating	Performance (Points Earned: 53.9%)
High School Rating	Performance with Distinction (Points Earned: 77.4%)
Financial	Financial performance does not impact the school accreditation rating
Organizational	Organizational performance does not impact the school accreditation rating
Overall CARS Rating	Performance Plan





Provide each school the opportunity to review and respond to its draft report.

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 and presented to each school in September. 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
- Financial Performance: Amanda Karger
- Organizational Performance: Clare Vickland - State/Federal Programs | Anastasia Hawkins - Compliance Monitoring

If you wish to supplement any area of your report with additional evidence, these proposed changes or additions must be returned to CSI (ryanmarks@csi.state.co.us) no later than September 27th.

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

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

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

A majority of the metrics within this report will be collected by CSI on a yearly basis and presented to each school in September. 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
Financial Performance: Amanda Karger
Organizational Performance: Clare Vickland - State/Federal Programs | Anastasia Hawkins - Compliance Monitoring

If you wish to supplement any area of your report with additional evidence, these proposed changes or additions must be returned to CSI (ryanmarks@csi.state.co.us) no later than September 27th.


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.



*From NACSA's Annual Reports Made Easy



Publish the annual report online and make it available to the public.



School Ratings

See below for CSI schools performance ratings and CARS Reports for the 2019-20 school year.

To access CARS Reports for the 2018-19 school year, [click here](#).

Key	
% Framework Points (SPF) by Rating	
above 72.8%	Performance with Distinction
53.0% < x < 72.8%	Performance
42.0% < x < 53%	Improvement
34.0% < x < 42.0%	Priority Improvement
below 34.0%	Turnaround

Flags

- Low Participation: Participation rate is below 95% in two or more content areas (includes opt outs)
- Decreased Due to Participation: Accountability participation rate is below 95% in two or more content areas (excludes opt outs)

School	CSI Accreditation Rating and Report (click rating to view report)
Academy of Arts & Knowledge	Performance
Academy of Charter Schools	Performance with Distinction: Low Participation
Animas High School	Performance



*From NACSA's Annual Reports Made Easy



Resources

- ▷ [CSI Renewal Website](#) (includes all renewal materials, site visit materials, and supplemental resources)
- ▷ [Annual accountability reports](#) and [resources](#)
 - [School Accountability One Pagers](#)
 - [Annotated CARS Report](#)
 - [CARS Handbook](#)
- ▷ [CARS Dashboard](#)
- ▷ [NACSA Quality Practice Project](#)
- ▷ NACSA [Essential Practices](#) and [Principles and Standards](#)