



# Pullman Community Montessori

**2022-23 ANNUAL STUDENT ACADEMIC  
PERFORMANCE REPORT**

by Washington State Charter School Commission



WASHINGTON STATE  
*Charter School Commission*  
STUDENTS • INNOVATION • TRANSPARENCY

# SCHOOL OVERVIEW

## Pullman Community Montessori

115 NW State Street, Suite 212, Pullman, WA 99163

School Contact Information	509-336-5909
School Website	<a href="https://www.pullmancommunitymontessori.org/">https://www.pullmancommunitymontessori.org/</a>
Neighborhood Location	Pullman School District
Leadership	Laylah Bewick
School Mission	To prepare all students to reach their full potential for future success in high school, college, career, and life, using the rich resources of our community.
Education Program Terms & Design Elements	Developmentally appropriate age-grouped classrooms Self-directed learning environment Learning through action and community
Grades Served	K-6
First Year of Operation	2021-22
Total Student Enrollment	97
Currently Operational	Yes

*NOTE: All data in this report are from the 2022-23 school year, including school leadership and contract elements*

# Student Demographics

## STUDENT GROUPS

Students with Disabilities	<b>17.0%</b>
English Learners	<b>2.1%</b>
Low Income	<b>38.1%</b>

## GENDER

Male	<b>42.3%</b>
Female	<b>55.7%</b>
Gender X	<b>2.1%</b>

## RACE / ETHNICITY

American Indian / Alaskan Native	<b>0.0%</b>
Asian	<b>3.1%</b>
Black / African American	<b>2.1%</b>
Hispanic / LatinX	<b>17.5%</b>
Native Hawaiian / other Pacific Islander	<b>0.0%</b>
Two or More Races	<b>14.4%</b>
White	<b>62.9%</b>

## PURPOSE OF REPORT

The Washington State Charter School Commission is committed to promoting high-quality education for public school students in Washington. This Annual Performance Report is produced in order to:

- 1** Provide timely information to the charter school on its performance relative to the standards and expectations established by applicable federal and state law and the charter contract.
- 2** Identify the school’s strengths and any areas needing improvement.
- 3** Provide information that enables the community and the public to understand the school’s performance, including its fulfillment of public obligations.

## ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK (APF)

The Academic Performance Framework (APF) includes measures that allow the Commission to evaluate charter school academic performance. A charter school that meets the standards in this area is implementing its academic program effectively, and student learning—the central purpose of every school—is taking place.

The APF contains measures that have been grouped according to:

### 1. STATE AND FEDERAL ACCOUNTABILITY RESULTS answer the question:

Is the charter school meeting performance expectations based on the Washington School Improvement Framework?

### 2. GEOGRAPHIC COMPARISONS answer the question:

How are charter school students performing compared to the traditional public schools that students would otherwise attend if they did not attend the charter school?

### 3. SCHOOL-SPECIFIC ACADEMIC GOALS answer the question:

Did the school meet its school specific academic goals?

## The APF measures roll-up to an overall rating.

The overall rating provides clarity to schools about how decisions will be made, and which components of performance are most important. Additionally, an overall rating provides a “bright line” regarding charter school performance expectations that ensures consistency in Commission decision-making and supports parents as they navigate their public school options.

### Overall Tier Rating: NA

Indicator 1 was not calculated for Pullman Community Montessori because they do not have a Washington School Improvement Framework score calculated for 2022-23.

Tier	Rating
1	EXCEEDS Standard
2	MEETS Standard
3	DOES NOT MEET Standard
4	FALLS FAR BELOW Standard

INDICATOR	MEASURE		RATING	WEIGHT	
				K-8	HS
1. State Accountability	1a. WA School Improvement Framework	1a.1. All Students Framework Score		25%	25%
		1a.2. Subgroup Framework Score		25%	25%
2. Geographic Comparisons (Assigned School Comparisons)	2a.1. Proficiency geographic comparison (ELA/Math/Science)		F F D	5%	5%
	2a.2. Subgroup geographic comparison (ELA/Math/Science)		F F	5%	5%
	2b.1. All students growth geographic comparison (ELA/Math)		F D	10%	n/a
	2b.2. Subgroup growth geographic comparison (ELA/Math)		M D	10%	n/a
	2c.1. Graduation rate geographic comparison			n/a	7.5%
	2c.2. Graduation rate subgroup geographic comparison			n/a	7.5%
	2d.1. EL Progress			1.25%	1.25%
	2d.2. Subgroup EL Progress		*	1.25%	1.25%
	2e.1. Regular Attendance		F	1.25%	1.25%
	2e.2. Subgroup Regular Attendance		F	1.25%	1.25%
	2f.1. 9th Graders on Track			n/a	1.25%
	2f.2. Subgroup 9th Graders on Track			n/a	1.25%
	2g.1. Dual Credit			n/a	1.25%
	2g.2. Subgroup Dual Credit			n/a	1.25%
3. School-Specific Goals	3a. School-Specific Goals		M	15%	15%

NOTES: \*Student subgroup data for measure 2d.2 is not required to be reported on by ESSA and is not reported out by OSPI. This indicator will be re-evaluated by the Commission in the future.

- An overall academic tier is not calculated for schools that do not have at least one year of Smarter Balanced Assessment data or if one or more of the three indicators is missing.
- Measures 2a.1., 2a.2., 2b.1., and 2b.2. are weighted evenly by subject.

# ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK INDICATORS

## 1. STATE ACCOUNTABILITY

### 1a.1. All Students WA School Improvement Framework Score

### 1a.2. Subgroup WA School Improvement Framework Score

Is the charter school meeting performance expectations based on the state accountability system?

**E** **Exceeds Standard:** Charter school receives an all students Framework Score of 8, 9, or 10.

**D** **Does Not Meet Standard:** Charter school receives an all students Framework Score of 4 or 5.

**M** **Meets Standard:** Charter school receives an all students Framework Score of 6 or 7.

**F** **Falls Far Below Standard:** Charter school receives an all students Framework Score of 1, 2, or 3.

GROUP	SCHOOL PERFORMANCE	RATING
1a.1. All Students		
American Indian/Alaskan Native		
Asian		
Black/African American		
Hispanic/LatinX		
Native Hawaiian/ other Pacific Islander		
Two or More Races		
White		
Students with Disabilities		
English Learners		
Low Income		
1a.2. Overall Subgroups		

*NOTES: Any results not shown suppressed due to OSPI suppression rules or grades served.*

## 2. Geographic Comparisons: Assigned School Comparisons (ASC)

### Proficiency

2a.1. All Students Proficiency geographic comparison (ELA/Math/Science) Assigned School Comparison (ASC)

2a.2. Subgroup Proficiency geographic comparison (ELA/Math/Science) Assigned School Comparison (ASC)

How are charter school students performing on state assessments compared to the traditional public schools that they would otherwise attend if they did not attend the charter school?

**E** **Exceeds Standard:** Charter school proficiency is 10 or more percentage points above the ASC average.

**D** **Does Not Meet Standard:** Charter school proficiency is up to 9 percentage points below the ASC average.

**M** **Meets Standard:** Charter school proficiency is equal to or up to 9 percentage points above the ASC average.

**F** **Falls Far Below Standard:** Charter school proficiency is 10 or more percentage points below the ASC average.

GROUP	ELA			MATH			SCIENCE		
	SCHOOL	ASC	RATING	SCHOOL	ASC	RATING	SCHOOL	ASC	RATING
2a.1. All Students	30	63	F	30	61	F	64	72	D
American Indian/ Alaskan Native									
Asian									
Black/African American									
Hispanic/LatinX									
Native Hawaiian/ other Pacific Islander									
Two or More Races									
White	41	67	F	29	65	F			
Female	42	69	F	<25	56	F			
Male	<19	52	F	38	62	F			
Students with Disabilities									
English Learners									
Low Income	<27	46	F	<27	39	F			
2a.2. Overall Subgroups			F			F			

**NOTES:** Students in Washington take the End of Year science assessment in 5<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, and 11<sup>th</sup> grades. Any results not shown suppressed due to OSPI suppression rules or grades served.

### School response:

# GROWTH

## 2b.1. All Students Growth geographic comparison (ELA/Math) Assigned School Comparison (ASC)

## 2b.2. Subgroup Growth geographic comparison (ELA/Math) Assigned School Comparison (ASC)

How are charter school students meeting growth expectations compared to the traditional public schools that students would otherwise attend if they did not attend the charter school? (based on school and subgroup median growth percentiles [MGP])

**E Exceeds Standard:** Charter school MGP is 5 or more points above ASC average MGP.

**D Does Not Meet Standard:** Charter school MGP is up to 4 points below the ASC average MGP.

**M Meets Standard:** Charter school MGP is equal to or up to 4 points above ASC average MGP.

**F Falls Far Below Standard:** Charter school MGP is 5 or more points below the ASC average MGP.

GROUP	ELA			MATH		
	SCHOOL	ASC	RATING	SCHOOL	ASC	RATING
2b.1. All Students	35	55.5	F	43	65	F
American Indian/ Alaskan Native						
Asian						
Black/African American						
Hispanic/LatinX						
Native Hawaiian/ other Pacific Islander						
Two or More Races						
White	56	54.5	M	62	66	D
Female						
Male						
Students with Disabilities						
English Learners						
Low Income						
2b.2. Overall Subgroups			M			D

*NOTES: ASC results are presented only if corresponding charter results are available. Any results not shown suppressed due to OSPI suppression rules or grades served.*

### School response:

# GRADUATION RATE

## 2c.1. Graduation Rate Assigned School Comparison (ASC)

## 2c.2. Graduation Rate Subgroup Assigned School Comparison (ASC)

How are charter school student high school cohort graduation rates compared to the traditional public schools that students would otherwise attend if they did not attend the charter school?

**E Exceeds Standard:** Charter school graduation rate is 10 or more percentage points above ASC average.

**D Does Not Meet Standard:** Charter school graduation rate is up to 9 percentage points below the ASC average.

**M Meets Standard:** Charter school graduation rate is equal to or up to 9 percentage points above ASC average.

**F Falls Far Below Standard:** Charter school graduation rate is 10 or more percentage points below the ASC average.

GROUP	SCHOOL PERFORMANCE	ASC PERFORMANCE	RATING
2c.1. All Students			
American Indian/ Alaskan Native			
Asian			
Black/African American			
Hispanic/LatinX			
Native Hawaiian/ other Pacific Islander			
Two or More Races			
White			
Female			
Male			
Students with Disabilities			
English Learners			
Low Income			
2c.2. Overall Subgroups			

**NOTES:** ASC results are presented only if corresponding charter results are available. Any results not shown suppressed due to OSPI suppression rules or grades served.



# English Learner Progress

2d.1. English Learner Progress Assigned School Comparison (ASC)

2d.2. English Learner Progress Subgroup Assigned School Comparison (ASC)

**\*\* Student subgroup data for measure 2d.2 is not required to be reported on by ESSA and is not reported out by OSPI. This indicator will be re-evaluated by the Commission in the future.**

How does Charter School English Learner progress compare to the district schools that students would otherwise attend if they did not attend the charter school?

- E Exceeds Standard:** Charter school performance is 10 or more percentage points above ASC average.
- D Does Not Meet Standard:** Charter school performance is up to 9 percentage points below the ASC average.
- M Meets Standard:** Charter school performance is equal to or up to 9 percentage points above ASC average.
- F Falls Far Below Standard:** Charter school performance is 10 or more percentage points below the ASC average.

GROUP	SCHOOL PERFORMANCE	ASC PERFORMANCE	RATING
All Students			

*NOTES: ASC results are presented only if corresponding charter results are available. Any results not shown suppressed due to OSPI suppression rules or grades served.*

## ADDITIONAL INDICATORS

2e.1., 2e.2. Regular Attendance Assigned School Comparison (ASC)

2 f.1., 2 f.2. 9th Graders on Track Assigned School Comparison (ASC)

2g.1., 2g.2. Dual Credit Assigned School Comparison (ASC)

How are charter school students performing compared to traditional public schools that students would otherwise attend if they did not attend the charter school?

**E** **Exceeds Standard:** Charter school performance is 10 or more percentage points above the ASC average.

**D** **Does Not Meet Standard:** Charter school performance is up to 9 percentage points below the ASC average.

**M** **Meets Standard:** Charter school performance is equal to or up to 9 percentage points above the ASC average.

**F** **Falls Far Below Standard:** Charter school performance is 10 or more percentage points below the ASC average.

GROUP	REGULAR ATTENDANCE (2.e)			9 <sup>TH</sup> GRADERS ON TRACK (2.f)			DUAL CREDIT (2.g)		
	SCHOOL	ASC	RATING	SCHOOL	ASC	RATING	SCHOOL	ASC	RATING
All Students	<b>44%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>F</b>						
American Indian/ Alaskan Native									
Asian									
Black/African American									
Hispanic/LatinX	<b>29%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>F</b>						
Native Hawaiian/ other Pacific Islander									
Two or More Races									
White	<b>48%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>F</b>						
Female	<b>44%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>F</b>						
Male									
Students with Disabilities	<b>26%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>F</b>						
English Language Learners									
Low Income	<b>15%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>F</b>						
Overall Subgroups			<b>F</b>						

*NOTES: ASC results are presented only if corresponding charter results are available. Any results not shown suppressed due to OSPI suppression rules or grades served.*

**School response:**

### 3. SCHOOL-SPECIFIC ACADEMIC GOAL(S)

**E** **Exceeds Standard:** >60% of students scoring Lo/Lo Avg meet their individual growth projection goals on Spring 2023 MAP assessment

**D** **Does Not Meet Standard:** 35-49% of students scoring Lo/Lo Avg meet their individual growth projection goals on Spring 2023 MAP assessment

**M** **Meets Standard:** 50-59% of students scoring Lo/Lo Avg meet their individual growth projection goals on Spring 2023 MAP assessment

**F** **Falls Far Below Standard:** <35% of students scoring Lo/Lo Avg meet their individual growth projection goals on Spring 2023 MAP assessment

GOAL	SCHOOL PERFORMANCE	RATING
Of the students who score Lo and LoAvg on their MAP ELA in Fall 2022, half of them will achieve their MAP Projected Growth Goals by the Spring 2023 testing session.	78%	E
Of the students who score Lo and LoAvg on their MAP Math in Fall 2022, half of them will achieve their MAP Projected Growth Goals by the Spring 2023 testing session.	55%	M

**School response:**



**MAILING ADDRESS**

P.O. Box 40996, Olympia, WA 98504-0996

**STREET ADDRESS**

1068 Washington Street SE, Olympia, WA 98501

**PHONE**

(360) 725-5511

**EMAIL**

[charterschoolinfo@k12.wa.us](mailto:charterschoolinfo@k12.wa.us)

[CHARTERSCHOOL.WA.GOV](http://CHARTERSCHOOL.WA.GOV)

