INDIANAPOLIS LIGHTHOUSE CHARTER SCHOOL

2010-2011 Performance Analysis

Core Question 2: Is the organization effective and well-run?

2.1. Is the school in sound fiscal health?	
STANDARD	**The school presents significant concerns in no more than one of the following areas: a) its state financial audits (e.g., presence of "significant findings"); b) its financial staffing and systems; c) its success in achieving a balanced budget over the past three years; d) the adequacy of its projections of revenues and expenses for the next three years; e) its fulfillment of financial reporting requirements under Sections 10 and 17 of the charter agreement. In addition, if the school presents significant concerns in one area, it has a credible plan for addressing the concern that has been approved by the Mayor's Office.**

2010-11 Performance: **Approaching Standard**

In 2010-11, Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School (ILCS) had established adequate staffing and systems for managing the school's finances and regularly met its reporting deadlines in a timely and accurate manner, and successfully met financial reporting requirements.

The Mayor's Office contracts with an independent accounting firm to complete annual financial performance reviews of each school. Based on a review of ILCS's finances for 2010-11, the Mayor's Office found that the school achieved a balanced budget. In addition, projections of revenues and expenses were adequate.

ILCS exceeded enrollment targets which helped provide financial relief and had adequately fulfilled the financial reporting requirements of the charter agreement. However, the school faced difficulty maintaining a balanced budget and relied on a line of credit and/or loans to offset deficits, which negatively impacted its financial situation and adequacy of projecting revenues and expenses. Accordingly, ILCS approached standard for this indicator.

2.2. Are the school's student enrollment, attendance, and retention rates strong?	
STANDARD	**The school is consistently fully enrolled. Student attendance and retention rates are generally at or above the school's agreed-upon target rates.**

2010-11 Performance: **Approaching Standard**

Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School exceeded its enrollment target for 2010-11. The following chart displays the school's target enrollment compared with its official fall enrollment, as reported by the IDOE.

Year	Target Enrollment	Fall Enrollment	Percent Below
2010-11	615	631	0%

***Source**: Official fall enrollment figures from the IDOE. Target enrollment is the maximum capacity from the school's charter agreement with the Mayor's Office, submitted by the school.*

The 2010-11 attendance rate at ILCS was slightly below the average of the state and above the county.

	ILCS	MC	IN
2010-11 Attendance rate	95.10%	94.89%	95.92%

No targets have been established for student retention rates for ILCS.

Based on the 2010-11 performance, ILCS approached the Mayor's Office standard for this indicator due to the school meeting enrollment targets but being slightly below the state in attendance.

2.3. Is the school's Board active and competent in its oversight?	
STANDARD	**The Board's membership collectively contributes a broad skill set and fair representation of the community; Board members are knowledgeable about the school; roles and responsibilities of the Board are clearly delineated; Board meetings reflect thoughtful discussion and progress in the consideration of issues; overall, the Board provides consistent and competent stewardship of the school.**

2010-11 Performance: **Approaching Standard**

In 2010-11, Lighthouse Academies of Indiana (LAI) served as the governing Board to all five Indiana Lighthouse schools, including Indianapolis Lighthouse Charter School. By-laws were created in 2009-10 to form an LLC Board, to serve as a local Board and provide governance to the two Indianapolis LAI charters. The LLC Board (local Board) was designed to interface with the LAI Board by having two representatives who would also serve on the LAI Board. However, the charter for ILCS is held by the LAI Board. In 2010-2011, the LLC Board was in place.

The LAI Board (governing Board) lacked a quorum at a number of Board meetings in 2010-11. Board membership was relatively unstable in 2010-11, as three of the seven members resigned. Additionally, three of the seven LAI Board members were also employees of Lighthouse Academies, the school's Education Management Organization (EMO). This relationship leaves the board structurally dependent upon and connected to the EMO, which the Board was tasked with overseeing. The LAI Board was active in its oversight of ILCS's finances, student performance, facilities, and technology.

Upon review of the LLC Board's minutes, quorum was consistently achieved and roles and responsibilities were clearly delineated, however the Board lost three of its initial members throughout the year and is establishing an understanding of basic governing practices to provide clear, consistent, and competent stewardship. The LLC Board's responsibilities included advising the LAI Board regarding the school's budget, recommendation of principal candidate, personnel decisions, performance review of the principal, and oversight of the curriculum. However, the LLC Board struggled to develop, significantly impairing competent oversight of the school.

ILCS had only recently implemented a board structure that included a local Board of Trustees (LLC Board). The LLC Board, although having clearly designated roles and responsibilities, had yet to achieve stable and well balanced membership expertise which can provide clear, consistent, and competent oversight of the school. The LAI Board had improved board stability; however turnover has been consistently high throughout the school's history. The LAI Board struggled with both attendance and achieving quorum. Therefore, the school approaches standard for this indicator.

2.4. Is there a high level of parent satisfaction with the school?	
STANDARD	**More than 80% but less than 90% of parents surveyed indicate that they are satisfied overall with the school.**

2010-11 Performance: **Approaching Standard**

In the spring of each year, researchers administered anonymous surveys to parents of students enrolled at Mayor-sponsored charter schools. In 2010-11, 79% of ILCS parents reported overall satisfaction with the school. According to the data, the school approached the Mayor's Office standard for performance for this indicator for the 2010-11 academic year.

2.5. Is the school administration strong in its academic and organizational leadership?	
STANDARD	**The school's leadership a) has sufficient academic and/or business expertise; b) has been sufficiently stable over time; c) has clearly defined roles and responsibilities among leaders and between leaders and the Board; d) actively engages in a process of continuous improvement which has led to some mid-course corrections.**

2010-11 Performance: **Meets Standard**

In 2010-11, the administration at ILCS was strong in its academic and business expertise. The administration included a principal for K-8, a principal for grades 9 and 10 (growing up to grade 12), and instructional leader, as well as a Regional Director (RD) employed by the school's EMO. The RD is an experienced educator with considerable academic expertise. Under the guidance of the RD, the school administration had engaged in a process of continuous improvement. Roles and responsibilities between the RD, who was an employee of the EMO, and the school principals and instructional leader, appeared to be clearly defined and understood by all stakeholders. The RD resigned in the spring of 2011. With the departure of the RD, who

played a significant role in the school's academic and operational growth, the school's Board was challenged with staffing a key position within ILCS's administrative structure.

2.6. Is the school meeting its school-specific organizational and management performance goals?	
Meets standard	**School has clearly met its school-specific organizational goal.**

Not applicable. ILCS did not have school-specific organizational and management performance goals that were evaluated in 2010-11.