# PARAMOUNT SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE

## 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 2010-2011, Paramount School of Excellence (PSoE) struggled to develop sound staffing and systems for managing the school's finances. The school met its financial reporting requirements and regularly met its reporting deadlines in a timely and accurate manner.

PSoE's financial staffing and reporting systems struggled in their initial year as the school's leadership, board, and charter management organization (CMO) worked to implement and refine contractual roles and responsibilities to ensure financial reporting and expenditures were transparent and understood by all parties. This also hindered the school's ability to successfully meet its revenue and expense projections. The board began to improve staffing and reporting systems after concerns were raised regarding true autonomy from the CMO, and transparency about from the CMO.

The Mayor's Office contracts with an independent accounting firm to complete annual financial performance reviews of each school. Based on a review of PSoE's finances for 2010-11, the Mayor's Office found that the school achieved a balanced budget and ended the fiscal year with a surplus. Accordingly, the school 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: **Does Not Meet**

PSoE did not meet 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2009-10 | 585 | 372 | 37% |

***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 the attendance rate at PSoE was below the averages of the state and county.

| | PSoE | MC | IN |
|---|---|---|---|
| **2009-10 Attendance rate** | 91.54% | 94.89% | 95.92% |

No targets have been established for student retention rates for PSoE. The schools retention rates were not calculated as 2010-2011 was the school's first year of operation.

Based on the 2010-11 performance, PSoE does not meet the Mayor's Office standard for this indicator because they did not meet enrollment targets and had an attendance rate lower than the state and county.

| **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, the Paramount School of Excellence Board struggled to collectively contribute a broad skill set, properly delineate roles and responsibilities, and provide consistent and competent stewardship of the school due to high turnover and disagreements between the board and their contracted charter management organization (CMO). The Board adequately represents the community, was knowledgeable about the school, and progressively improved thoughtful discussions and consideration of issues.

The Board roster for 2010-11 revealed eight members with a range of expertise. However, from the initial founding board to the school's first year of operation, 7 members resigned. This level of high turnover coupled with disagreements between the CMO caused much tension. However, through board recruitment of individuals with broad skill sets and terminating the contract with the CMO in the summer of 2011, the board was able to improve their oversight. Therefore, the school approached the Mayor's Office 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: **Meets Standard**

In the spring of each year, researchers administer anonymous surveys to parents of students enrolled at Mayor-sponsored charter schools. In 2010-11, 90% of PSoE parents reported overall satisfaction with the school. According to the data, the school meets 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: **Approaching Standard**

In 2010-11, Paramount School of Excellence's administration exhibited sufficient academic and leadership expertise and demonstrated continuous improvement. However concerns exist with regard to the delineation of roles and responsibilities of leaders and between leaders, including the CMO, and the Board. This, in turn, compromised the leadership's ability to actively engage in a process of continuous improvement leading to mid-course corrections.

The School Leader, Business Manager, and hired CMO collectively demonstrated sufficient academic and business expertise. However, true autonomy of the school leader and business manager from the CMO was compromised as the CMO was charged with hiring, training, and evaluating staff, including leadership, but was also comprised of PSoE's founders. Upon terminating the contract with the CMO, the school leadership was then tasked with reorganizing roles and responsibilities. Therefore the school approached the Mayor's Office standard for this indicator.

| 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**. Paramount School of Excellence did not have school-specific organizational and management performance goals that were evaluated in 2010-11.