

THE INDIANAPOLIS PROJECT 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 <u>one</u> 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: Does Not Meet Standard

In 2010-11, the Indianapolis Project School (TPS) was improving staffing and systems for managing the school’s finances and its financial reporting requirements. The school was still improving to meet reporting deadlines in a timely and accurate manner. Based on a review of TPS’s finances for 2010-11, the Mayor’s Office found that the school did not achieve a balanced budget, and had no reserves on hand to cash flow into the next fiscal year, therefore compromised the adequacy of its projections and revenues moving forward.

TPS did not meet enrollment targets for the 2010-11 academic year and thus, faced significant debt, but financial staffing systems suggest the school was improving, utilizing cost efficiency measures with a Business Manager, hired business consultant, and a financial team comprised of board and school administrators in order to address financial concerns. In addition, the school is set to hire a CFO for the 2011-2012 academic year. Although, the school planned strategies to improve its financial staffing and systems and meeting reporting deadlines, successful outcomes did not materialize in the 2010-11 academic year. These factors, coupled with an unbalanced budget result in the school not meeting standard for this indicator in for the 2010-11 year.

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

In 2010-11, TPS did not meet its enrollment target. 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	300	268	14%
---------	-----	-----	-----

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 TPS was higher than the county and slightly below the average of the state.

	TPS	MC	IN
2010-11 Attendance rate	95.28%	94.89%	95.92%

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

Based on the 2010-11 performance, TPS approached the Mayor's Office standard for this indicator because they were not fully enrolled and had an attendance rate higher than the county, but lower than the state.

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 TPS Board was knowledgeable about the school. Its membership reflects a broad skill set and is relatively representative of the community, and achieving quorum at board meetings has been consistent. The Board was representative of the community and contributes expertise. Board membership was complete (bylaws call for up to 15 members; the board has 10 members.) Members had varied skill sets and varied backgrounds, including representatives from business, development, fundraising, and higher education. However, consistent representation of all members, which help to contribute varying skill sets, was not consistent.

The TPS Board was active in its stewardship to the school but was still defining its roles and responsibility of providing fiscal and operational oversight of the school. The board had begun to implement its committee structure as articulated in its by-laws. The board had not developed a plan to hold the school leader accountable. Additionally, although meetings were posted on the school's website and school calendar, the board had not consistently posted notice of meetings in high traffic areas of the school per Open Door Law.

Based on the performance demonstrated in the 2010-11 academic year, the TPS Board 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.
-----------------	--

Not Evaluated. In the spring of each year, researchers administer anonymous surveys to parents of students enrolled at Mayor-sponsored charter schools. In 2010-11, 97% of TPS parents reported overall satisfaction with the school. However, this parental feedback represented only 16% of students at TPS; therefore accurate parental satisfaction could not be obtained to provide the school a rating for this performance indicator.

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

The administration of TPS was strong in its academic and business expertise, had remained stable over time, actively engaged in continuous improvement, and had improved its delineation of roles and responsibilities among and between leaders.

The Mayor's Office's monitoring of TPS's administration has not revealed any significant concerns related to academic and organizational oversight, stability, or evidence of the school engaging in a process of continuous improvement. All members of the leadership team have been with the school since its first year. Three of the four members are founders. The school noted within its third year self review that many school improvements have been made based on mid-course corrections in areas such as technology, project development, curriculum, assessment, collaboration, and developing classroom culture. In addition, TPS has recognized deficiencies in its financial capacity and hired a CFO for the 2011-2012 academic year. However, clearly defined roles and responsibilities among leaders and the Board with regard to the school's academic and financial oversight is unclear. Accordingly, the school approached 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. TPS did not have school-specific organizational and management performance goals that were evaluated in 2010-11.