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Demand nationwide for choices in education remains strong. Over one million students are enrolled in over 4,000 charter schools throughout the country. Ball State University serves as the largest authorizer of public charter schools in the state of Indiana, with 22 schools open throughout the state in 2007-08 serving approximately 6,350 students. With four more schools already approved for the coming year, at least 26 schools will be operating with approximately 8,450 students enrolled.

Since the passage of the Indiana charter law in 2001, Ball State has been committed to ongoing growth and development of charter schools and has developed rigorous standards to ensure that the schools authorized are held accountable for providing a high-quality educational experience for students served. With new leadership in the Office of Charter Schools (OCS) in the summer of 2006, a review of policies, procedures, and approaches to reviewing and approving applications has been underway. In addition, the OCS has increased the capacity of the staff dedicated to the responsibilities of authorization.

Emphasis on improving student achievement is central to the OCS mission. In 2006-07, forty-three percent (43%) of the charter schools sponsored by the university met the federal No Child Left Behind Act standard of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). This level mirrors the average of all charter schools statewide that year. Progress on the ISTEP+ and achievement growth data obtained from the required Northwest Evaluation Association for all schools is carefully assessed annually as an important indicator of quality.

Increasing the percentage of its charters that meet AYP is a commitment that the OCS has made to the University’s Strategic Plan. By 2012, the OCS has established the goal of being the authorizer with the highest percentage of schools meeting AYP. To this end, additional mechanisms and strategies for assisting and supporting its charters to aggressively improve student academic performance are being implemented.

As parents and communities continue to call for high-quality educational options, Ball State remains committed to meeting their needs, as do the many dedicated charter school administrators, teachers, staff and volunteers who serve on school boards, assist in the classrooms, and otherwise advance these schools on behalf of their students.

Sincerely,

Roy A. Weaver
Dean, Teachers College
The Ball State University Office of Charter Schools is pleased to provide this Accountability Report along with additional information regarding data summarized in this report online: www-bsu-edu-teachers-charter
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What are Charter Schools?

Charter schools are independent public schools that are open to all students and are state funded. Students do not pay tuition to attend these schools, which are designed and operated by educators, parents, and community leaders. Charters are binding contracts that are entered into by each school with its authorizing entity. In Indiana, charter schools may be authorized by a limited number of entities, such as the executive of a consolidated city or a state university offering four-year degrees. Currently, Ball State University is the only public university in Indiana to serve as a sponsor of charter schools. Through these schools, Ball State University contributes to the variety of choices in education available to Indiana students. Each school chartered by the university is expected to strive for academic excellence and has a well-defined mission that is tailored to the community’s needs.

Like all public schools, charter schools are held to high academic standards, require participation in state testing programs, hire certified teachers, and publish annual reports to the public. The curriculum often includes new and innovative approaches for teaching and can be tailored to the specific needs of students.

Charter schools are allowed considerable autonomy through the Indiana charter law. In exchange for that autonomy, each school is held to a high level of accountability.

Ball State University Sponsored Charter Schools

During the 2006-2007 school year, nineteen charter schools in Indiana were authorized by Ball State University. Figure 1 (on page 5) shows the geographic distribution of these schools.

Role of Ball State University as a Charter Authorizer

Ball State University is a leader in the development and promotion of educational innovations and best practices for public schools in Indiana. As a key aspect of its efforts to build better communities, the University demonstrates its commitment to redefining education by serving as Indiana’s only post-secondary institution authorizing public charter schools.

As a public charter school authorizer, Ball State does not manage the schools it sponsors. Its primary mission is to:

1) Evaluate applications for charters and determine which groups are to be awarded charter contracts.

2) Set high expectations for each charter school it sponsors.

3) Provide oversight to each charter school it sponsors to ensure it is meeting the terms of its charter and applicable laws.

4) Intervene when sponsored schools do not meet the terms of their charter contracts or applicable laws.

5) Evaluate the performance of the charterschools it sponsors to determine whether to renew the contract for each school.

The University reserves the right to rescind a charter if a school fails to meet performance standards. Ball State is committed to improving the quality and success of charter schools through high standards and clear accountability. That is the primary role of Ball State University and this annual review of performances provides much of the information needed to demonstrate the progress of the University in meeting that commitment.
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Role of the Office of Charter Schools

Ball State University has established an Office of Charter Schools to serve as the primary source of contact with each group seeking a charter and each operating charter school. The office serves as the administrator of the University’s charter program, making recommendations to the President on such major decisions as the granting of charters, significant actions related to the performance of schools, and renewal decisions.

During its initial four years of the University’s charter program, the Office of Charter Schools was established and staffed to begin the development of an accountability process. Building on this foundation, new leadership in the Office of Charter Schools has focused on a major restructuring of its charter authorizing practices.

Key elements of that restructuring include:
- Redesigning the Accountability Framework to gain a more complete understanding of each school’s success.
- More clearly defining expectations for successful charter schools.
- Implementing more rigorous requirements for charter proposals.
- Overhauling the compliance monitoring process.
- Shortening the length of new charters from seven years to five years.
- Implementing a rigorous review process for charter renewal decisions.

The University is committing significant resources to this restructuring process. Since summer 2006, the University has added these new full-time positions to the Office of Charter Schools to increase the capacity of the office to fulfill its mission:

Accountability/Compliance and Finance Coordinator
Assessment and Accountability Coordinator
Additional Field Representative

This restructuring is part of a developmental process through which few charter authorizers move. Ball State University is undertaking this major effort to provide a well-defined platform upon which the schools sponsored by the University will be successful. Due in part to these changes over the next few years, it is expected that the performance of the schools Ball State University sponsors will increase in a number of areas, including financial management and student achievement.

Goals for the University Charter School Program

In its effort to set aggressive expectations for its Charter School Program, Ball State has established a goal that, by 2012-2013, the University will be the sponsor of the highest percentage of charter schools that meet the federal No Child Left Behind requirement of Adequate Yearly Progress of the major charter sponsors in the state of Indiana. With the current restructuring plan in process, this objective is clearly attainable. Progress toward this objective will likely take two to three years after the completion of the restructuring process. This time is necessary to allow the existing schools that need further development to re-examine their goals and the strategies to attain those goals and to allow new schools granted charters under the more rigorous proposal requirements to demonstrate the success of the students who enroll and are impacted by the new schools’ educational programs.

In 2006-2007, the percentage of charter schools under Ball State sponsorship that met federal No Child Left Behind Act Adequate Yearly Progress was 43% (6 out of 14 schools eligible), which matched the statewide average percentage of 43% for all eligible charter schools (12 out of 28). It is the goal of the University to significantly improve this percentage, exceeding the statewide average. The attainment of this goal is a primary reason for restructuring the authorizing practices of the Office of Charter Schools.

Ball State University is strengthening its capacity to ensure that the charter schools it sponsors are meeting or moving toward high levels of performance within a reasonable amount of time.

The charters of schools that are unable to meet expectations established by Ball State University may be rescinded after being given a reasonable opportunity to make changes in their administrative and educational operations. This approach to charter authorizing is consistent with the basic premise for establishing public charter schools: increased autonomy for increased accountability.
Purpose of the Accountability Report

Each year, the Ball State University Office of Charter Schools publishes an accountability report indicating the charter schools’ performance. This is the fifth annual accountability report.

The purpose of this report is to provide a snapshot of the performance of each charter school sponsored by Ball State University that was open during the 2006-2007 school year.

The Accountability Report provides the following information:

- Each school’s educational philosophy and approach
- Demographics of the school’s student population
- 2006-2007 student achievement data
  - ISTEP+ results
  - Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measure of Academic Progress results
- Results of the constituent survey, which is administered annually to parents of enrolled students, school staff, and board members.
- School improvement actions taken by the schools in direct response to the Office of Charter Schools accountability requirements for continual school improvement.

Individual school responses. In preparing this year’s report, the Office of Charter Schools requested that each school provide background information about its mission and the unique characteristics of the students it serves, along with comments on its performance, the challenges it faced, and the strategies the school is using to increase student achievement. The Office of Charter Schools recognizes that each school is a work in progress. This Accountability Report provides an opportunity for each school to tell its story of successes and challenges and the efforts it is making to aid the students who have enrolled. The overall success of the charter schools program is based primarily on the success of each charter school and the University expects each school to pursue strategies that increase the probability of both student and school success.

Limitations. This report is of the performance of each school for the academic year 2006-2007 only. A history of the performance of each school is not addressed here. Another limitation in the ability of this report to fully depict school performance is in the reporting of data from the state assessment program, the ISTEP+. The Indiana Department of Education reports test results only at the school level by grade. Because individual student performance has not been made available to the Office of Charter Schools, the Office is presently unable to track individual student progress. Anecdotal reports indicate that many students are making gains in performance on the ISTEP+ over time. Without individual student performance on the ISTEP+, specific gains of those individual students from year to year cannot be tracked. There are discussions at the federal level of revising the No Child Left Behind Act to permit states to base the Adequate Yearly Progress reporting process on individual student improvement models rather than reporting overall school level passing rates. Focusing on school passing rates does not allow reporting to take into account the movement of individual students into and out of schools. Such movement is quite significant for some of the Ball State University sponsored schools, thereby masking performance gains of students who remain at a school for a number of years. For accuracy, the performance of a school should be based on the impact of its educational program on the same students over a reasonable period of time.

Since its implementation with the charter schools that Ball State University sponsors, the NWEA Measure of Academic Progress has been used as a means of identifying individual student’s areas of needed improvement. Not all students in the Ball State University sponsored charter schools have been required to take this assessment. The percentages of students achieving their NWEA target growth rate are included here to provide another indicator of student performance, but this should not be considered a complete evaluation of the school’s success in achieving growth among students.

In the fall of 2006, the constituent survey was conducted online for the first time. This presented numerous challenges to many of the charter schools, particularly those serving more disadvantaged populations. Computer access was made available, but was not convenient for many potential respondents. For this reason, there were unacceptable rates of response to the constituent survey for many of the schools. This report includes the number of respondents, and the analysis for each school considers the low response rate of some of the constituent groups. Board member responses are not included due to the low response rate at many of the schools. Administrators were collapsed into the staff category and respondents who have a dual role in the charter school were considered in only one category. There were 49 parents who also served as board members, administrators, or staff. Their responses were included in the parent category only. In 2007-2008, each charter school is being offered a choice of administering the survey in paper form or online. This change in the administration of the survey is being made to increase participation and, thereby, the accuracy of reported information.
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

The federal No Child Left Behind Act requires schools to show annual improvements in academic achievement and attendance. Schools that receive Title I funds, those with high percentages of low income students, face federally imposed consequences if they are not able to show the requisite improvements on the state’s assessment.

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) has determined Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for all public schools, including charter schools. There are two methods through which IDOE determines AYP designations for each school. The first method is based on the overall percentage of students passing the English and mathematics portions of ISTEP+, participation rates, elementary and middle school attendance rates, and high school graduation rates. Any student subgroups of at least 30 students within the population, including race/ethnicity, free/reduced price lunch eligibility, limited English proficiency and special education, must also meet the performance, participation, and attendance or graduation targets in this first method of meeting AYP. Beginning in 2005-2006, an Indiana school could meet AYP if at least 65.7 percent of each of the school’s eligible student subgroups passed the language arts portion of the test and if at least 64.3 percent passed the mathematics portion of the test. These percent passing targets will increase in 2008.

The percent passing targets used in the first method of determining AYP may be unrealistic for schools serving high numbers of low achieving students. In these schools, students may be making progress, but still not approaching the target percent passing rates. For these schools, a “Safe Harbor” was created. Using a second method of determining AYP, schools that do not meet the target percent passing the ISTEP+ will be considered to have achieved the progress necessary if they meet attendance rate targets and reduce the number of students not meeting performance targets by 10 percent over the previous year.

AYP does not account for the migration of students moving in and out of individual student cohorts, which is typical in charter schools. It also provides a limited view of high schools as accountability decisions are based on only one year of growth and are highly dependent upon the starting points of the school’s students. Nonetheless, especially for elementary and middle schools, AYP does begin to put some focus on improvement measures. It also helps draw attention to the performance of individual subgroups at those schools, rather than grade- or school-wide averages. Appendix A summarizes the AYP results for Ball State University’s charter schools.
The Northwest Evaluation Association, a non-profit organization, has partnered with school corporations and educational agencies across the nation to provide comprehensive assessment since 1977. More than 2 million students in the United States participate in NWEA assessments each year, providing an ample body of reference data for achievement norms. With a variety of support services, resource materials, and in-depth training, NWEA is a leader in longitudinal research for student achievement and growth and school improvement.

In keeping with the NWEA mission to help all students learn, the organization uses assessment data to provide instructional tools for educators. Test results are made available for immediate use, with detailed reports and interpretation of student performance. Each Ball State University charter school in Indiana has administered the Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) standardized test in the fall and the spring. Growth rates are determined by the change in scores from fall to spring. Target growth rates are individualized, based on the average for comparison students in the norm group who received a similar score. The target rate for one student may not be the same as the target rate for another. The percentage of students meeting their target growth rate for each school includes only those students present for both the fall and spring testing. NWEA assessments will be required for accountability reporting in 2007-2008, ensuring a higher number of students tested at each school. These data provide another snapshot of student performance that is focused specifically on student growth. In addition to a report within each school summary, Appendix A contains a report of all Ball State University sponsored charter schools’ NWEA performance.

Public Law 221 – Indiana’s State Accountability Law (PL 221)

Beginning with the 2005-2006 school year, the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) began publishing the results of a new state accountability system. Under the new law, schools must show progress on ISTEP+ passing rates for each “non-mobile” student cohort, those students who attended the school for at least 70 percent of the year (or 126 school days) and who have an ISTEP score from the previous school year. Performance under this new accountability system is judged by improvement, as the passing rates must improve for the same set of students as they progress from one grade level to another. Although PL 221 designation applies to both Title I and non-Title I schools, the consequences that follow a lack of improvement do not apply to charter schools. PL 221 is useful for demonstrating an improvement or lack of improvement among the students in the Ball State University sponsored charter schools.

As is illustrated in Table 1, schools are placed in performance categories based on both their current passing rates and the improvement made by their non-mobile cohort of students. For example, a school with 63 percent of its students passing would be labeled as “Exemplary Progress” if the current pass rate represents an improvement of four percentage points or more when averaged over three years, but would be labeled as only “Academic Watch” if the current pass rate represents improvement of less than two percentage points. No school can be placed higher than “Academic Progress” if it does not also meet Adequate Yearly Progress under federal accountability expectations. In addition to the report of PL 221 designations within each school summary, Appendix A indicates the category placements for each of Ball State University’s charter schools that opened prior to 2006-2007.

### Table 1: Public Law 221 Performance Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Passing Rate on ISTEP+</th>
<th>Passing Rate Improvement Average Over Three Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; or = 90%</td>
<td>Exemplary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; or = 80%</td>
<td>Exemplary Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; or = 70%</td>
<td>Exemplary Watch (Priority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; or = 60%</td>
<td>Commendable Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; or = 50%</td>
<td>Academic Progress (Priority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; or = 40%</td>
<td>Academic Watch (High Priority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Placement:</th>
<th>Exemplary Progress</th>
<th>Commendable Progress</th>
<th>Academic Progress</th>
<th>Academic Watch</th>
<th>Academic Probation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Source: Indiana Department of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)

The Northwest Evaluation Association, a non-profit organization, has partnered with school corporations and educational agencies across the nation to provide comprehensive assessment since 1977. More than 2 million students in the United States participate in NWEA assessments each year, providing an ample body of reference data for achievement norms. With a variety of support services, resource materials, and in-depth training, NWEA is a leader in longitudinal research for student achievement and growth and school improvement.

In keeping with the NWEA mission to help all students learn, the organization uses assessment data to provide instructional tools for educators. Test results are made available for immediate use, with detailed reports and interpretation of student performance. Each Ball State University charter school in Indiana has administered the Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) standardized test in the fall and the spring. Growth rates are determined by the change in scores from fall to spring. Target growth rates are individualized, based on the average for comparison students in the norm group who received a similar score. The target rate for one student may not be the same as the target rate for another. The percentage of students meeting their target growth rate for each school includes only those students present for both the fall and spring testing. The NWEA assessments will be required for accountability reporting in 2007-2008, ensuring a higher number of students tested at each school. These data provide another snapshot of student performance that is focused specifically on student growth. In addition to a report within each school summary, Appendix A contains a report of all Ball State University sponsored charter schools’ NWEA performance.
COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW of BSU Sponsored Charter Schools

The Ball State University sponsored charter schools serve a wide variety of populations spread across the state of Indiana. Some of these schools serve students demographically similar to those in their community and others serve students who differ from those in the local schools. In considering the performance of a school, the demographics of the students it serves must be taken into account.

Each school is working toward meeting the high expectations set by the Office of Charter Schools for improvement and compliance with their individual charters. The Ball State University sponsored charter schools share a common goal of providing an effective educational environment for their students. As they work toward achieving this goal, the Office of Charter Schools fully expects that it will, likewise, achieve its goal of being the sponsor of the highest percentage of charter schools meeting AYP in the state of Indiana by 2012-2013.
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Mission
The Campagna Academy Charter School (CACS) is an “alternative school of choice” located in Schererville, Indiana. The school provides partial-day, full-day and evening educational programs to serve Grades 9-12. Many students attending CACS had poor performance or attendance in high school. Additionally, students may choose to attend Campagna Academy for a more structured educational environment and smaller classes.

Educational Program
Campagna Academy Charter School offers instruction in Core 40 curriculum classes taught by qualified, Indiana state-licensed teachers. Elective courses are offered to students to expand their knowledge base. Advanced and remedial programs are available through computer-assisted instruction and independent study programs. The school requires the completion of an independent project in order to graduate and also requires either school involvement or community service as a part of graduation requirements.
Demographic Summary

The Campagna Academy Charter School serves youth at risk of not completing their high school education. The school is part of the Campagna Academy, a social work agency that provides both residential and day treatment to youths in Grades 6 to 12. Many of the students at CACS attend the school in response to adjudication; they may have been expelled or suspended from their home schools; they may have difficulty with drug or alcohol dependence; they may be teen mothers who are responsible for their child/children or who are pregnant; or they may be students who have fallen so far behind academically that they see no hope of graduating. CACS’s population is fluid, with students moving in and out of the school as their situations change. In filling this unique role, the statistics reported for CACS below should be considered in a different light than those reported for a school with a traditional student body.

More than two-thirds of CACS students are Black, fewer than the ratio of Black to White students in the Gary Community Schools, but significantly higher than the average in the state of Indiana (Figure A-1). Over half of CACS students receive a free or reduced lunch, compared with 65% of students in Gary Community Schools and 38% in the state (Figure A-2). The same percentage of CACS students receive special education services as the state average, but this is a higher percentage than other schools in the Gary area (Figure A-3). Please note that graduation statistics for 2007 were not available from the Indiana Department of Education at the time of this report’s publication.

Academic Progress

Academically, CACS students perform quite similarly on the ISTEP+ to students in the Gary Community Schools, but much lower than the state average (see Table A-2). CACS students perform slightly better than other Gary schools in the English/Language Arts subtest, but slightly worse on the math subtest. The percentage of students passing is extremely low in both the 9th and 10th grades at CACS, particularly in the Math subtest, which only 15% of students in either grade pass, but it is a significant improvement over the 2005-2006 ISTEP+ performance.

Constituent Survey

Parents (n=58) and staff (n=14) who responded to the Constituent Survey were overwhelmingly supportive of the school. The majority reported being satisfied with the school and willing to recommend it to others (Figures A-4 & A-5). Both parents and staff indicated satisfaction with the overall quality of education at CACS (Figures A-8 – A-14), although staff were less positive about the curriculum and academic program in general. The school’s administration was considered effective by both staff and parents, but it appears that staff considered support services and services for students with special needs to be in need of improvement (see Figures A-15 –A-20). Both parents and staff reported that the school is safe for students (Figure A-21).

Financial Review

Financially, the school met Ball State University Office of Charter Schools’ expectations. It appears to be in a solid financial condition. Actual revenues exceeded actual expenses as budgeted. The school has minimal debt and its equity position is at an acceptable level. Auditors completed an Agreed-Upon Procedures Report for the year ending June 30, 2006 for CACS. Five procedures were identified that required corrective action by the school; all five procedures have been corrected.
School Improvement

To improve student ISTEP+ performance, CACS has taken the following steps:

- To slow the pace and allow struggling learners to keep up and master the information:
  - We are now covering the Indiana Standards in English 9 over three trimesters, instead of two.
  - We are now covering the Indiana Standards in Algebra I over three trimesters, instead of two.
  - We are now covering the Indiana Standards in Biology I over three trimesters, instead of two.
- The ISTEP+ results are shared with the entire staff in a meeting during which we search for problematic areas and areas of obvious weakness in an effort to better help our students.

NWEA data were used to improve student achievement in the following ways:

- We have a veteran teacher who has taught Curriculum Development on the college level. She arranged to teach a class to other faculty members, endorsed by Indiana University, over how to write a workable, practical curriculum.
- Our teachers have been working hard to develop a solid curriculum for all classes they teach based on the Indiana Standards. Their goal is to ensure our students can master these standards.
- We have freed up our special education teacher to work with struggling students in smaller groups all day long.
- Because we have such a high turnover of students, being a residential and day treatment facility, the data only gives us overall trends, not always immediately useful data.
- With that in mind, we made the changes to slow the pace and allow struggling learners to keep up and master the information.
- We have dedicated one staff member to amassing NWEA information and reports. That person analyzes the reports and shares that with the entire staff.
- The entire staff goes over the results in an effort to find any weaknesses and correct them.

To address deficiencies that might affect AYP status for the 2007-2008 school year, CACS has taken the following actions:

- We have freed up a staff member to call parents over attendance, non-participation in class, and other problems where we need to work with the parent.

To improve the perceptions of their school in response to the results of the constituent survey, CACS has taken the following actions:

- Overall, we made significant gains in the 2007 survey over the 2006 survey. We think this was due to a strengthened curriculum, a change in faculty, and a change in administration.
- We made an effort to contact parents more often through Parent/Teacher conferences, letters home, and more frequent phone calls.
- We added another computer lab of 20 computers.
- We made an effort to involve the staff in more decisions concerning the school and the students.
- We worked more closely with our School Council, giving more frequent and more detailed information.
- We have met with local referral agencies that send us students, explaining our services in greater detail.
- The entire staff worked to come up with a list of strategies to make education the focal point instead of constantly dealing with behavior problems. It was a united effort to increase our presence, emphasize education, and hold students more accountable for their poor behaviors.
- We placed a greater emphasis on the importance of doing well on ISTEP+, NWEA and TABE.
- We offered more fun activities for students last year, and will continue to do so this year.
- This year we have started a Student Council and a club for girls.
Student Demographics

Figure A-1: Race/Ethnicity Percentages: 2006-2007

Figure A-2: Percentages of Students Qualifying for Free & Reduced Lunch: 2006-2007

Figure A-3: Percentages of Students in Special Education: 2006-2007

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education
Program Statistics

Table A-1: Attendance Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Campagna Academy Charter School</th>
<th>Gary Community Schools</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-2: Percentages Passing ISTEP+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>Campagna Academy</th>
<th>Gary</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
<th>Campagna Academy</th>
<th>Gary</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
<th>Campagna Academy</th>
<th>Gary</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-3: PL 221

ACADEMIC PROBATION

Performance: 21.9%
Improvement: 0.0% (too few students for accurate count)

Table A-4: Annual Yearly Progress

OVERALL DETERMINATION: NO (third time not meeting AYP)  GRADUATION: YES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>PARTICIPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Indiana Department of Education

Table A-5: NWEA Percent Meeting Target Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Language Arts</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
<td>% Met Target Growth Rate</td>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: NWEA
Constituent Surveys

Figure A-4: Overall, how satisfied are you with the charter school?

Figure A-5: How likely are you to... Recommend the school to friends & colleagues?

Figure A-6: How likely are you to... Return to the school next year?
Figure A-7: How likely are you to... Increase your support of the school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Not Very Likely</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent (n=58)</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (n=14)</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Academic Program

Figure A-8: How satisfied are you with the overall quality of education?

Figure A-9: Your overall evaluation of... Curriculum/academic program

Figure A-10: Our school has a high quality academic program
Your overall evaluation of... Quality of teaching/instruction

Figure A-11:

![Graph showing evaluations of quality of teaching/instruction for parents and staff.]

Data Source: The Kensington Group

Our school uses sound, rigorous educational practices

Figure A-12:

![Graph showing evaluations of educational practices for parents and staff.]

How would you rate the overall quality of education?

Figure A-13:

![Graph showing evaluations of overall quality of education for parents and staff.]

How would you compare the overall quality of education to that of other schools?

Figure A-14:

![Graph showing comparisons of overall quality of education to other schools for parents and staff.]

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Organization/Providing Services

Figure A-15: Our school has effective administration

Figure A-16: All members of the school community understand the mission of the school

Figure A-17: Our school has the resources to achieve its mission
Your overall evaluation of... Individualized student attention

Figure A-18:

Your overall evaluation of... Support services (e.g. counseling, healthcare, etc.)

Figure A-19:

Your overall evaluation of... Services provided to the special needs students (e.g. ESL, disabilities, etc.)

Figure A-20:

Our school is safe for students

Figure A-21:

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Charter School of the Dunes:

**Mission**
Charter School of the Dunes is designed to inspire student success through an innovative curriculum and creative teaching. The school adheres to rigorous standards of academic achievement with the expectation that students will become lifelong learners. The school encourages development of solid character, citizenship, and environmental stewardship. Charter School of the Dunes embraces diversity in its students, adapts to special needs, and expects students to take responsibility for their education with the strong support systems of family, school, and community.

**Educational Program**
Charter School of the Dunes emphasizes the core skills of mathematics and language arts, reasoning and research, the interdisciplinary Paragon Curriculum integrated with technology, and intensive teacher training to deliver a well rounded, quality education.

860 N. Lake Street
Gary, IN 46403
(219) 939-9690

[www.csotd.org](http://www.csotd.org)

- Grades Served: K-8
- 2006-2007 Enrollment: 490
- 2005-2006 Enrollment: 514
- 2004-2005 Enrollment: 442
- 2003-2004 Enrollment: 436
- Enrollment at capacity: 675

Year Opened: 2003-2004
Final Year in Current Contract: 2009-2010
Demographic Summary
Similar to other Gary schools, Charter School of the Dunes serves a majority Black population (Figure B-1), with much higher percentages of Black students than other schools in Indiana. Nearly two-thirds of these students receive reduced cost or free lunches (Figure B-2), an indication of the socioeconomic disadvantage of the area. Special education students make up roughly the same percentage of the student body at Charter School of the Dunes as they do at other Gary area schools (Figure B-3).

Academic Progress
The percentage of students passing ISTEP+ (see Table B-2) varies dramatically across grades at Charter School of the Dunes, with particular problems suggested in the 8th and 5th grade, in which very few students passed either the math or English/LA subtests. Less than half of the students in the school overall pass the ISTEP+, a somewhat lower percentage than the Gary Community Schools average and substantially lower than the state average. Highest percentages are found in the 6th grade, and the third grade has 48% of students passing the English/LA subtest, but only 25% passing the math.

Charter School of the Dunes did not meet AYP for the third year in a row (Table B-4). Math scores were inadequate to meet the performance targets, although English/LA performance and overall participation requirements were met. The improvement in percent passing ISTEP+ would have earned Charter School of the Dunes an “Exemplary Progress” rating on PL 221, but that was not awarded because AYP was not met for two years in a row. Instead the school was placed in the “Academic Progress” category on PL 221 (Table B-3). About half of the students who took the NWEA tests in 2006 and 2007 met their target growth rate in reading and language. Only about a quarter of the students tested met the NWEA target growth rate in math. This information, in combination with ISTEP+ math performance, indicates a need for improvements in math instruction.

Constituent Survey
Although the K-8 school has a student population of 490, only 16 parents were able to respond to the online constituent survey during 2006-2007. The responses of these few parents are not generalizable and will not be discussed in the following description of survey results. More of the staff responded (n=42) and a summary of their responses follows.

About 70% of staff respondents were satisfied overall with the Charter School of the Dunes (Figure B-4). Nearly 80% would recommend the school to friends and colleagues (Figure B-5) and most planned to return to the school and increase their support for it (Figures B-6 & B-7). One source of staff respondents’ apparent dissatisfaction arises from ambiguous feelings about the academic program. Although a majority rated the curriculum and other aspects of the program “Good,” (see Figures B-8 – B-14), few selected superlatives to describe them.

Only 45% of staff believed the administration is effective (Figure B-15), and there were mixed feelings about the school community’s understanding of its mission (Figure B-16) and the availability of resources to carry out that mission (Figure B-17). Staff respondents did not applaud the school’s ability to provide individualized student attention and support services (Figures B-18 – B-20). Student safety was a concern for nearly 40% of staff respondents (Figure B-21).

Financial Review
Financially, the school met Ball State University Office of Charter Schools’ expectations. It strengthened its financial position in the past year, reporting strong net income and ending the year with a positive cash balance. The school’s current equity position is favorable and it appears likely it will maintain its strong finances. The State Board of Accounts performed an audit this past year, reporting on the period of July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2006. The audit identified eleven issues. All issues have been addressed and corrected by the Charter School of the Dunes.
School Improvement

To improve student ISTEP+ performance, Charter School of the Dunes has taken the following steps:

- Saturday morning math tutoring has been in place since February with two certified teachers tutoring students in math on a one-to-two basis.
- The entire Dunes teaching staff received professional development in Rocket Math on May 11. The Rocket Math program has been implemented and will address the deficit basic math skills of our K-8 students.
- An intensive summer school math-tutoring program will be implemented using Title 1 A monies. The program begins June 25, 2008.
- A math committee has met six times to address low math scores and to begin curriculum alignment with Indiana state standards. Also, the committee has already purchased math ISTEP+ materials to be used in the classroom immediately, with special emphasis on teaching our students test-taking strategies. Math word walls are in place in all rooms and math problem solving skills are being taught to our students.
- A Chief Instructional Officer will be hired to address all curriculum concerns at the Dunes with specific emphasis on math.
- Ongoing professional development in Real Math and differentiated instruction will commence August, 2007.
- NWEA assessments will be used three times this coming school year to monitor the math success of our students.

NWEA data were used to improve student achievement in the following ways:

- All students at the Dunes have an IEP, created with the assistance of NWEA data.

To improve the perceptions of their school in response to the results of the constituent survey, Charter School of the Dunes has taken the following actions:

- We hired a parent/coordinator/social worker to address parent issues and facilitate parent communication within our community.
- Positive staff responses have improved over the prior year’s survey.
Student Demographics

Figure B-1: Race/Ethnicity Percentages: 2006-2007

Figure B-2: Percentages of Students Qualifying for Free & Reduced Lunch: 2006-2007

Figure B-3: Percentages of Students in Special Education: 2006-2007

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education
# Program Statistics

## Table B-1: Attendance Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Charter School of the Dunes</th>
<th>Gary Community Schools</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table B-2: Percentages Passing ISTEP+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>CS of the Dunes</th>
<th>Gary</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
<th>CS of the Dunes</th>
<th>Gary</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
<th>CS of the Dunes</th>
<th>Gary</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table B-3: PL 221

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance: 41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement: 6.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table B-4: Annual Yearly Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL DETERMINATION: NO (third time not meeting AYP)</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE: YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERFORMANCE</td>
<td>PARTICIPATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education

## Table B-5: NWEA Percent Meeting Target Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READING</th>
<th>LANGUAGE ARTS</th>
<th>MATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
<td>% Met Target Growth Rate</td>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: NWEA
Constituent Surveys

**Figure B-4:** Overall, how satisfied are you with the charter school?

![Bar Graph](chart1)

**Figure B-5:** How likely are you to... Recommend the school to friends & colleagues?

![Bar Graph](chart2)

**Figure B-6:** How likely are you to... Return to the school next year?

![Bar Graph](chart3)
Figure B-7: How likely are you to... Increase your support of the school?

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Academic Program

Figure B-8: How satisfied are you with the overall quality of education?

- Parent (n=16):
  - Very Satisfied: 12.5%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 25.0%
  - Neutral: 7.5%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 15.0%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 25.0%
  - Don’t Know: 37.5%

- Staff (n=42):
  - Very Satisfied: 2.5%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 10.0%
  - Neutral: 10.0%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 15.0%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 25.0%
  - Don’t Know: 50.0%

Figure B-9: Your overall evaluation of... Curriculum/academic program

- Parent (n=16):
  - Excellent: 75.0%
  - Very Good: 12.5%
  - Good: 12.5%
  - Fair: 2.5%
  - Poor: 2.5%
  - Don’t Know/Not Applicable: 2.5%

- Staff (n=42):
  - Excellent: 5.0%
  - Very Good: 12.5%
  - Good: 32.5%
  - Fair: 40.0%
  - Poor: 12.5%
  - Don’t Know/Not Applicable: 7.5%

Figure B-10: Our school has a high quality academic program

- Parent (n=16):
  - Strongly Agree: 6.3%
  - Agree: 6.3%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 25.0%
  - Disagree: 18.8%
  - Strongly Disagree: 43.8%

- Staff (n=42):
  - Strongly Agree: 7.5%
  - Agree: 15.0%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 20.0%
  - Disagree: 15.0%
  - Strongly Disagree: 52.5%
Your overall evaluation of... Quality of teaching/instruction

Figure B-11:

- Parent (n=16):
  - Excellent: 37.5%
  - Very Good: 31.3%
  - Good: 18.8%
  - Fair: 11.9%
  - Poor: 7.1%
  - Don't Know: 2.4%

- Staff (n=42):
  - Excellent: 54.8%
  - Very Good: 37.5%
  - Good: 19.0%
  - Fair: 11.9%
  - Poor: 7.1%
  - Don't Know: 2.4%

Our school uses sound, rigorous educational practices

Figure B-12:

- Parent (n=16):
  - Strongly Agree: 56.3%
  - Agree: 42.5%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 15.0%
  - Disagree: 4.8%
  - Strongly Disagree: 2.5%

- Staff (n=42):
  - Strongly Agree: 42.5%
  - Agree: 20.0%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 17.5%
  - Disagree: 15.0%
  - Strongly Disagree: 2.5%

How would you rate the overall quality of education?

Figure B-13:

- Parent (n=16):
  - Excellent: 62.5%
  - Very Good: 28.6%
  - Good: 12.5%
  - Fair: 18.8%
  - Poor: 6.3%

- Staff (n=42):
  - Excellent: 40.5%
  - Very Good: 28.6%
  - Good: 16.7%
  - Fair: 15.0%
  - Poor: 4.8%

How would you compare the overall quality of education to that of other schools?

Figure B-14:

- Parent (n=16):
  - Much Better: 43.8%
  - Somewhat Better: 31.3%
  - About the Same: 25.0%

- Staff (n=42):
  - Much Better: 27.5%
  - Somewhat Better: 20.0%
  - About the Same: 25.0%
CHARTER SCHOOL OF THE DUNES of BSU Charter Schools

Organization/Providing Services

Figure B-15: Our school has effective administration

Figure B-16: All members of the school community understand the mission of the school

Figure B-17: Our school has the resources to achieve its mission
**Figure B-18:**
Your overall evaluation of... Individualized student attention

**Figure B-19:**
Your overall evaluation of... Support services (e.g. counseling, healthcare, etc.)

**Figure B-20:**
Your overall evaluation of... Services provided to the special needs students (e.g. ESL, disabilities, etc.)

**Figure B-21:**
Our school is safe for students

Data Source: The Kensington Group
East Chicago Lighthouse Charter School

“We prepare students for college with a rigorous arts-infused program.”

Mission

Students at East Chicago Lighthouse Charter School will acquire the knowledge, skills, values and attributes to be responsible citizens and effective workers. Students will realize this mission through a curriculum that infuses fine and performing arts into a rigorous core of content.

Educational Program

East Chicago Lighthouse Charter School will offer students an arts-infused education program that includes disciplines such as painting, performance, and computer-assisted design. The scope and sequence of each grade level will reflect the Core Knowledge Sequence, Indiana’s Academic Standards, and the Lighthouse Exit Standards. Underlying this engaging pedagogy will be a solid base in key skills. Students will learn to read, write, perform mathematical operations, and solve problems. A variety of programs that have been tested by careful research will be used to master a rich body of standards.

719 Clark Road
Gary, IN  46406
(219) 977-9713

www.lighthouse-academies.org

Grades Served . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .K-5
2006-2007 Enrollment . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .115

Year Opened:  2006-2007
Final Year in Current Contract:  2012-2013
Demographic Summary
East Chicago Lighthouse Charter School was in its first year of operation during 2006-2007. Serving Grades K-4 in the Gary Community Schools area, the student population is entirely Black (66%) and Hispanic (34%), a higher percentage of minority students than the average in Gary Community Schools and dramatically different from the average in the state of Indiana (Figure C-1). Ninety-one percent of East Chicago Lighthouse’s students received free or reduced cost lunches in 2006-2007; again, more than the average in Gary Community Schools or in Indiana (Figure C-2). With only 8% of students receiving special education services at East Chicago Lighthouse (Figure C-3), both Gary and the state as a whole serve a higher percentage of students in special education.

Academic Progress
Because this is the first year of East Chicago Lighthouse Charter School’s operation, the low percent passing ISTEP+ in September of 2006 (Table C-2) may not be cause for alarm. The students would only have been at the school for a few weeks at the time of the test. The 2007 testing will give a better indication of the school’s progress with students. NWEA target growth rates (Table C-3), provide an evaluation of the improvement over the school year in reading, language arts, and math for those students tested. In all of these areas, students fall behind the average in their growth from fall to spring testing, particularly in the reading subtest.

Constituent Survey
Nearly all parents and staff who responded to the constituent survey reported satisfaction with the school overall (Figure C-4). Most would recommend it to others and indicated their support for the school (Figures C-5 – C-7). Both parents and staff approved of the academic program, but parents were more likely to give strong ratings than staff (Figures C-8 – C-14). Notably, all respondents agreed that the school uses sound, rigorous educational practices. Staff and parent respondents appear to have been pleased with the administration (Figure C-15). Most respondents agreed that the mission was understood by all community members, but staff was less certain than parents that the school had the resources to accomplish its mission. Although parents who knew about the support services provided rated them positively, staff did not agree. A majority of staff respondents considered the support services provided to students as only “Fair” or “Poor” (Figure C-19), and services provided to special needs students received primarily a “Good” rating (Figure C-20). There appears to have been a concern among staff about the services provided to students. All staff and all but one parent agreed that students are safe at the East Chicago Lighthouse Charter School.

Financial Review
As a new school that opened in 2006, it is not surprising that the actual revenues at East Chicago Lighthouse Charter School exceeded budget. Actual expenses exceeded budgeted expenses, resulting in a net loss for the year. This is normal for a school in its first year due to the State of Indiana’s funding structure. Therefore, the school met Ball State University Office of Charter Schools’ expectations. Enrollment is expected to double in 2007-2008, which will eventually strengthen East Chicago Lighthouse Academy’s financial position. The school is scheduled to be audited by the State Board of Accounts during the 2007-2008 financial year.
School Improvement

To improve student ISTEP+ performance, East Chicago Lighthouse Charter School has taken the following steps:

• Created ISTEP+ prep plan to use throughout the year.
• Provided professional development on the structure and expectations of the test.
• Teachers instruct students on strategies each week throughout the year.
• Teachers model math problem solving and writing process weekly and assess student progress on sample ISTEP+ tests.
• During team planning meetings, teachers compare school’s curriculum to the state standards and identify missing areas to teach.

NWEA data were used to improve student achievement in the following ways:

• Students made more growth in math than reading. We increased our reading professional development and are partnering with Open Court Reading to provide training on the curriculum.
• We have ordered more books at students’ reading levels to differentiate for their needs.
• Teachers use the NWEA data to determine how long to spend on concepts and to adjust their instructional pacing.
• Title I teachers use the NWEA to target their instruction and analyze students’ progress using mastery checklists.
• After-school tutoring is provided to address areas of weakness on the test.
• Teachers use the data to create progress action plans so parents and students know which subcategories need the most improvement.

To address deficiencies that might affect AYP status for the 2007-2008 school year, East Chicago Lighthouse Charter School has taken the following actions:

• We have increased our attendance goal from 90% to 95% and, at parent orientation, we emphasized the importance of daily student attendance.
• We have created an ESL program to address the needs of our second language learners.
• We have implemented a school-wide intervention block daily when students are instructed on their reading level to provide more differentiation for students who are higher and lower achievers.
• We have restructured our Title I targeted assistance program to include a math interventionist and a reading interventionist. They are providing services daily based upon student needs and are servicing a greater number of students who are scoring below average.

To improve the perceptions of their school in response to the results of the constituent survey, East Chicago Lighthouse Charter School has taken the following actions:

• We added more parent orientations at the beginning of the year and made them mandatory so we could explain our expectations clearly and answer questions.
• We have shared positive student achievement results with parents.
• We have increased our publicity to inform the community about our school mission and goals so they know what is unique about our charter school.
• We have created a local school advisory board to give parents a forum for their concerns and a structure where they can positively impact the school.
• We created and used an internal parent survey to understand their concerns more and responded to their concerns in a parent newsletter.
• We revised our school discipline policy to be more clear and consistent.
Student Demographics

**Figure C-1:** Race/Ethnicity Percentages: 2006-2007

**Figure C-2:** Percentages of Students Qualifying for Free & Reduced Lunch: 2006-2007

**Figure C-3:** Percentages of Students in Special Education: 2006-2007

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education
Program Statistics

Table C-1: Attendance Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>East Chicago Lighthouse Charter School</th>
<th>Gary Community Schools</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C-2: Percentages Passing ISTEP+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>English/LA</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Both English &amp; Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Chicago Lighthouse</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education

Table C-3: NWEA Percent Meeting Target Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Students Taking Subtest</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Language Arts</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: NWEA
Constituent Surveys

Figure C-4: Overall, how satisfied are you with the charter school?

- Parent (n=39)
  - Very Satisfied: 84.6%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 60.0%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 2.6%

- Staff (n=10)
  - Very Satisfied: 40.0%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 60.0%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 2.6%

Figure C-5: How likely are you to... Recommend the school to friends & colleagues?

- Parent (n=39)
  - Extremely Likely: 76.9%
  - Very Likely: 20.5%
  - Somewhat Likely: 2.6%

- Staff (n=10)
  - Extremely Likely: 60.0%
  - Very Likely: 30.0%
  - Somewhat Likely: 10.0%

Figure C-6: How likely are you to... Return to the school next year?

- Parent (n=39)
  - Extremely Likely: 79.5%
  - Very Likely: 15.4%
  - Somewhat Likely: 5.1%

- Staff (n=10)
  - Extremely Likely: 50.0%
  - Very Likely: 40.0%
  - Somewhat Likely: 10.0%
Figure C-7: How likely are you to... Increase your support of the school?

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Academic Program

Figure C-8: How satisfied are you with the overall quality of education?

- **Parent (n=39)**:
  - Very Satisfied: 92.3%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 2.6%
  - Neutral: 5.1%

- **Staff (n=10)**:
  - Very Satisfied: 50.0%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 10.0%
  - Neutral: 40.0%

Figure C-9: Your overall evaluation of... Curriculum/academic program

- **Parent (n=39)**:
  - Excellent: 53.8%
  - Very Good: 33.3%
  - Good: 10.3%
  - Fair: 2.6%

- **Staff (n=10)**:
  - Excellent: 60.0%
  - Very Good: 40.0%
  - Good: 2.6%
  - Fair: 2.6%

Figure C-10: Our school has a high quality academic program

- **Parent (n=39)**:
  - Strongly Agree: 74.4%
  - Agree: 23.1%

- **Staff (n=10)**:
  - Strongly Agree: 60.0%
  - Agree: 40.0%
Figure C-11: Your overall evaluation of... Quality of teaching/instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=39)</th>
<th>Staff (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure C-12: Our school uses sound, rigorous educational practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=39)</th>
<th>Staff (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure C-13: How would you rate the overall quality of education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=39)</th>
<th>Staff (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure C-14: How would you compare the overall quality of education to that of other schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=39)</th>
<th>Staff (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much Better</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Better</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Worse</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Organization/Providing Services

Figure C-15: Our school has effective administration

Figure C-16: All members of the school community understand the mission of the school

Figure C-17: Our school has the resources to achieve its mission
Figure C-18: Your overall evaluation of... Individualized student attention

Figure C-19: Your overall evaluation of... Support services (e.g. counseling, healthcare, etc.)

Figure C-20: Your overall evaluation of... Services provided to the special needs students (e.g. ESL, disabilities, etc.)

Figure C-21: Our school is safe for students

Data Source: The Kensington Group
EAST CHICAGO URBAN ENTERPRISE ACADEMY of BSU Charter Schools

“A Different Kind of Public School”

Mission
To create a K-8 school that offers a rigorous academic program, provides a safe and supportive environment for learning and encourages the involvement of its families and the community.

Educational Program
East Chicago Urban Enterprise Academy utilizes Core Knowledge curriculum as the instructional foundation based on Indiana Standards. SRA’s Open Court Reading and Saxon Math are used as base curriculum. This curriculum has been used with success by American Quality Schools, the not-for-profit EMO, partnered with East Chicago Urban Enterprise for student success. Character education is an additional portion of the school curriculum. The Academy recognizes that the ethical and moral development of its students is a critical and essential part of each child’s education. Character education will not be taught as a separate class in the early grades, but will permeate the classrooms and affect the entire school culture.

1402 E. Chicago Avenue
East Chicago, IN 46312
(219) 392-3650

www.ecueacademy.org

Grades Served . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . K-6
2006-2007 Enrollment . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 284
2005-2006 Enrollment . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 205
Enrollment at Capacity . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 415

Year Opened: 2006-2007
Final Year in Current Contract: 2012-2013
Demographic Summary

East Chicago Urban Enterprise Academy (ECUEA) serves a primarily minority population in grades K-5 (ultimately K-8) in the East Chicago area. ECUEA’s 63% Black and 32% Hispanic differs from the population of the community schools (Figure D-1), the School City of East Chicago district, which has approximately half Black and half Hispanic students. It is quite different than the average in the state, which is primarily White. Nearly identical percentages of students of both ECUEA (90%) and the School City of East Chicago district (87%) received free and reduced cost lunches, substantially higher than the state average (37% ; Figure D-2). ECUA serves very few students identified with a need for special education services compared to the nearby schools (Figure D-3).

Academic Progress

ECUA’s ISTEP+ percent passing rate is comparable to other schools in the area, even surpassing those rates in some cases (Table D-2). Performance and participation in ISTEP+ produced a passing AYP determination (Table D-4), and “Exemplary Progress” in PL 221 (Table D-3). Only about one-third of the students tested with NWEA met their target growth rates in the reading, language arts, and math subtests.

Constituent Survey

Most parent and staff respondents to the 2006-2007 Constituent Survey were very satisfied overall with ECUEA (Figure D-4), and were supportive of the school (Figures D-5 – D-7). The academic program was rated positively by both parent and staff respondents (Figures D-8 – D-14). Administration was considered mostly positively (Figure D-15), and the school’s mission, for which respondents believed there are adequate resources, was considered to be understood by all (Figures D-16 – D-17). Support services appear to be an area of concern, both for parent and staff respondents (Figures D-19 – D-20). The school is considered to be safe for students (Figure D-21). In general, constituents appear to be quite pleased with ECUEA.

Financial Review

Financially, the school met Ball State University Office of Charter Schools’ expectations. It is in a strong financial position for a school completing its second year. Actual revenues exceeded budget, and actual expenses were less than revenues, providing the school with a positive net income for the year. The school has a strong cash position, and long-term debt is at an acceptable level. The State Board of Accounts performed an audit this past year, reporting on the period of July 1, 2005-June 30, 2006. Four issues were identified; East Chicago Urban Enterprise Academy properly addressed and corrected all issues.
School Improvement

To improve student ISTEP+ performance, ECUEA has taken the following steps:
- We are using a continued test preparation model throughout the school year instead of a major focus leading up to the test. In other words, those skills and standards will be a major focus of every day in test preparation for math and reading.
- We will use after-school tutorials, and we have hired additional instructional assistants to help the classroom teacher differentiate instruction in the classroom.
- We have also implemented some new supplemental reading and math materials that will help target what Open Court and Saxon Math neglect.

NWEA data were used to improve student achievement in the following ways:
- The data that we received from NWEA was used to predetermine the reading and math groups for this year’s classes.
- The dynamic reports gave us information that helped us to form these groups that will assist the teachers in using differentiated instruction in their classrooms. In doing so we hope to use more targeted and deliberate teaching strategies that will focus on the needs of the individual instead of teaching to the middle.

To address deficiencies that might affect AYP status for the 2007-2008 school year, ECUEA has taken the following actions:
- Attendance
  - We’ve actually cracked down on our attendance and tardy policy where we are less lenient and follow our attendance code and consequences to the letter.
  - We endeavor to work with families as much as possible, by connecting car pool groups and assisting parents with transportation such as local transportation companies (kiddy cab).
- Minority Performance
  - We have a good participation rate and hope to maintain that.
- Special Education Participation
  - Students who are in this category are tested and have participated.

To improve the perceptions of their school in response to the results of the constituent survey, ECUEA has taken the following actions:
- We know that reaching out to our parents and making them knowledgeable about all facets of the Academy is necessary.
- Monthly meetings for Parents In Action, Public Relations, Safety, and Building committees will get parents involved.
- We are partnering with our parents more now than in any of the other years.
- Constant contact, incentives, parent nights, and other events where we can get the parents to come out and become more involved with the school is what we are presently doing to improve communication and perceptions of parents.
- We are also reaching out to the community and businesses to not only ask for financial assistance, but also to partner with us for career days and after-school programs.
Student Demographics

Figure D-1: Race/Ethnicity Percentages: 2006-2007

Figure D-2: Percentages of Students Qualifying for Free & Reduced Lunch: 2006-2007

Figure D-3: Percentages of Students in Special Education: 2006-2007

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education
Program Statistics

Table D-1: Attendance Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>East Chicago Urban Enterprise Academy</th>
<th>School City of East Chicago</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-2: Percentages Passing ISTEP+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>East Chicago Urban Enter.</th>
<th>Sch. City</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D-3: PL 221

- EXEMPLARY PROGRESS
  - Performance: 62.7%
  - Improvement: 10.5%

Table D-4: Annual Yearly Progress

- OVERALL DETERMINATION: YES

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education

Table D-5: NWEA Percent Meeting Target Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Students Taking Subtest</th>
<th>READING</th>
<th>LANGUAGE ARTS</th>
<th>MATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: NWEA
Constituent Surveys

Figure D-4: Overall, how satisfied are you with the charter school?

Figure D-5: How likely are you to... Recommend the school to friends & colleagues?

Figure D-6: How likely are you to... Return to the school next year?
Figure D-7: How likely are you to... Increase your support of the school?

- Parent (n=41)
  - Extremely Likely: 2.4%
  - Very Likely: 14.6%
  - Somewhat Likely: 4.9%
  - Not Very Likely: 30.0%
  - Don’t Know: 78.0%

- Staff (n=20)
  - Extremely Likely: 5.0%
  - Very Likely: 5.0%
  - Somewhat Likely: 60.0%

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Academic Program

Figure D-8: How satisfied are you with the overall quality of education?

Figure D-9: Your overall evaluation of... Curriculum/academic program

Figure D-10: Our school has a high quality academic program
Figure D-11: Your overall evaluation of... Quality of teaching/instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=41)</th>
<th>Staff (n=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure D-12: Our school uses sound, rigorous educational practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=41)</th>
<th>Staff (n=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure D-13: How would you rate the overall quality of education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=41)</th>
<th>Staff (n=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure D-14: How would you compare the overall quality of education to that of other schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=41)</th>
<th>Staff (n=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much Better</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Better</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the Same</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Worse</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much Worse</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Organization/Providing Services

Figure D-15: Our school has effective administration

- **Parent (n=41)**
  - Strongly Agree: 56.1%
  - Agree: 31.7%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 9.8%
  - Disagree: 2.4%

- **Staff (n=20)**
  - Strongly Agree: 35.0%
  - Agree: 35.0%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 15.0%
  - Disagree: 15.0%

Figure D-16: All members of the school community understand the mission of the school

- **Parent (n=41)**
  - Strongly Agree: 53.7%
  - Agree: 34.1%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 7.3%
  - Disagree: 2.4%

- **Staff (n=20)**
  - Strongly Agree: 50.0%
  - Agree: 40.0%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 5.0%
  - Disagree: 5.0%

Figure D-17: Our school has the resources to achieve its mission

- **Parent (n=41)**
  - Strongly Agree: 46.3%
  - Agree: 34.1%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 12.2%
  - Disagree: 2.4%

- **Staff (n=20)**
  - Strongly Agree: 60.0%
  - Agree: 35.0%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 5.0%
  - Disagree: 5.0%
### Figure D-18: Your overall evaluation of... Individualized student attention

- **Parent** (n=41)
  - Excellent: 40.0%
  - Very Good: 35.0%
  - Good: 15.0%
  - Fair: 5.0%
  - Poor: 2.5%
  - Don't Know/Not Applicable: 2.5%

- **Staff** (n=20)
  - Excellent: 50.0%
  - Very Good: 35.0%
  - Good: 10.0%
  - Fair: 5.0%
  - Poor: 2.5%
  - Don't Know/Not Applicable: 2.5%

### Figure D-19: Your overall evaluation of... Support services (e.g. counseling, healthcare, etc.)

- **Parent** (n=41)
  - Excellent: 41.5%
  - Very Good: 29.3%
  - Good: 24.4%
  - Fair: 19.5%
  - Poor: 15.0%
  - Don't Know/Not Applicable: 7.3%

- **Staff** (n=20)
  - Excellent: 30.0%
  - Very Good: 25.0%
  - Good: 25.0%
  - Fair: 30.0%
  - Poor: 15.0%
  - Don't Know/Not Applicable: 5.0%

### Figure D-20: Your overall evaluation of... Services provided to the special needs students (e.g. ESL, disabilities, etc.)

- **Parent** (n=41)
  - Excellent: 43.9%
  - Very Good: 29.3%
  - Good: 21.3%
  - Fair: 9.8%
  - Poor: 2.4%
  - Don't Know/Not Applicable: 14.6%

- **Staff** (n=20)
  - Excellent: 35.0%
  - Very Good: 30.0%
  - Good: 25.0%
  - Fair: 10.0%
  - Poor: 5.0%
  - Don't Know/Not Applicable: 15.0%

### Figure D-21: Our school is safe for students

- **Parent** (n=41)
  - Strongly Agree: 63.4%
  - Agree: 29.3%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 7.3%
  - Disagree: 5.0%
  - No Opinion: 2.5%

- **Staff** (n=20)
  - Strongly Agree: 65%
  - Agree: 30.0%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 5.0%
  - Disagree: 0%
  - No Opinion: 0%

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Mission

The purpose of Gary Lighthouse Charter School is to prepare students for college through a rigorous arts-infused curriculum. To accomplish this, students will be expected to master all appropriate standards and understand all sequenced content each year through its unique curriculum. Overall, Gary Lighthouse Charter School is committed to seeing every student succeed, and the school and instruction are designed to reflect that commitment.

Educational Program

Gary Lighthouse Charter School will offer students an arts-infused education program that includes disciplines such as painting, performance, and computer-assisted design. The scope and sequence of each grade level will reflect Indiana’s Academic Standards and the Lighthouse Exit Standards as indicated in the Lighthouse Instructional Pacing Guides. Underlying this engaging pedagogy will be a solid base in key skills. Students will learn to read, write, perform mathematical operations, and solve problems. A variety of programs that have been tested by careful research will be used to master a rich body of standards.
Demographic Summary

Gary Lighthouse Charter School serves a nearly all-Black population similar to the local Gary Community Schools (Figure E-1). Both Gary Lighthouse and the Gary Community Schools have a much higher percentage of economically disadvantaged students than the average in the state of Indiana (Figure E-2). Gary Lighthouse does not serve a large special education population, with only 7% of its students receiving special education services (Figure E-3).

Academic Progress

ISTEP+ percent passing rates at Gary Lighthouse are lower than those at the Gary Community schools in all subtests and grades (see Table E-2). The highest percent passing ISTEP+ rate is found in the 6th-Grade math performance at Gary Lighthouse. All other grades have notably lower percent passing than the surrounding Gary Community Schools, which, in turn, have much lower percent passing rates than the state average. Low performance in these grades, particularly in the 3rd grade, are responsible for the lack of Adequate Yearly Progress in this first year in which such tracking was possible. The 7% improvement in scores since the 2005-2006 ISTEP+ testing earned the school a PL 221 “Commendable Progress” report. About half of Gary Lighthouse Charter School students tested in both fall and spring met their NWEA target growth rate in reading and math, with a slightly higher percentage meeting the target in language arts (Table E-5).

Constituent Survey

More than 80% of both parent and staff respondents reported satisfaction with the school overall (Figure E-4) and would be likely to recommend it to friends and colleagues (Figure E-5), but there are indications that there is room for improvement. Questions about the academic program did not engender overwhelmingly positive responses, indicating some mixed feelings about academics at the school (Figures E-8 – E-14). Parent respondents tended to rate the program more highly than staff respondents, who did not give questions regarding academics consistently positive responses. About half of staff respondents considered the school to have an effective administration, compared with about three-fourths of parent respondents (Figure E-15). In general, respondents felt that community members understand the mission of the school and there are sufficient resources to accomplish the mission (Figures E-16 & E-17). Staff respondents apparently believed that students were being short-changed at Galileo, and gave low ratings to individualized student attention and other student support services (Figures E-18 – E-20). Safety did not appear to be an issue for parent or staff respondents (Figure E-21).

Financial Review

Financially, Gary Lighthouse Charter School exceeded Ball State University Office of Charter Schools’ expectations. The school has very strong financials. The school’s revenue exceeded expenses, reporting a net income position and a solid cash balance at year-end. The school has very limited long-term debt and is likely to be able to maintain strong finances. The State Board of Accounts performed an audit for the period March 14, 2005 – June 30, 2006. Seven issues were identified by the auditors. Gary Lighthouse Charter School properly addressed and corrected all issues.
School Improvement

To improve student ISTEP+ performance, Gary Light-house Charter School has taken the following steps:

- Analysis of ISTEP format.
- Alignment of NWEA data with ISTEP data.
- Weekly Benchmark assessment accessed through DOE web site targeting areas of development identified through NWEA.
- Daily implementation of structures to address areas of weakness in Math Problem Solving, Writing, and Comprehension of Informational Text.
- Summer School and Jumpstart Program designed to review Academic Standards in preparation for ISTEP/Next Grade level.

NWEA data were used to improve student achievement in the following ways:

- NWEA subsets were aligned with ISTEP and benchmark goals established.
- NWEA Dynamic Reporting Suite was used to analyze and predict performance for 2007 ISTEP.
- Next step will be the development of curriculum ladders intended to intensify the differentiation.

To address deficiencies that might affect AYP status for the 2007-2008 school year, Gary Lighthouse Charter School has taken the following actions:

- Attendance Incentive Program implemented to increase attendance.

To improve the perceptions of their school in response to the results of the constituent survey, Gary Lighthouse Charter School has taken the following actions:

- A clearer handbook of expectations has been designed to communicate standards to parents.
- Monthly parent meetings are designed to assist parents in helping their students academically.
- Parent Coordinator conducts frequent formal/informal surveys to keep abreast of the needs of parents.
Student Demographics

Figure E-1: Race/Ethnicity Percentages: 2006-2007

Figure E-2: Percentages of Students Qualifying for Free & Reduced Lunch: 2006-2007

Figure E-3: Percentages of Students in Special Education: 2006-2007

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education
## Program Statistics

### Table E-1: Attendance Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Gary Lighthouse Charter School</th>
<th>Gary Community Schools</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table E-2: Percentages Passing ISTEP+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>English/LA</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>BOTH ENGLISH &amp; MATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gary Lighthouse</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table E-3: PL 221

**COMMENDABLE**

Performance: 36.0% Improvement: 6.7%

### Table E-4: Annual Yearly Progress

**OVERALL DETERMINATION: NO**

**ATTENDANCE: YES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education

### Table E-5: NWEA Percent Meeting Target Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READING</th>
<th>LANGUAGE ARTS</th>
<th>MATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
<td>% Met Target Growth Rate</td>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: NWEA
Constituent Surveys

Figure E-4: Overall, how satisfied are you with the charter school?

- **Parent (n=127)**
  - Very Satisfied: 56.7%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 12.6%
  - Neutral: 23.6%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 4.7%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 2.9%

- **Staff (n=35)**
  - Very Satisfied: 54.3%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 31.4%
  - Neutral: 14.3%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 5.7%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 2.9%

Figure E-5: How likely are you to... Recommend the school to friends & colleagues?

- **Parent (n=127)**
  - Extremely Likely: 4.8%
  - Very Likely: 18.3%
  - Somewhat Likely: 23.8%
  - Not Very Likely: 2.9%
  - Not at All Likely: 2.9%

- **Staff (n=35)**
  - Extremely Likely: 4.7%
  - Very Likely: 14.3%
  - Somewhat Likely: 25.7%
  - Not Very Likely: 5.7%
  - Not at All Likely: 5.7%

Figure E-6: How likely are you to... Return to the school next year?

- **Parent (n=127)**
  - Extremely Likely: 55.1%
  - Very Likely: 22.8%
  - Somewhat Likely: 14.2%
  - Not Very Likely: 4.7%
  - Not at All Likely: 2.4%

- **Staff (n=35)**
  - Extremely Likely: 57.1%
  - Very Likely: 20.0%
  - Somewhat Likely: 14.3%
  - Not Very Likely: 5.7%
  - Not at All Likely: 2.9%
Figure E-7: How likely are you to... Increase your support of the school?

Parent (n=127)
- 1.6%
- 2.4%
- 12.7%
- 26.2%
- 56.3%

Staff (n=35)
- 2.9%
- 2.9%
- 14.7%
- 32.4%
- 44.1%

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Figure E-8: How satisfied are you with the overall quality of education?

![Bar chart showing satisfaction levels for parents (n=127) and staff (n=35).]

- **Parents**
  - Very Satisfied: 65.6%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 20.8%
  - Neutral: 6.4%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 5.6%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 1.6%

- **Staff**
  - Very Satisfied: 45.7%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 22.9%
  - Neutral: 8.6%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 22.9%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 6.4%

Figure E-9: Your overall evaluation of the... Curriculum/academic program

![Bar chart showing evaluations for parents (n=127) and staff (n=35).]

- **Parents**
  - Excellent: 43.7%
  - Very Good: 26.2%
  - Good: 19.8%
  - Fair: 7.1%
  - Poor: 1.6%
  - Don't Know/Not Applicable: 1.6%

- **Staff**
  - Excellent: 31.4%
  - Very Good: 31.4%
  - Good: 20.0%
  - Fair: 11.4%
  - Poor: 11.4%
  - Don't Know/Not Applicable: 5.7%

Figure E-10: Our school has a high quality academic program

![Bar chart showing agreement levels for parents (n=127) and staff (n=35).]

- **Parents**
  - Strongly Agree: 40.9%
  - Agree: 40.9%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 11.0%
  - Disagree: 5.5%
  - Strongly Disagree: 0.8%

- **Staff**
  - Strongly Agree: 54.3%
  - Agree: 28.6%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 11.4%
  - Disagree: 5.7%
  - Strongly Disagree: 0.8%
### Figure E-11: Your overall evaluation of... Quality of teaching/instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=127)</th>
<th>Staff (n=35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/Not Applicable</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure E-12: Our school uses sound, rigorous educational practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=127)</th>
<th>Staff (n=35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure E-13: How would you rate the overall quality of education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=127)</th>
<th>Staff (n=35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure E-14: How would you compare the overall quality of education to that of other schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=127)</th>
<th>Staff (n=35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much Better</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Better</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the Same</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Worse</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much Worse</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Organization/Providing Services

Figure E-15: Our school has effective administration

Figure E-16: All members of the school community understand the mission of the school

Figure E-17: Our school has the resources to achieve its mission
Figure E-18: Your overall evaluation of... Individualized student attention

Figure E-19: Your overall evaluation of... Support services (e.g. counseling, healthcare, etc.)

Figure E-20: Your overall evaluation of... Services provided to the special needs students (e.g. ESL, disabilities, etc.)

Figure E-21: Our school is safe for students

Data Source: The Kensington Group
“There are no shortcuts”

Mission

The mission of KIPP LEAD College Preparatory School (Student Leaders with Empathy, Achievement and Dedication) is to empower students with the character, knowledge, and leadership skills necessary to succeed in college, strengthen the community, and help change the world. The key components of the school’s program can be summed up in the school’s motto, “THERE ARE NO SHORTCUTS,” words that apply to administration, faculty, students, and parents alike. KIPP LEAD College Prep will achieve its success through a culture of high expectations, excellent teaching, and more time in school.

Educational Program

KIPP LEAD students will attend school until 5:00 p.m. on weekdays, alternating Saturdays, and three weeks in the summer. They will receive 60% more time to learn than their counterparts in typical public schools. This time will be devoted to the core subject areas and ensuring that students are performing at or above grade level. For example, students at KIPP LEAD will receive over 3 hours of literacy instruction everyday. The time that students spend in school during traditional “after-school” hours will also help them focus on academics and their personal development.
Demographic Summary

KIPP LEAD College Preparatory Academy began operation in Gary in the fall of 2006. In its first year, it served only 5th graders, but it will expand to serve Grades 5 through 8. Ninety-nine percent of students at KIPP LEAD are Black, similar to the Gary Community Schools, and very different from the 12% Black students that is the average in the state (Figure F-1). Eighty percent of KIPP LEAD students received free or reduced cost lunches in 2006-2007, a higher percentage than in the Gary schools and much higher than the average in the state (Figure F-2). This minority population is also financially disadvantaged. KIPP LEAD serves a much lower percentage of students in need of special education services than the local schools or the statewide average (Figure F-3).

Academic Progress

ISTEP testing occurred in September of 2006, only a few weeks after KIPP LEAD opened. With so little time before the test occurs, percent passing rates do not give an indication of the school’s progress with its students. Testing of the 6th graders in the fall of 2007 will provide some evidence of KIPP’s success. Of the students tested with the NWEA MAP assessment in both fall and spring, about half met their target growth rate in language arts and math (Table F-3). Only about a third met their target growth rate in reading, suggesting a potential area in need of improvement.

Constituent Survey

Too few staff members responded to the 2006-2007 Constituent Survey (Figure F-4 – F-21) to give an indication of the opinion of all the staff about the school's functioning. In nearly every area of the survey, parent respondents gave only the highest ratings. Parent respondents were satisfied with the school overall, with its academic program, and with the effectiveness of school administration. Of those parents who had an opinion about support services, only one parent reported dissatisfaction with such services as counseling and health services. In its first year of operation, KIPP LEAD appears to have the full support of parents.

Financial Review

KIPP LEAD College Preparatory Academy is a new school that opened in 2006. Actual revenue was 23% below budgeted levels. Actual expenses were within 2% of budgeted levels. The school experienced a net income loss for the year, which is normal for a first-year school due to the state of Indiana’s funding structure. Therefore, the school met Ball State University Office of Charter Schools’ expectations. KIPP LEAD’s debt level is reasonable for a start-up school. The doubling of the number of the school’s students in 2007-2008 will significantly increase revenues and assist income levels as fixed costs remain constant. KIPP LEAD College Preparatory Academy is scheduled to be audited by the State Board of Accounts during the 2007-2008 financial year.
School Improvement

As a new school in 2006-2007, there were few markers indicating a need for areas of improvement. Some changes were made over the course of the year, however.

NWEA data were used to improve student achievement in the following ways:

• We analyzed the results and used the data to help us redesign our summer program for our current 6th graders. This information was used to create the scope and sequence for our summer program to help students prepare for the ISTEP in the fall.

To address deficiencies that might affect AYP status for the 2007-2008 school year, KIPP LEAD College Preparatory Academy has taken the following actions:

• We created more ambitious attendance goals for this academic year. Specifically, only students with fewer than 10 absences in this school year will be able to attend the end-year out-of-state field trip.
### Student Demographics

#### Figure F-1: Race/Ethnicity Percentages: 2006-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIPP LEAD College Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Community School Corp</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Indiana</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure F-2: Percentages of Students Qualifying for Free & Reduced Lunch: 2006-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Free</th>
<th>Reduced</th>
<th>Paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIPP LEAD College Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Community School Corp</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Indiana</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure F-3: Percentages of Students in Special Education: 2006-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIPP LEAD Academy of Gary</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Community School Corp</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Indiana</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education
## Program Statistics

### Table F-1: Attendance Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>KIPP LEAD College Preparatory Academy</th>
<th>Gary Community Schools</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table F-2: Percentages Passing ISTEP+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>ENGLISH/LA</th>
<th>MATH</th>
<th>BOTH ENGLISH &amp; MATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KIPP LEAD</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education

### Table F-3: NWEA Percent Meeting Target Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READING</th>
<th>LANGUAGE ARTS</th>
<th>MATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
<td>% Met Target Growth Rate</td>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: NWEA
Constituent Surveys

Figure F-4: Overall, how satisfied are you with the charter school?

![Bar graph showing satisfaction levels for KIPP LEAD College Preparatory Academy. The majority of parents (96.4%) are very satisfied, with 3.6% not sure.]

Figure F-5: How likely are you to... Recommend the school to friends & colleagues?

![Bar graph showing likelihood of recommending the school. All parents (100.0%) are extremely likely to recommend.]

Figure F-6: How likely are you to... Return to the school next year?

![Bar graph showing likelihood of returning to the school. The majority of parents (96.4%) are extremely likely to return, with 3.6% somewhat likely.]
Figure F-7: How likely are you to... Increase your support of the school?

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Academic Program

Figure F-8: How satisfied are you with the overall quality of education?

Figure F-9: Your overall evaluation of... Curriculum/academic program

Figure F-10: Our school has a high quality academic program
Figure F-11: Your overall evaluation of... Quality of teaching/instruction

Figure F-12: Our school uses sound, rigorous educational practices

Figure F-13: How would you rate the overall quality of education?

Figure F-14: How would you compare the overall quality of education to that of other schools?

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Organization/Providing Services

Figure F-15: Our school has effective administration

Figure F-16: All members of the school community understand the mission of the school

Figure F-17: Our school has the resources to achieve its mission
Figure F-18: Your overall evaluation of... Individualized student attention

Figure F-19: Your overall evaluation of... Support services (e.g. counseling, healthcare, etc.)

Figure F-20: Your overall evaluation of... Services provided to the special needs students (e.g. ESL, disabilities, etc.)

Figure F-21: Our school is safe for students

Data Source: The Kensington Group
THEA BOWMAN LEADERSHIP ACADEMY of BSU Charter Schools

“One Who Learns, Leads”

150 West 15th Avenue
Gary, IN 46407
(415) 531-7157
www.bowmancharterschool.org

Mission
Thea Bowman Leadership Academy strives to provide Gary parents and children a high-quality academic option within the public schools. The school is based on a rigorous curriculum that will allow children to succeed in high school and beyond. Thea Bowman Leadership Academy’s mission is to create a pre-high school college preparatory program that combines academic achievement with leadership skills and opportunities.

Educational Program
Thea Bowman utilizes the Core Knowledge curriculum as the instructional foundation based on Indiana Standards. SRA’s Open Court reading is used to teach reading and writing simultaneously, and Saxon Math is the core mathematics curriculum. Students are also taught character education, multicultural information and appreciation, civic leadership, and economic justice through business, entrepreneurial leadership, and professional leadership.
Demographic Summary

Thea Bowman Leadership Academy serves a nearly all-Black student population that is similar demographically and economically to the average schools in the Gary area, with much higher percentages of minority and economically disadvantaged students than the statewide average (Figures G-1 & G-2). Thea Bowman has a lower percentage of students in need of special education services than the local community or the state as a whole (Figure G-3).

Academic Progress

ISTEP+ performance at Thea Bowman is notably higher than the average of the local Gary Community Schools, with a few exceptions, particularly in 4th and 5th grade math. Poor performance in math and among students receiving free and reduced cost lunches resulted in a lack of Adequate Yearly Progress (Table G-4). Overall improvement, however, was sufficient to earn an “Exemplary Progress” PL 221 status. Of students tested with the NWEA MAP in both fall and spring, not quite half met their target growth rate in language arts (Table G-5), and fewer met their target growth rate in reading (36%) and math (22%).

Constituent Survey

Both parent and staff respondents to the 2006-2007 Constituent Survey indicated strong support for and satisfaction with the school (Figures G-4 – G-7). Academics and administration received positive ratings (Figures G-8 – G-15). Possible areas of weakness suggested by respondent ratings were in individualized student attention and services provided to students (Figures G-18 – G-20).

Financial Review

Financially, Thea Bowman Leadership Academy exceeded Ball State University Office of Charter Schools’ expectations. Its financials are very strong, and it appears the school will remain solid. Actual revenue exceeded budgeted revenues by 8%. Although actual expenses exceeded budgeted expenses by 15%, the school had a significant net income for the year. Thea Bowman Leadership Academy continues to maintain a high cash position, and has a significant net equity position. The State Board of Accounts performed an audit for the period July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2006. Eight issues were identified that required a response. Thea Bowman Leadership Academy properly addressed and corrected all issues.
School Improvement

To improve student ISTEP+ performance, Thea Bowman Leadership Academy has taken the following steps:

• Increased reading time to 1 ½ hours in Grades 5 and 6.
• Increased the number of books being read for the required reading program.
• Small group classroom instruction with highly qualified instructional assistants in language arts and math
• Continue to align curriculum to state standards.
• Professional development in differentiated instruction.
• Use of research-based reading and math strategies.

NWEA data were used to improve student achievement in the following ways:

• Professional development for staff on how to interpret test data.
• Use of the “DesCartes” continuum of learning as a resource to align curriculum and instruction and to reinforce skills and concepts not yet learned.

To address deficiencies that might affect AYP status for the 2007-2008 school year, Thea Bowman Leadership Academy has taken the following actions:

• Targeted struggling students for extra support during the day as well as after school.

To improve the perceptions of their school in response to the results of the constituent survey, Thea Bowman Leadership Academy has taken the following actions:

• Support an active parent/teacher/community organization.
• Establishing Family Fun Nights.
• End-of-year Writers’ Fair.
Student Demographics

Figure G-1: Race/Ethnicity Percentages: 2006-2007

Figure G-2: Percentages of Students Qualifying for Free & Reduced Lunch: 2006-2007

Figure G-3: Percentages of Students in Special Education: 2006-2007

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education
Program Statistics

Table G-1: Attendance Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Thea Bowman Leadership Academy</th>
<th>Gary Community Schools</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table G-2: Percentages Passing ISTEP+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>ENGLISH/LA</th>
<th>MATH</th>
<th>BOTH ENGLISH &amp; MATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thea Bowman</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table G-3: PL 221

ACADEMIC PROBATION

Performance: 58.6%  Improvement: 5.1%

Table G-4: Annual Yearly Progress

OVERALL DETERMINATION: NO  ATTENDANCE: YES

PERFORMANCE  PARTICIPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table G-5: NWEA Percent Meeting Target Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>READING</th>
<th>LANGUAGE ARTS</th>
<th>MATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Students Taking</td>
<td>% Met</td>
<td>% Met</td>
<td>% Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtest</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education

Data Source: NWEA
Constituent Surveys

**Figure G-4:** Overall, how satisfied are you with the charter school?

- **Parent (n=76):**
  - Very Satisfied: 75.0%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 15.8%
  - Neutral: 5.3%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 1.3%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 2.6%

- **Staff (n=56):**
  - Very Satisfied: 72.7%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 18.2%
  - Neutral: 9.1%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 2.6%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 1.3%

**Figure G-5:** How likely are you to... Recommend the school to friends & colleagues?

- **Parent (n=76):**
  - Extremely Likely: 2.6%
  - Very Likely: 10.5%
  - Somewhat Likely: 36.8%
  - Not Very Likely: 19.7%
  - Not At All Likely: 21.1%
  - Don’t Know: 1.3%

- **Staff (n=56):**
  - Extremely Likely: 1.8%
  - Very Likely: 7.3%
  - Somewhat Likely: 38.2%
  - Not Very Likely: 22.4%
  - Not At All Likely: 34.1%
  - Don’t Know: 1.3%

**Figure G-6:** How likely are you to... Return to the school next year?

- **Parent (n=76):**
  - Extremely Likely: 2.6%
  - Very Likely: 9.2%
  - Somewhat Likely: 21.1%
  - Not Very Likely: 28.6%
  - Not At All Likely: 26.9%
  - Don’t Know: 1.3%

- **Staff (n=56):**
  - Extremely Likely: 3.6%
  - Very Likely: 30.9%
  - Somewhat Likely: 38.2%
  - Not Very Likely: 22.4%
  - Not At All Likely: 10.7%
  - Don’t Know: 1.3%
Figure G-7: How likely are you to... Increase your support of the school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Not At All Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent (n=76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (n=56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: The Kensington Group
## Academic Program

**Figure G-8:** How satisfied are you with the overall quality of education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=76)</th>
<th>Staff (n=56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure G-9:** Your overall evaluation of... Curriculum/academic program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=76)</th>
<th>Staff (n=56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/Not Applicable</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure G-10:** Our school has a high quality academic program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=76)</th>
<th>Staff (n=56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure G-11: Your overall evaluation of... Quality of teaching/instruction

![Graph showing evaluation of teaching/instruction by parents and staff.]

Figure G-12: Our school uses sound, rigorous educational practices

![Graph showing agreement with the use of sound, rigorous educational practices by parents and staff.]

Figure G-13: How would you rate the overall quality of education?

![Graph showing ratings of overall quality of education by parents and staff.]

Figure G-14: How would you compare the overall quality of education to that of other schools?

![Graph showing comparison of overall quality of education to other schools by parents and staff.]

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Organization/Providing Services

Figure G-15: Our school has effective administration

Figure G-16: All members of the school community understand the mission of the school

Figure G-17: Our school has the resources to achieve its mission
Figure G-18: Your overall evaluation of... Individualized student attention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=76)</th>
<th>Staff (n=56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know/Not Applicable</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure G-19: Your overall evaluation of... Support services (e.g. counseling, healthcare, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=76)</th>
<th>Staff (n=56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know/Not Applicable</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure G-20: Your overall evaluation of... Services provided to the special needs students (e.g. ESL, disabilities, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=76)</th>
<th>Staff (n=56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know/Not Applicable</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure G-21: Our school is safe for students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=76)</th>
<th>Staff (n=56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Mission
Veritas Academy teaches children to think clearly, speak eloquently, write persuasively, and calculate accurately. The curriculum offers a traditional, well-balanced core of subjects that are challenging and effective. In addition, a character development focus is integrated throughout the instructional program to help students become caring, responsible citizens. Veritas Academy provides a learning environment designed to develop each child’s search for knowledge, to encourage each child’s curiosity, and to foster each child’s creativity. A central focus of Veritas Academy is the creation of an inclusive community where students, parents, staff, and community members are partners in the educational process and achievement of all children.

Educational Program
The educational curriculum of Veritas closely follows the Core Knowledge Sequence developed by E.D. Hirsch, a national leader in educational reform. It involves teaching core content in highly specified yearly sequences so that children have a coherent, cumulative, solid foundation of knowledge and competencies. The basic premise of Core Knowledge is that children expand their learning by building on what they already know.
Demographic Summary

Veritas Academy serves a more diverse population than the state average, but it is similar to other schools in the South Bend area, with nearly 40% African American students (Figure H-1). This diverse population is less financially disadvantaged than other South Bend schools, however, with approximately 34% of its students receiving free or reduced-cost lunches (Figure H-2). In this regard, it more closely resembles the average school in the state of Indiana than those nearby. The corporation of South Bend Community Schools has a higher percentage than statewide average of students in need of special education services (Figure H-3). With 12% of students requiring special education services, Veritas Academy has a lower percentage than the statewide average and less than half the percentage of the South Bend Community Schools.

Academic Progress

For the third year in a row, Veritas Academy students’ performance and participation met the standards of Adequate Yearly Progress (Table H-4). Most grades have passing rates around two-thirds of the grade, with a few higher (notably the 3rd-Grade English/LA, which surpasses the statewide average) and a few lower (unfortunately, this is also the 3rd Grade, which had only 38% passing the math, well below the 59% of local schools). Math pass rates are closer to half for both 7th- and 8th-Grade students. Average pass rates for the school saw an improvement of 9% since the last year, leading to an “Exemplary Progress” PL 221 status. A little more than a third of students who took the NWEA MAP assessment in both fall and spring met their target growth rate in reading (Table H-5). Almost half met their target in language arts and just under that met their target in math.

Constituent Survey

Few parents (n=12) or staff (n=10) responded to the 2006-2007 Constituent Survey at Veritas Academy, so the interpretations that follow cannot be considered an accurate representation of the full population of parents and staff. The few parents and staff who responded were generally satisfied with and supportive of the school (Figures H-4 – H-7). Although the few responses cannot be considered representative of all constituents, the tendency of the responses among both parents and staff to indicate satisfaction with academics at the school suggests there was not overwhelming dissatisfaction with the quality of education (Figures H-8 – H-14). Neither was there overwhelming satisfaction among these respondents. Most staff and parent respondents considered the school to have effective administration (Figure H-15). The mission of the school, although apparently clear to a majority of these respondents, may not be attainable due to insufficient resources (Figures H-16 – H-17). The 10 staff members who responded to the survey appeared to be somewhat dissatisfied with services provided to the students (Figures H-19 & H-20). Although these responses should not be considered representative of the constituents as a whole, they do not raise significant alarms. The only area of concern in which there appeared to be some consensus is in the availability of resources to achieve the school’s mission. One-third of both staff and parents did not believe the school had sufficient resources to accomplish their goals.
Financial Review
Financially, Veritas Academy did not meet Ball State University Office of Charter Schools’ expectations. It has made numerous changes to improve its financial operation, including the hiring of a different accounting firm and appointing a new financial manager for the school. Veritas Academy had a small net loss in 2006-2007. The school began reducing the amount of their aged accounts payable. The school owes a large debt to the Internal Revenue Service, and has an agreement with the agency that the debt will be forgiven when Veritas Academy sells a property owned by the school and turns the proceeds over to the IRS. Veritas Academy has a payment agreement with the state of Indiana’s Internal Revenue Department and with Ball State University to pay debts owed to both of those institutions.

Auditors completed an Agreed-Upon Procedures Report for the year ending June 30, 2006 for Veritas Academy. The auditors identified a number of records and documents that could not be located. The auditors also stated that there were funds that were not being tracked. Veritas Academy has corrected its procedures. The State Board of Accounts will perform an audit in the coming year, reviewing the financials for the period July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2007.

School Improvement
To improve student ISTEP+ performance, Veritas Academy has taken the following steps:
- Veritas Academy has implemented a new math curriculum (K-8) with a hands-on, life applicable approach.
- Title I services provided for students qualifying through ISTEP+.
- Summer school provided and required for those students not passing ISTEP+.
- New summer school curriculum was adopted and implemented.
- After-school tutoring was provided.
- Teachers participated in professional development.

NWEA data were used to improve student achievement in the following ways:
- NWEA scores determine students’ eligibility for Title I services.
- Title I services were provided by Title I teacher for qualifying students.
- Individual Progress Plans developed for every Veritas student (1-8) based on DesCartes System.
- Individualized instruction provided for students based on NWEA norms for their achievement level.

To improve the perceptions of their school in response to the results of the constituent survey, Veritas Academy has taken the following actions:
- Veritas has developed a working Parent Cooperative to improve parental involvement.
- Parent committees have been formed to increase parent participation.
- Parent education opportunities were provided.
- Increased professional development opportunities for staff.
Student Demographics

Figure H-1: Race/Ethnicity Percentages: 2006-2007

- Veritas Academy: 47.3% White, 36.8% Black, 4.4% Hispanic, 11.5% Other
- South Bend Community Schools: 41.9% White, 35.9% Black, 14.2% Hispanic, 8.1% Other
- State of Indiana: 76.7% White, 12.2% Black, 6.1% Hispanic, 5.0% Other

Figure H-2: Percentages of Students Qualifying for Free & Reduced Lunch: 2006-2007

- Veritas Academy: 25.3% Free, 9.3% Reduced, 65.4% Paid
- South Bend Community Schools: 56.0% Free, 6.2% Reduced, 37.7% Paid
- State of Indiana: 29.4% Free, 8.1% Reduced, 62.5% Paid

Figure H-3: Percentages of Students in Special Education: 2006-2007

- Veritas Academy: 11.5%
- South Bend Community Schools: 23.2%
- State of Indiana: 17.0%

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education
Program Statistics

Table H-1: Attendance Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Veritas Academy</th>
<th>South Bend Community Schools</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table H-2: Percentages Passing ISTEP+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>Veritas Academy</th>
<th>South Bend Community Schools</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENGLISH/LA</td>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>BOTH ENGLISH &amp; MATH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Veritas Academy</td>
<td>South Bend Community Schools</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table H-3: PL 221

EXEMPLARY PROGRESS

Performance: 74.5%  Improvement: 8.6%

Table H-4: Annual Yearly Progress

OVERALL DETERMINATION: YES

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education

Table H-5: NWEA Percent Meeting Target Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Students Taking Subtest</th>
<th>READING</th>
<th>LANGUAGE ARTS</th>
<th>MATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Met Target Growth Rate</td>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
<td>% Met Target Growth Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: NWEA
Constituent Surveys

Figure H-4: Overall, how satisfied are you with the charter school?

Figure H-5: How likely are you to... Recommend the school to friends & colleagues?

Figure H-6: How likely are you to... Return to the school next year?
Figure H-7: How likely are you to... Increase your support of the school?

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Academic Program

Figure H-8: How satisfied are you with the overall quality of education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure H-9: Your overall evaluation of... Curriculum/academic program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure H-10: Our school has a high quality academic program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure H-11: Your overall evaluation of... Quality of teaching/instruction

Figure H-12: Our school uses sound, rigorous educational practices

Figure H-13: How would you rate the overall quality of education?

Figure H-14: How would you compare the overall quality of education to that of other schools?

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Organization/Providing Services

Figure H-15: Our school has effective administration

Figure H-16: All members of the school community understand the mission of the school

Figure H-17: Our school has the resources to achieve its mission
Figure H-18: Your overall evaluation of... Individualized student attention

![Bar chart showing evaluations of individualized student attention by parents (n=12) and staff (n=10).]

Figure H-19: Your overall evaluation of... Support services (e.g. counseling, healthcare, etc.)

![Bar chart showing evaluations of support services by parents (n=12) and staff (n=10).]

Figure H-20: Your overall evaluation of... Services provided to the special needs students (e.g. ESL, disabilities, etc.)

![Bar chart showing evaluations of special needs services by parents (n=12) and staff (n=10).]

Figure H-21: Our school is safe for students

![Bar chart showing evaluations of school safety by parents (n=12) and staff (n=10).]

Data Source: The Kensington Group
WEST GARY LIGHTHOUSE
CHARTER SCHOOL of BSU Charter Schools

“We prepare students for college through a rigorous arts-infused program.”

Mission
Students at West Gary Lighthouse Charter School will acquire the knowledge, skills, values and attributes to be responsible citizens and effective workers. Students will realize this mission through a curriculum that infuses fine and performing arts into a rigorous core of content.

Educational Program
West Gary Lighthouse Charter School offers students an arts-infused education program that includes disciplines such as dance, visual arts, musical theory and practice, and performance. The scope and sequence of each grade level reflects the Core Knowledge Sequence, Indiana’s Academic Standards, and the Lighthouse Exit Standards. Underlying this engaging pedagogy is a solid base of key skills. Students learn to read, to write, to solve mathematical operations and problems, and to think critically in all subject areas. Research-based programs are used by committed educators to help students master our rich body of standards.

725 Clark Road
Gary, IN  46408
(219) 977-9583

www.lighthouse-academies.org

Grades Served . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . K-5
2006-2007 Enrollment . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 340
Year Opened:  2006-2007
Final Year in Current Contract:  2012-2013
Demographic Summary

2006 was the first year of operation for West Gary Lighthouse Charter School. The majority African American population at West Gary Lighthouse has a higher percentage of economically disadvantaged students than others in the Gary area, with 80% of their students receiving free or reduced-cost lunches (Figures I-1 & I-2). The school’s racial and economic diversity differs dramatically from the average school in the state of Indiana, as does its special education population, which at 9% is half the state average (Figure I-3).

Academic Progress

As a new school in fall of 2006, the September 2006 ISTEP+ test results do not offer a reasonable indication of West Gary Lighthouse’s efficacy with its students. September 2007 test results will provide evidence of progress made over the 2006-2007 year. Over the academic year, about half of the students tested in both spring and fall met their target growth rate on the language arts subtest of the NWEA assessment (Table I-3). A lower percentage of students tested did so in reading (29%) and math (43%).

Constituent Survey

Relatively few parents (n=28) responded to the 2006-2007 Constituent Survey, but those who did gave resoundingly positive reviews of the academic program, of administration, and of the services provided to students. Parent respondents indicated great support of the school. Staff respondents were similarly supportive, indicating general satisfaction with academics (Figures I-8 – I-14) and services provided to special needs students (Figure I-20). They were less positive about support services for students (Figure I-19), suggesting that counseling, health care, and other similar services for students may be in need of improvement. Administration was considered effective by both staff and parent respondents (Figure I-15), but there appears to have been concern among staff over the resources available to fulfill the school’s mission (Figure I-17).

Financial Review

West Gary Lighthouse Charter School is a new school that opened in 2006. The actual revenues under-ran the budget by 59%, while actual expenses under-ran budget by 10%, resulting in a net loss for the year, which is normal for a school in its first year due to the State of Indiana’s funding structure. Therefore, the school met Ball State University Office of Charter Schools’ expectations. The school’s enrollment is projected to increase by 31% in 2007-2008, which will eventually strengthen West Gary Lighthouse Charter School’s financial position. The school is scheduled to be audited by the State Board of Accounts during the 2007-2008 financial year.
School Improvement

To improve student ISTEP+ performance, West Gary Lighthouse Academy has taken the following steps:

- When funds were received for Title I in January of 2007, students who did not pass the ISTEP+ were targeted for additional assistance through a push-in instructional program during the school day.
- Students who did not pass the ISTEP+ in the 2006-2007 school year were invited to attend a three-week summer school program in July of 2007.
- Following the receipt of our ISTEP+ results, our professional development programs for staff changed to a focus on reading instruction and an increased use of reading strategies.
- In the spring of 2007, the school moved to a weekly focus on different reading comprehension strategies and nonfiction text structures. Each Friday an assessment was given in third through fifth grade and class results were posted publicly.

NWEA data were used to improve student achievement in the following ways:

- When funds were received for Title I in January of 2007, students who performed below the 50th percentile for the target RIT range at their grade level on the NWEA were selected for additional assistance through a push-in instructional program during the school day.
- Based on the scores of the winter NWEA administration, each classroom teacher chose two or three specific strands (i.e., phonics, reading, vocabulary/word structure, problem solving, measurement) to focus upon during the instructional day.
- Using the winter NWEA data results, teachers determined the specific standards where their students needed the most assistance. Looking at the Indiana Department of Education’s web site, teachers downloaded specific lessons and assessments to use in the classroom. Each Friday, teachers administered assessments for specific strands in English, language arts, and mathematics. If 80% or more of the students passed the assessments, teachers moved on to a new standard for study. If students did not pass, the class spent another week studying the same topic.

To address deficiencies that might affect AYP status for the 2007-2008 school year, West Gary Lighthouse Academy has taken the following actions:

- Our original charter goal was to maintain an ADM of 90%. For the 2007-2008 school year, that percentage has been raised to 95%.
- As a school we have implemented a rigorous monitoring system to track and analyze excessive absenteeism and tardiness.
- In order to improve the achievement rate of our special education students, extra one-on-one work time (outside of minutes required in an Individual Education Plan [IEP]) has been structured into the master schedule. Students work in small groups on specific skill deficiencies with an overall goal of meeting IEP goals.

To improve the perceptions of their school in response to the results of the constituent survey, West Gary Lighthouse Academy has taken the following actions:

- One area of improvement listed in the constituent survey was the consistency of our behavior management plan. At the beginning of the 2007-2008 school year, we introduced families to a new code of conduct and consequence structure for misbehaviors at the school.
- On the survey families requested more opportunities for involvement. Our state Board of Trustees, Lighthouse Academies of Indiana, approved local, school-specific boards for the 2007-2008 school year. At West Gary Lighthouse Charter School one of the main foci of this board is to increase parent involvement at the school. Additionally, the school’s family coordinator has implemented classroom volunteer programs and provides additional parent education classes during the day and in the evening.
Student Demographics

**Figure I-1:** Race/Ethnicity Percentages: 2006-2007

- West Gary Lighthouse Charter School: 97.6%
- Gary Community School Corp: 97.5%
- State of Indiana: 76.7%

**Figure I-2:** Percentages of Students Qualifying for Free & Reduced Lunch: 2006-2007

- West Gary Lighthouse Charter School: 72.9%
- Gary Community School Corp: 63.0%
- State of Indiana: 62.5%

**Figure I-3:** Percentages of Students in Special Education: 2006-2007

- West Gary Lighthouse Charter School: 8.5%
- Gary Community School Corp: 14.4%
- State of Indiana: 17.0%

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education
Program Statistics

Table I-1: Attendance Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>West Gary Lighthouse Charter School</th>
<th>Gary Community Schools</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I-2: Percentages Passing ISTEP+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>West Gary Lighthouse</th>
<th>Gary</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
<th>West Gary Lighthouse</th>
<th>Gary</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
<th>West Gary Lighthouse</th>
<th>Gary</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education

Table I-3: NWEA Percent Meeting Target Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Students Taking Subtest</th>
<th>% Met Target Growth Rate</th>
<th># of Students Taking Subtest</th>
<th>% Met Target Growth Rate</th>
<th># of Students Taking Subtest</th>
<th>% Met Target Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: NWEA
Constituent Surveys

**Figure I-4:** Overall, how satisfied are you with the charter school?

- **Parent (n=28):**
  - Very Satisfied: 3.6%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 7.1%
  - Neutral: 10.7%
- **Staff (n=25):**
  - Very Satisfied: 8.0%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 4.0%
  - Neutral: 48.0%

**Figure I-5:** How likely are you to... Recommend the school to friends & colleagues?

- **Parent (n=28):**
  - Extremely Likely: 3.6%
  - Very Likely: 10.7%
  - Somewhat Likely: 28.6%
- **Staff (n=25):**
  - Extremely Likely: 12.0%
  - Very Likely: 16.0%
  - Somewhat Likely: 28.0%

**Figure I-6:** How likely are you to... Return to the school next year?

- **Parent (n=28):**
  - Extremely Likely: 3.6%
  - Very Likely: 28.6%
- **Staff (n=25):**
  - Extremely Likely: 4.0%
  - Very Likely: 40.0%
Figure I-7: How likely are you to… Increase your support of the school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=28)</th>
<th>Staff (n=25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely Likely</td>
<td>Very Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent (n=28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (n=25)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Academic Program

Figure I-8: How satisfied are you with the overall quality of education?

Figure I-9: Your overall evaluation of... Curriculum/academic program

Figure I-10: Our school has a high quality academic program
Figure I-11: Your overall evaluation of... Quality of teaching/instruction

![Bar Chart]

- **Parent (n=28)**
  - Excellent: 21.4%
  - Very Good: 4.0%
  - Good: 12.0%
  - Fair: 12.0%
  - Don't Know/Not Applicable: 53.6%

- **Staff (n=25)**
  - Excellent: 64.0%
  - Very Good: 8.0%
  - Good: 12.0%
  - Fair: 12.0%
  - Don't Know/Not Applicable: 4.0%

Figure I-12: Our school uses sound, rigorous educational practices

![Bar Chart]

- **Parent (n=28)**
  - Strongly Agree: 39.3%
  - Agree: 14.3%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 4.0%
  - Disagree: 46.4%

- **Staff (n=25)**
  - Strongly Agree: 36.0%
  - Agree: 4.0%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 4.0%
  - Disagree: 56.0%

Figure I-13: How would you rate the overall quality of education?

![Bar Chart]

- **Parent (n=28)**
  - Excellent: 10.7%
  - Very Good: 7.1%
  - Good: 25.0%
  - Fair: 17.9%
  - Poor: 28.6%

- **Staff (n=25)**
  - Excellent: 36.0%
  - Very Good: 4.0%
  - Good: 32.0%
  - Fair: 28.0%
  - Poor: 36.0%

Figure I-14: How would you compare the overall quality of education to that of other schools?

![Bar Chart]

- **Parent (n=28)**
  - Much Better: 3.6%
  - Somewhat Better: 7.1%
  - About the Same: 28.6%
  - Somewhat Worse: 28.6%
  - Much Worse: 60.7%

- **Staff (n=25)**
  - Much Better: 4.0%
  - Somewhat Better: 4.0%
  - About the Same: 48.0%
  - Somewhat Worse: 48.0%
  - Much Worse: 48.0%

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Organization/Providing Services

Figure I-15: Our school has effective administration

Figure I-16: All members of the school community understand the mission of the school

Figure I-17: Our school has the resources to achieve its mission
Your overall evaluation of... Individualized student attention

Figure I-18:

Your overall evaluation of... Support services (e.g. counseling, healthcare, etc.)

Figure I-19:

Your overall evaluation of... Services provided to the special needs students (e.g. ESL, disabilities, etc.)

Figure I-20:

Our school is safe for students

Figure I-21:

Data Source: The Kensington Group
“GEO 21st Century Model”

Mission
The educational philosophy of the 21st Century Charter School of Gary is to teach according to the needs of the individual while maintaining a commitment to standards achievement. Using technology as a management and delivery tool, as well as off-computer activities emphasizing hands-on learning, students will proceed through the standards. All students will be given a variety of continuous assessments to make sure that skills are mastered.

Educational Program
The curriculum proposed will be woven through the following seven components of instruction: a) core values and character education; b) Indiana Standards and GQE requirements; c) Standards basic skills application sequential and measured, fostering lifelong learning and life skills; d) project-based learning aligned with student interests and Standards mentoring, internships, employment and community outsourcing opportunities; e) Spanish language instruction beginning at age five; f) fine arts instruction; and g) physical wellness and conditioning.

556 Washington Street
Gary, IN 46402
(219) 886-9339

www.21ccharter.org

Grades Served . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .4-9
2006-2007 Enrollment . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .304
2005-2006 Enrollment . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .265
Enrollment at Capacity . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .420

Year Opened: 2005-2006
Final Year in Current Contract: 2011-2012
Demographic Summary

In 2006-2007, 21st Century at Gary was in its second year of operation, serving a primarily Black population – 98% of its 304 students – statistically the same demographics as served by the larger Gary Community School Corporation (Figure J-1). Half of these students receive free or reduced cost lunches, a lower percentage than Gary Community Schools, but a higher percentage than in the state of Indiana overall (Figure J-2). A lower percentage of 21st Century’s students are in special education than in Gary Community Schools or the state (Figure J-3).

Academic Progress

In 2006-2007 21st Century at Gary performed poorly, with less than a third passing ISTEP+ in most grades. For example, none of the 32 10th graders tested passed the math subtest. The highest performance was among 3rd graders, 40% of whom passed the math subtest. AYP was not met in performance or participation and improvement over last year’s performance was insufficient to place the school above PL 221 “Academic Probation” status (Tables J-3 & J-4). Of the students receiving the NWEA fall 2006 and spring 2007 tests, about half are meeting their target growth rate in reading and language arts (Table J-5). Only about one-fourth are meeting their target growth rate in math, indicating a need for improvement in math instruction, a need also indicated by the poor performance on the ISTEP+ math subtests.

Constituent Survey

Too few parents (n=5) responded to the constituent survey to utilize their responses in this report. Staff responses may provide a better indicator of constituents’ feelings about the school, with 28 staff members responding. The majority of staff respondents were clearly dissatisfied with the quality of education at 21st Century, indicating that they saw room for improvement in the curriculum/academic program and in the quality of teaching (Figures J-8 through J-14). Excellence is out of the picture, as far as these respondents were concerned.

Staff respondents gave administration at the school fairly high marks (Figure J-15), although more attention may be needed to ensure that all members of the school community understand the mission of the school (Figure J-16). Most staff respondents believed the school has insufficient resources to accomplish its mission (Figure J-17). Support services and services to students with special needs appeared to be deficient in the eyes of most staff respondents to the constituent survey (Figures J-19 & J-20). Individualized student attention (Figure J-18) and even school safety (Figure J-21) received mixed reviews from the staff respondents, indicating a potentially unsupportive environment for the students at 21st Century. Combined with the negative reviews of the academic program, these responses suggest the staff saw a need for improvement in many areas at the school.
Financial Review

Financially, the school met Ball State University Office of Charter Schools’ expectations. It completed its second year in a financially healthy position. Revenue exceeded expenses, resulting in a positive net income position. Expenses appeared to be appropriate. The school has a positive cash balance, and is likely to maintain strong finances in the future. The State Board of Accounts audit covering July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006 identified eleven issues. All issues were properly addressed and corrected by 21st Century Charter School of Gary.
**Student Demographics**

**Figure J-1:** Race/Ethnicity Percentages: 2006-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>21st Century Charter School of Gary</th>
<th>Gary Community School Corp</th>
<th>State of Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure J-2:** Percentages of Students Qualifying for Free & Reduced Lunch: 2006-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lunch Status</th>
<th>21st Century Charter School of Gary</th>
<th>Gary Community School Corp</th>
<th>State of Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure J-3:** Percentages of Students in Special Education: 2006-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Education</th>
<th>21st Century of Gary</th>
<th>Gary Community School Corp</th>
<th>State of Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education
# Program Statistics

**Table J-1: Attendance Rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>21st Century Charter School of Gary</th>
<th>Gary Community Schools</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table J-2: Percentages Passing ISTEP+**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>21st Century of Gary</th>
<th>Gary</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
<th>21st Century of Gary</th>
<th>Gary</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
<th>21st Century of Gary</th>
<th>Gary</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Percentages are not calculated for grades in which less than 10 students were tested.

**Table J-3: PL 221**

**ACADEMIC PROBATION**

Performance: 29.8%  
Improvement: 0.3%

**Table J-4: Annual Yearly Progress**

OVERALL DETERMINATION: NO (first time eligible for AYP)  
ATTENDANCE: YES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>PARTICIPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education

**Table J-5: NWEA Percent Meeting Target Growth Rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READING</th>
<th>LANGUAGE ARTS</th>
<th>MATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
<td>% Met Target Growth Rate</td>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: NWEA
Constituent Surveys

Figure J-4: Overall, how satisfied are you with the charter school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff (n=28)</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure J-5: How likely are you to... Recommend the school to friends & colleagues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Not Very Likely</th>
<th>Not At All Likely</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff (n=28)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure J-6: How likely are you to... Return to the school next year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Not Very Likely</th>
<th>Not At All Likely</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff (n=28)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure J-7: How likely are you to... Increase your support of the school?

Staff (n=28)

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Academic Program

Figure J-8: How satisfied are you with the overall quality of education?

Staff (n=28)

- Very Satisfied: 3.6%
- Somewhat Satisfied: 3.6%
- Neutral: 3.6%
- Somewhat Dissatisfied: 28.6%
- Very Dissatisfied: 35.7%

Figure J-9: Your overall evaluation of... Curriculum/academic program

Staff (n=28)

- Excellent: 21.4%
- Very Good: 32.1%
- Good: 32.1%
- Fair: 14.3%
- Poor: 32.1%

Figure J-10: Our school has a high quality academic program

Staff (n=28)

- Strongly Agree: 7.4%
- Agree: 29.6%
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 29.6%
- Disagree: 29.6%
- Strongly Disagree: 3.7%
Your overall evaluation of... Quality of teaching/instruction

Figure J-11:

Our school uses sound, rigorous educational practices

Figure J-12:

How would you rate the overall quality of education?

Figure J-13:

How would you compare the overall quality of education to that of other schools?

Figure J-14:

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Organization/Providing Services

Figure J-15: Our school has effective administration

Figure J-16: All members of the school community understand the mission of the school

Figure J-17: Our school has the resources to achieve its mission
BSU Office of Charter Schools Accountability Report 2006-07

Figure J-18: Your overall evaluation of... Individualized student attention

Figure J-19: Your overall evaluation of... Support services (e.g. counseling, healthcare, etc.)

Figure J-20: Your overall evaluation of... Services provided to the special needs students (e.g. ESL, disabilities, etc.)

Figure J-21: Our school is safe for students

Data Source: The Kensington Group
“For these are all our children and we will either benefit them or pay the consequences for whom they become.” - James Baldwin

**Mission**

Using the cornerstones of literacy, character development, and self-esteem, the Galileo Charter School will educate children in a community of mutual respect, inspire a lifelong love of learning, and develop contributing members of our global community.

**Educational Program**

Galileo Charter School will use a scientifically based research-validated curriculum. Literacy will be emphasized and supported through early identification, prevention, and intervention strategies. Galileo Charter School will utilize Open Court Reading for language arts and reading instruction as well as support multiple approaches for assessment and intervention. Uniquely, every teacher at Galileo has been trained in the Lindamood Bell “Phoneme Sequencing” and “Visualizing and Verbalizing” programs, which are utilized for preventative and remedial instruction.
Demographic Summary
Galileo Charter School, in Richmond, serves a student population higher in diversity than the local schools or than the average in the state of Indiana (Figure K-1). Although Richmond area students are more socioeconomically disadvantaged than the statewide average, Galileo’s students are even more so, as indicated by the 73% of students receiving a free or reduced cost lunch (Figure K-2). Galileo serves a higher percentage of students in special education than the state average, but a lower percentage than the Richmond Community Schools (Figure K-3).

Academic Progress
Too few students were tested in the 5th grade to calculate a percent passing ISTEP+. The other grades, however, performed well below the community average (see Table K-2), which is comparable to the state average. Third graders had a particularly difficult time with the math subtest. These low math performances and poor performances on the English/LA subtest among economically disadvantaged students kept Galileo from meeting AYP. With an 11% improvement in ISTEP+ percent passing, Galileo earned an “Exemplary Progress” PL 221 category placement. More than half of students met their target growth rate on the NWEA MAP in all subtests.

Constituent Survey
Parent and staff respondents were generally satisfied with and supportive of Galileo Charter School (Figures K-4 – K-7). Both staff and parent respondents appear to have been quite satisfied with the academic program at the school (Figures K-8 – K-14), with very few negative ratings regarding academics at Galileo. Respondents had confidence in the administration and agreed that the mission was understood and adequately provided for (Figures K-15 – K-17). A small minority of both parent and staff respondents indicated dissatisfaction with services provided to students (Figures K-19 – K-20). Staff respondents tended to rate these services lower than parents and not as highly as other survey items.

Financial Review
Financially, Galileo Charter School exceeded Ball State University Office of Charter Schools’ expectations. It has managed its resources well and is in a strong financial position. Actual revenues exceeded budget and actual expenses were under budget, resulting in a positive net income for the year. The school has a favorable cash position and has limited debt. Student levels are projected to increase by 30% in 2007-2008, which will further strengthen the school’s financial position. The State Board of Accounts performed an audit this past year, reporting on the period of July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006; five issues were identified. Galileo Charter School properly addressed and corrected all issues.
School Improvement

To improve student ISTEP+ performance, Galileo Charter School has taken the following steps:

- Implemented a summer Jumpstart program for our students who did not pass ISTEP+. We attempted to make this mandatory for these students.
- Our entire school has been designed to differentiate instruction by means of flexible ability grouping our students. We use objective measurements to group all students (DIBELS, ISTEP+, Open Court Reading, etc.).
- Extended instruction time in key academic areas (math, reading, language arts, etc.) to ensure quality instruction within a smaller group setting to closer meet students’ individual needs (zones of proximal development).
- Focused on literacy and math in after-school tutoring programs.
- Increased the number of college work study/Bonner Scholars/volunteers to assist in the classrooms with literacy groups.
- Conducted summer staff training the week before school started that addressed curriculum, differentiation of instruction, modalities of learning, brain-based learning, special education, and multicultural training.
- Information received has been shared with parents, and teachers have acted as a resource to provide assistance to parents expressing a desire to be involved in partnering with us to improve these scores.
- Increased the number of college work study/volunteers to assist in the classrooms with literacy groups.
- Analyzed specific components of the assessment and made each student’s deficiency a priority in their individual learning plan.
- More focus on certain aspects of curriculum (e.g., grammar, story problems)

NWEA data were used to improve student achievement in the following ways:

- To develop Individual Learning Plans for all students.
- To assist students in developing academic goals.
- We partnered with the Virtual Special Education Cooperative to implement the Response to Intervention literacy program.
- Weekly classroom assessments in Open Court Reading.
- Student Assessment Revision (Taking NWEA three times a year).
- Newly acquired components of pre-existing curriculum (Open Court Reading “Imagine It”, SRA Math “Real Math”.
- Weekly assessment with DIBELS.
- Continuous curriculum development.
- Professional development for faculty in the areas showing student deficiencies.
- Utilizing NWEA three times per year, as opposed to two the previous year, was definitely a goal for Galileo. Each teacher analyzed individual and group tests to tailor instruction for their students. Students set benchmark goals and measured their progress from fall to winter, then winter to spring.

To address deficiencies that might affect AYP status for the 2007-2008 school year, Galileo Charter School has taken the following actions:

- We have dedicated more teacher-directed instruction on the core curriculum subjects.
- We redesigned our daily schedule and increased the allotted time for mathematics.
- Implemented a structured, targeted system of tracking attendance and reporting excessive absenteeism to appropriate authorities. Created partnerships with parents, to ensure students are at school.
- Free & Reduced/Participation Rate
  - Hired two instructional assistants to assist with Title 1 students.
- Special Education Performance/Participation
  - Increased staff training / awareness of SPED children in classroom. Organized and restructured the SPED department to ensure teachers are aware of and accountable for meeting students’ needs as set forth in the IEPs. Teachers review goals and progress towards goals in scheduled meetings.
  - Hired an additional special education teacher of record to assist in the management of special education students.
  - Allocated time within staff meetings to teach staff about IEPs, goals, functional behavioral assessments, GEI process, and so forth.

To improve the perceptions of their school in response to the results of the constituent survey, Galileo Charter School has taken the following actions:

- Developed more school community activities.
- Developed new process for communicating with parents.
- Required staff/teacher to send a predetermined amount of positive communicating to families each week.
- Held more parent-teacher meetings.
- As a school community, we have sponsored literacy activities (book fairs, Book It, and classroom reading programs, literacy nights) to foster a sense of importance amongst our families.
Student Demographics

Figure K-1: Race/Ethnicity Percentages: 2006-2007

Figure K-2: Percentages of Students Qualifying for Free & Reduced Lunch: 2006-2007

Figure K-3: Percentages of Students in Special Education: 2006-2007

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education
# Program Statistics

## Table K-1: Attendance Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Galileo Charter School</th>
<th>Richmond Community Schools</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table K-2: Percentages Passing ISTEP+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>ENGLISH/LA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>MATH</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>BOTH ENGLISH &amp; MATH</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Galileo</td>
<td>R.C.S.</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Galileo</td>
<td>R.C.S.</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Galileo</td>
<td>R.C.S.</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Percentages are not calculated for grades in which less than 10 students were tested.

## Table K-3: PL 221

**ACADEMIC PROBATION**

**Performance:** 41.2%

**Improvement:** 10.6%

## Table K-4: Annual Yearly Progress

**OVERALL DETERMINATION:** NO

**ATTENDANCE:** YES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education

## Table K-5: NWEA Percent Meeting Target Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>READING</th>
<th></th>
<th>LANGUAGE ARTS</th>
<th></th>
<th>MATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
<td>% Met Target Growth Rate</td>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
<td>% Met Target Growth Rate</td>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
<td>% Met Target Growth Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: NWEA
Constituent Surveys

Figure K-4: Overall, how satisfied are you with the charter school?

- **Parent (n=65)**
  - Very Satisfied: 69.2%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 15.4%
  - Neutral: 10.5%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 3.1%
  - Extremely Dissatisfied: 10.8%

- **Staff (n=19)**
  - Very Satisfied: 89.5%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 10.5%

Figure K-5: How likely are you to... Recommend the school to friends & colleagues?

- **Parent (n=65)**
  - Extremely Likely: 4.6%
  - Very Likely: 6.6%
  - Somewhat Likely: 12.3%
  - Not Very Likely: 27.7%
  - Not At All Likely: 36.8%

- **Staff (n=19)**
  - Extremely Likely: 63.2%
  - Very Likely: 36.8%

Figure K-6: How likely are you to... Return to the school next year?

- **Parent (n=65)**
  - Extremely Likely: 4.6%
  - Very Likely: 3.1%
  - Somewhat Likely: 13.8%
  - Not Very Likely: 23.1%
  - Not At All Likely: 55.4%

- **Staff (n=19)**
  - Extremely Likely: 68.4%
  - Very Likely: 26.3%
Figure K-7: How likely are you to... Increase your support of the school?

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Academic Program

Figure K-8: How satisfied are you with the overall quality of education?

Figure K-9: Your overall evaluation of... Curriculum/academic program

Figure K-10: Our school has a high quality academic program
Figure K-11: Your overall evaluation of... Quality of teaching/instruction

Parent (n=65) and Staff (n=19) evaluations of Quality of teaching/instruction.

- Parent: 3.1% Excellent, 18.8% Very Good, 35.9% Good, 42.2% Fair
- Staff: 5.3% Excellent, 36.8% Very Good, 57.9% Good, 42.2% Fair

Figure K-12: Our school uses sound, rigorous educational practices

Parent (n=65) and Staff (n=19) evaluations of educational practices.

- Parent: 1.5% Strongly Agree, 6.2% Agree, 33.8% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 58.5% Disagree
- Staff: 5.3% Strongly Agree, 52.6% Agree, 42.1% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 52.6% Disagree

Figure K-13: How would you rate the overall quality of education?

Parent (n=65) and Staff (n=19) evaluations of overall quality.

- Parent: 3.1% Excellent, 18.5% Very Good, 35.4% Good, 43.1% Fair
- Staff: 5.3% Excellent, 21.1% Very Good, 63.2% Good, 10.5% Fair

Figure K-14: How would you compare the overall quality of education to that of other schools?

Parent (n=65) and Staff (n=19) evaluations of comparison to other schools.

- Parent: 3.1% Much Better, 12.3% Somewhat Better, 26.2% About the Same, 26.2% Somewhat Worse, 26.2% Don’t Know
- Staff: 5.3% Much Better, 15.8% Somewhat Better, 26.3% About the Same, 26.3% Somewhat Worse, 26.3% Don’t Know

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Organization/Providing Services

**Figure K-15:** Our school has effective administration

- **Parent (n=65):**
  - Strongly Agree: 37.5%
  - Agree: 48.4%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 9.4%
  - Disagree: 3.1%
  - No Opinion: 1.6%

- **Staff (n=19):**
  - Strongly Agree: 47.4%
  - Agree: 52.6%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 3.1%
  - Disagree: 1.6%
  - No Opinion: 9.4%

**Figure K-16:** All members of the school community understand the mission of the school

- **Parent (n=65):**
  - Strongly Agree: 24.6%
  - Agree: 53.8%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 10.5%
  - Disagree: 18.5%
  - No Opinion: 3.1%

- **Staff (n=19):**
  - Strongly Agree: 31.6%
  - Agree: 57.9%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 10.5%
  - Disagree: 15.8%
  - No Opinion: 6.2%

**Figure K-17:** Our school has the resources to achieve its mission

- **Parent (n=65):**
  - Strongly Agree: 23.1%
  - Agree: 55.4%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 12.3%
  - Disagree: 6.2%
  - No Opinion: 3.1%

- **Staff (n=19):**
  - Strongly Agree: 21.1%
  - Agree: 52.6%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 10.5%
  - Disagree: 15.8%
  - No Opinion: 6.2%
Your overall evaluation of... Individualized student attention

![Figure K-18:](chart)

Your overall evaluation of... Support services (e.g. counseling, healthcare, etc.)

![Figure K-19:](chart)

Your overall evaluation of... Services provided to the special needs students (e.g. ESL, disabilities, etc.)

![Figure K-20:](chart)

Our school is safe for students

![Figure K-21:](chart)

Data Source: The Kensington Group
GEIST MONTESSORI ACADEMY of BSU Charter Schools

“Education from within“

Geist Montessori Academy provides an academically and culturally rich educational environment that allows children to acquire knowledge in a noncompetitive, individualized manner. We recognize that many environmental factors act upon the development of the child, and seek to prepare a school environment that encourages joyful learning, and greater exploration of the community and the world.

Mission

Geist Montessori Academy provides an academically and culturally rich educational environment that allows children to acquire knowledge in a noncompetitive, individualized manner. We recognize that many environmental factors act upon the development of the child, and seek to prepare a school environment that encourages joyful learning, and greater exploration of the community and the world.

Educational Program

The Academy’s educational program is based on the Montessori philosophy and methodology. This method identifies and utilizes individual strengths and interests to assist in learning, while the curriculum promotes academic success, social awareness, self-awareness, respect for others and our environment, problem-solving skills and independent thinking. Academics integrate with character building and community awareness to form a whole-child curriculum that prepares our students for life.

6633 West 900 North
McCordsville, IN 46055
(317) 335-3456

www.montessoriacademygeist.org

Grades Served . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .K-8
2006-2007 Enrollment . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .38
Year Opened: 2006-2007
Final Year in Current Contract: 2012-2013
Demographic Summary

Geist Montessori Academy began operation in the fall of 2006. The school is physically located within the Mt. Vernon Community Schools Corporation, but comparisons in this report are made with the nearby Hamilton Southeastern Schools, from which the majority of the school’s students are drawn. Geist Montessori serves a primarily White population, although with slightly greater diversity than in the local Hamilton Southeastern Schools (Figure L-1). The economic advantage experienced by students at Geist Montessori is evident in the ratio of students receiving free or reduced cost lunches (Figure L-2). No students at the school receive this economic assistance. Fewer of Geist Montessori’s students receive special education services than in the Hamilton Southeastern Schools or than the state average.

Academic Progress

ISTEP+ testing occurred in September, so students’ scores would be more representative of their previous school than of Geist Montessori. With less than 10 students tested in each grade except 4th, percent passing rates provide little meaningful information. Next year’s testing will provide a more accurate picture of the progress students have made while at Geist Montessori. A higher percentage of the students tested met their target growth rate in the NWEA reading subtest than in the other two subtests, particularly math (see Table L-3). Only 20% of students tested met their target growth rate in math, indicating that the remaining 80% of students are likely to fall behind others who scored similarly without improvement in math instruction.

Constituent Survey

Too few parents (n=8) or staff (n=1) responded to the constituent survey to indicate constituent satisfaction with the school.

Financial Review

As a new school, the actual revenue of Geist Montessori Academy was 48% above budgeted levels. Actual expenses were 29% above budgeted levels. The school reported a significant loss for the year, which is normal for a first-year school due to the state of Indiana’s funding structure. Therefore, the school met Ball State University Office of Charter Schools’ expectations. Geist Montessori has very little long-term debt. A 137% enrollment increase in 2007-2008 will greatly increase revenues for the school and improve income levels as fixed costs remain stable. Geist Montessori Academy is scheduled to be audited by the State Board of Accounts during the 2007-2008 financial year.
School Improvement

To improve student ISTEP+ performance, Geist Montessori Academy has taken the following steps:
- Developed literature curriculum to include literature circles and increased writing exercises.
- Increased faculty training in understanding ISTEP+ data.

NWEA data were used to improve student achievement in the following ways:
- Increased faculty training in understanding/interpreting data – stepping stones.
- Improved curriculum in writing/problem solving.

To address deficiencies that might affect AYP status for the 2007-2008 school year, Geist Montessori Academy has taken the following actions:
- Revised attendance policies.

To improve the perceptions of their school in response to the results of the constituent survey, Geist Montessori Academy has taken the following actions:
- Increased parent education seminars.
- Parent information seminars (pre-enrollment).
- Parent Liaison position.
Student Demographics

Figure L-1: Race/Ethnicity Percentages: 2006-2007

Figure L-2: Percentages of Students Qualifying for Free & Reduced Lunch: 2006-2007

Figure L-3: Percentages of Students in Special Education: 2006-2007

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education
### Program Statistics

#### Table L-1: Attendance Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Community Montessori</th>
<th>Hamilton - Southeastern Schools</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table L-2: Percentages Passing ISTEP+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>ENGLISH/LA</th>
<th>MATH</th>
<th>BOTH ENGLISH &amp; MATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geist Montessori</td>
<td>H.S.</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Percentages are not calculated for grades in which less than 10 students were tested.

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education

#### Table L-3: NWEA Percent Meeting Target Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Language Arts</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
<td>% Met Target Growth Rate</td>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: NWEA
IRVINGTON COMMUNITY SCHOOL of BSU Charter Schools

“Education from within”

Mission
Irvington Community School strives to educate children by providing a proven academic curriculum paired with an arts-and-music component within a safe environment. Irvington Community School emphasizes achievement and strong character education for its students. The school plans to grow to become an excellent K-12 school that will also serve as a resource center for the Irvington area. Irvington Community School works to bring together diverse community groups to strengthen the Irvington community.

Educational Program
Irvington Community School is built upon the premise that a well-conceived, liberal-arts educational program with technologically delivered assessments can help boost student achievement, serve the unique needs of students and families, and offer a new model for effective education in the 21st century. The educational program is designed to provide a comprehensive curriculum with high student expectations.

6705 East Julian Avenue
Indianapolis, IN 46219
(317) 357-5359

www.ics-charter.org

Grades Served . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . K-10
2006-2007 Enrollment . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .460
2005-2006 Enrollment . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .362
2004-2005 Enrollment . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .219
2003-2004 Enrollment . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .129
2002-2003 Enrollment . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .118
Enrollment at Capacity . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .814

Year Opened: 2002-2003
Final Year in Current Contract: 2008-2009
Demographic Summary
Irvington Community School serves an economically advantaged, nearly all-White population, with less diversity than either the local Indianapolis Public Schools or the statewide average (Figures M-1 & M-2). The school also serves a significantly lower percentage of students in need of special education services than either the local schools or the statewide average (Figure M-3).

Academic Progress
In 2006-2007, Irvington Community School (ICS) continued its tradition of meeting AYP (Table M-4), doing so for the fourth time. ISTEP+ percent passing rates are impressive, particularly in comparison with the local IPS schools (see Table M-2). The upper grades appear to struggle more than the lower and middle grades, with just over half passing the math subtest in the 8th and 9th grades. The 4th and 5th grades have particularly strong passing rates, with 90% of 4th graders passing math and 83% of 5th graders passing English/LA. Although the percent passing rates are favorable in relation to the local community averages, PL 221 improvement was actually negative since the 2005-2006 ISTEP+ testing, leading to an “Academic Watch” designation (Table M-3). Without attention, the school could lose the progress made over these past four years. About half of the students tested met their NWEA target growth rate in all three subtests: reading, language arts, and math (Table M-5).

Constituent Survey
Most parent and staff respondents to the 2006-2007 Constituent Survey were satisfied with the school overall (Figure M-4). Parents especially showed their support, willing to recommend the school to others and intending to return and even increase their support for the school (Figures M-5 – M-7). Academically, the school received more positive ratings from parent respondents than from staff respondents (Figures M-8 – M-14), although neither constituent group had very negative ratings. It appears that staff were not enthusiastic about academics at Irvington, but they did not reject the program.

Nearly three-fourths of both parent and staff respondents believe that the administration is effective (Figure M-15), but communication of the school’s mission appears to have been a problem (Figure M-16). Only 61% of parent respondents and only 46% of staff respondents agreed that all community members understand the school’s mission. More believed that the school has the resources to achieve the mission, however (Figure M-17). Most respondents believed that student support services and individualized attention are acceptable, but not worthy of superlative ratings (Figures M-18 – M-20). Student safety was not a concern (Figure M-21).

Financial Review
Financially, Irvington Community School approached Ball State University Office of Charter Schools’ expectations. Actual revenue under-ran the budgeted revenue by 14% and actual expenses over-ran budgeted expenses by 3%, resulting in a loss in annual net income. The school ended the year in a favorable cash position. The school’s debt level is reasonable. Irvington Community School anticipates a 17% enrollment increase in 2007-2008, which will enhance revenue levels. Strong financial accountability is evident in Irvington’s financial report. Auditors performed an Agreed-Upon Procedures Review in 2006-2007. That review was not submitted to the Office of Charter Schools as of the writing of this report. A State Board of Accounts audit will be performed in 2007-2008 for the period July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2007.
School Improvement

To improve student ISTEP+ performance, Irvington Community School has taken the following steps:

• In order to increase the improvement of ICS students year-to-year under PL 221, the school uses ISTEP+ data to help target underperforming students with small-group work, remediation classes, and extra tutoring and homework help.

• Literacy and Math coaches use ISTEP+ data to help teachers with classroom strategies, develop small groups for targeted support, and to identify students who need some individual help.

• As a Title I Targeted Assistance School, the ICS uses ISTEP+ data to identify at-risk students who will benefit from supplementary help from Title I funded staff.

• Analysis of ISTEP+ Mathematics results led to the hiring of a Title I funded Math Coach this year.

NWEA data were used to improve student achievement in the following ways:

• Although the ICS met or exceeded NWEA growth goals, the school continues to use the test results to track individual and class growth, in order to help teachers organize individual and small-group work.

• Academic coaches track data from the three annual administrations of the NWEA test to target individual students for assistance, and to work with classroom teachers on strategies for teaching reading and mathematics.

• The high school used NWEA test results to justify adopting trimesters, which allow for longer class periods and more differentiated instruction.

• Analysis of NWEA results have been used to select conferences for staff to attend, and in-house professional development.

To improve the perceptions of their school in response to the results of the constituent survey, Irvington Community School has taken the following actions:

• We have made a point of including more information about the school’s charter and mission in our weekly newsletter, and we have developed and published some position memos about families’ roles in the school, discipline philosophy, and so forth.

• The school added a Client Services Manager, whose role is to communicate with our stakeholders about the school’s mission and, as a kind of ombudsman, any issues they feel have not been properly handled. Some of this is formal, as in organizing meetings to resolve problems; some is informal, as he talks to families in our parking lot during the daily releases.

• The annual orientation for teachers included professional development on communication, and the school is finishing a redesign of its web site.

• The school has also adopted a Behavior Referral Board, which, along with some personnel changes, has engendered a much more cooperative and positive spirit in how the school and families handle discipline issues.
Student Demographics

Figure M-1: Race/Ethnicity Percentages: 2006-2007

Figure M-2: Percentages of Students Qualifying for Free & Reduced Lunch: 2006-2007

Figure M-3: Percentages of Students in Special Education: 2006-2007

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education
Program Statistics

Table M-1: Attendance Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Irvington Community School</th>
<th>Indianapolis Public Schools</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table M-2: Percentages Passing ISTEP+

Table M-3: PL 221

ACADEMIC WATCH

Performance: 74.9%  
Improvement: -0.2%

Table M-4: Annual Yearly Progress

OVERALL DETERMINATION: YES

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education

Table M-5: NWEA Percent Meeting Target Growth Rate

Data Source: NWEA
Constituent Surveys

Figure M-4: Overall, how satisfied are you with the charter school?

- **Parent (n=70)**
  - Very Satisfied: 8.6%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 22.9%
  - Neutral: 31.4%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 22.9%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 2.9%

- **Staff (n=41)**
  - Very Satisfied: 64.3%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 53.7%
  - Neutral: 31.4%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 22.9%
  - Very Dissatisfied: 2.4%

Figure M-5: How likely are you to... Recommend the school to friends & colleagues?

- **Parent (n=70)**
  - Extremely Likely: 1.4%
  - Very Likely: 11.4%
  - Somewhat Likely: 21.4%
  - Not Very Likely: 24.4%
  - Not At All Likely: 31.4%

- **Staff (n=41)**
  - Extremely Likely: 4.9%
  - Very Likely: 4.9%
  - Somewhat Likely: 29.3%
  - Not Very Likely: 34.1%
  - Not At All Likely: 22.9%

Figure M-6: How likely are you to... Return to the school next year?

- **Parent (n=70)**
  - Extremely Likely: 2.9%
  - Very Likely: 10.0%
  - Somewhat Likely: 11.4%
  - Not All Likely: 7.3%
  - Don’t Know: 31.4%

- **Staff (n=41)**
  - Extremely Likely: 7.3%
  - Very Likely: 7.3%
  - Somewhat Likely: 24.4%
  - Not All Likely: 22.9%
  - Don’t Know: 22.9%
Figure M-7: How likely are you to... Increase your support of the school?

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Academic Program

Figure M-8: How satisfied are you with the overall quality of education?

Figure M-9: Your overall evaluation of... Curriculum/academic program

Figure M-10: Our school has a high quality academic program
Your overall evaluation of... Quality of teaching/instruction

Figure M-11:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=70)</th>
<th>Staff (n=41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: The Kensington Group

Our school uses sound, rigorous educational practices

Figure M-12:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=70)</th>
<th>Staff (n=41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How would you rate the overall quality of education?

Figure M-13:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=70)</th>
<th>Staff (n=41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How would you compare the overall quality of education to that of other schools?

Figure M-14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=70)</th>
<th>Staff (n=41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much Better</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Better</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the Same</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Worse</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much Worse</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: The Kensington Group
IRVINGTON COMMUNITY SCHOOL of BSU Charter Schools

Organization/Providing Services

Figure M-15: Our school has effective administration

Figure M-16: All members of the school community understand the mission of the school

Figure M-17: Our school has the resources to achieve its mission
Figure M-18: Your overall evaluation of... Individualized student attention

Figure M-19: Your overall evaluation of... Support services (e.g. counseling, healthcare, etc.)

Figure M-20: Your overall evaluation of... Services provided to the special needs students (e.g. ESL, disabilities, etc.)

Figure M-21: Our school is safe for students

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Mission
New Community School provides a progressive educational alternative for families in the Lafayette-West Lafayette community. New Community School’s mission is to promote each child’s emotional, social, and academic growth through creative and exploratory learning experiences. Parents, students, and staff actively share responsibility for the well being of the school and the growth of confident, creative, and capable students. New Community School offers small classes led by highly educated, caring teachers as well as a strong sense of community throughout the school. New Community School is a democratic environment in which real and worthwhile choices are available for children within the context of respect, safety, and self-discipline.

Educational Program
New Community School places an emphasis on integrated learning in order to build on the natural curiosity of children (teaching reading, writing, math, and social skills through all content areas such as science, literature, art, and social studies). There is also an emphasis on problem formation, critical thinking, and problem solving in order to foster independent thought. The teaching is flexible and responsive to each child’s strengths, needs, and style of learning. The school offers opportunities for many levels of parent involvement that range from teaching classes to numerous committee opportunities.
Demographic Summary

New Community School serves a nearly all-White student population with fewer students receiving free or reduced cost lunches than either the local Lafayette community or the statewide average (Figures N-1 & N-2). Unlike its surrounding Lafayette Community Schools, New Community has a lower than statewide average percentage of students in need of special education services (Figure N-3).

Academic Progress

Rebounding after failing to meet AYP in 2005, New Community School met the standards for AYP in 2006 (Table N-4), earning an “Exemplary Progress” PL 221 category placement in the process (Table N-3). The number of students taking ISTEP+ in each grade was fewer than 10, too low for meaningful percentages to be calculated (Table N-2). Forty percent of students tested in both fall and spring with the NWEA Map assessment met their target growth rate in both the reading and math subtests (Table N-5). Sixty percent were successful in meeting their target growth rate in language arts.

Constituent Survey

Overall satisfaction and support for the school was fairly high among both parent and staff respondents (Figure N-4 – N-7). Respondents also indicated satisfaction with the academic program at the school, but they refrained from using the superlative rating when describing their academic program (Figures N-8 – N-14). Teachers were rated highly, but a majority of respondents did not consider the academic program to be excellent.

Although the school was given high ratings for an effective administration (Figure N-15), it appears that parents were less familiar than they would like to be with the school’s mission (Figure N-16). Neither parent or staff respondents were convinced that the school has adequate resources to accomplish its mission (Figure N-17). Support services such as counseling and health services were not highly rated by either staff or parent respondents (Figure N-19), but services for students with special needs received fairly high ratings (Figure N-20).

Constituent survey respondents indicated that New Community School could improve its academic program and should strengthen its communication with community members about the school’s mission. The resources needed to achieve the school’s mission may include the support services that respondents found lacking.

Financial Review

Financially, New Community School exceeded Ball State University Office of Charter Schools’ expectations. It utilized cash management to improve its income statement and balance sheet. The school reported a positive net income for 2006-2007. The school ended the year with a small cash balance. New Community School has almost no long-term debt and projects an enrollment growth of 24% in 2007-2008; this will improve the revenues the school receives. Auditors completed an Agreed-Upon Procedures Report for the year ending June 30, 2006 for New Community School. Seven issues were noted in the review that required corrective action by the school; all issues have been corrected.
School Improvement

To improve student ISTEP+ performance, New Community Charter School has taken the following steps:

- Professional development in meeting needs of individual children
  - Responsive Classroom
  - Math Their Way
  - Gifted and Talented Education
  - Special Education
- Increased focus on using and implementing General Education Intervention Plans.
- Provided summer remediation classes for students failing ISTEP+.
- Shared test results across grade levels to inform and align curriculum.
- Provided summer practice packets in areas of concern for all families.
- Planned additional after school enrichment opportunities for students in science and writing.

NWEA data were used to improve student achievement in the following ways:

- Provide DeCartes manuals to all teachers to more closely pinpoint different needs for every student.
- Increased the number of math resources and reference materials for teachers.
- Increased math practice in primary grades.
- Provided student goal sheets to stimulate conversations with students about purpose and focus.
- Began implementation of after-school programming in science and writing.
- Using it as a resource for curriculum development and revision.

To address deficiencies that might affect AYP status for the 2007-2008 school year, New Community has taken the following actions:

- Continue to focus on good attendance.
- Achieved 100% participation in testing.
- We continue to work on special education student performance.

To improve the perceptions of their school in response to the results of the constituent survey, New Community School has taken the following actions:

- Hopefully, we have eliminated the technical difficulties that resulted in low participation.
- We switched our structure from dual directors to an Executive Director to increase accountability.
- Improved safety and cleanliness of building.
- Improved communication
  - Between the director and families.
  - Between the board and families.
- Have tried to dispel negativism through positive, strong but open leadership which explains and defends the required values and requirements of a public school versus the private school model.
Student Demographics

Figure N-1: Race/Ethnicity Percentages: 2006-2007

Figure N-2: Percentages of Students Qualifying for Free & Reduced Lunch: 2006-2007

Figure N-3: Percentages of Students in Special Education: 2006-2007

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education
Program Statistics

Table N-1: Attendance Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>New Community School</th>
<th>Lafayette School Corporation</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table N-2: Percentages Passing ISTEP+

**ENGLISH/LA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>New Community</th>
<th>Laf. Corp.</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MATH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>New Community</th>
<th>Laf. Corp.</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BOTH ENGLISH & MATH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>New Community</th>
<th>Laf. Corp.</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Percentages are not calculated for grades in which less than 10 students were tested.

Table N-3: PL 221

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC PROBATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance: 83.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table N-4: Annual Yearly Progress

OVERALL DETERMINATION: YES

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education

Table N-5: NWEA Percent Meeting Target Growth Rate

**READING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Students Taking Subtest</th>
<th>% Met Target Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LANGUAGE ARTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Students Taking Subtest</th>
<th>% Met Target Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MATH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Students Taking Subtest</th>
<th>% Met Target Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: NWEA
Constituent Surveys

Figure N-4: Overall, how satisfied are you with the charter school?

Figure N-5: How likely are you to... Recommend the school to friends & colleagues?

Figure N-6: How likely are you to... Return to the school next year?
Figure N-7: How likely are you to... Increase your support of the school?

Data Source: The Kensington Group
NEW COMMUNITY SCHOOL of BSU Charter Schools

Academic Program

Figure N-8: How satisfied are you with the overall quality of education?

Figure N-9: Your overall evaluation of... Curriculum/academic program

Figure N-10: Our school has a high quality academic program
Figure N-11: Your overall evaluation of... Quality of teaching/instruction

- **Parent (n=28)**: 17.1% Excellent, 36.6% Very Good, 46.3% Good
- **Staff (n=14)**: 17.9% Excellent, 35.7% Very Good, 46.4% Good

Figure N-12: Our school uses sound, rigorous educational practices

- **Parent (n=28)**: 17.9% Strongly Agree, 32.1% Agree, 50.0% Neither Agree nor Disagree
- **Staff (n=14)**: 7.1% Strongly Agree, 35.7% Agree, 50.0% Neither Agree nor Disagree

Figure N-13: How would you rate the overall quality of education?

- **Parent (n=28)**: 25.0% Excellent, 17.9% Very Good, 57.1% Good
- **Staff (n=14)**: 7.1% Excellent, 14.3% Very Good, 78.6% Good

Figure N-14: How would you compare the overall quality of education to that of other schools?

- **Parent (n=28)**: 3.6% Much Better, 21.4% Somewhat Better, 32.1% About the Same, 42.9% Don’t Know
- **Staff (n=14)**: 7.1% Much Better, 28.6% Somewhat Better, 35.7% About the Same
Organization/Providing Services

Figure N-15: Our school has effective administration

Figure N-16: All members of the school community understand the mission of the school

Figure N-17: Our school has the resources to achieve its mission
Figure N-18: Your overall evaluation of... Individualized student attention

Figure N-19: Your overall evaluation of... Support services (e.g. counseling, healthcare, etc.)

Figure N-20: Your overall evaluation of... Services provided to the special needs students (e.g. ESL, disabilities, etc.)

Figure N-21: Our school is safe for students

Data Source: The Kensington Group
“Belong-Believe-Achieve”

Mission
The purpose of Options Charter School – Carmel is to provide a caring community for those students who are seeking an alternative to traditional high school programs. They offer educational services specifically for students who are not achieving in the traditional schools of Hamilton County and northern Marion County. Their focus is on the educational success and the health and wellness of each student. Options’ goal is to develop responsible individuals who are skilled problem solvers and caring, productive citizens.

Educational Program
The purpose of Options Charter School – Carmel is accomplished through an educational program that meets the Indiana Academic Standards for a Core 40 diploma. Teachers in this small learning environment are able to focus on the students’ learning styles, talents, developmental levels, and emotional needs. It is a place where those students who have disengaged from the learning process can re-engage, and those students who need a non-traditional approach to learning can flourish. The curriculum, developed by the teachers with input from students, parents, and the business community, is based on 12 exit standards that have been developed by the state.
Demographic Summary

The student population served by Options Charter School – Carmel is nearly all White, with very few students receiving free or reduced cost lunches, much like the population of other schools in the community (Figures O-1 & O-2). There is less diversity than the average of schools statewide. Options Charter School – Carmel serves a very high percentage of students in need of special education services, double that of the statewide average and more than double the average in the nearby Carmel Clay Schools (Figure O-3). Please note that graduation statistics for 2007 were not available from the Indiana Department of Education at the time of this report’s publication.

Academic Progress

AYP has eluded Options – Carmel for the third year in 2006 (Table O-4). Participation rates are cited as the reason for the lack of adequate progress. Indeed, participation in the 9th grade ISTEP+ testing was very low, with only 7 students taking the tests (Table O-2). Percent passing rates are not calculated for such a low number of students. A third of 10th graders passed the English/LA subtest and less than 20% passed the math. No improvement was seen from the previous year, leading to an “Academic Probation” PL 221 status (Table O-3). Of the few students who took the NWEA MAP assessment in both fall and spring, more than half met their target growth rate in reading and language arts (Table O-5). Only 20% of students taking both tests met their target growth rate in math.

Constituent Survey

Few parents (n=20) responded to the 2006-2007 survey, so caution should be used in interpreting the results. Parents who responded were overwhelmingly satisfied with the school overall, although staff respondents were not as enthusiastically supportive (Figures O-4 – O-7). Academics received mostly positive ratings, but very few parent or staff respondents considered it to be excellent (Figures O-8 – O-14). About one-third of staff respondents were particularly unimpressed with school administration, which they did not believe was effective (Figure O-15). Most respondents believed that community members understood the mission of the school, but many parent and staff respondents did not believe the school had the resources it needed to accomplish that mission (Figures O-16 – O-17). Both parent and staff respondents felt that students received the attention and support they need (Figures O-18 – O-20).

Financial Review

Financially, Options Charter School-Carmel met Ball State University Office of Charter Schools’ expectations. It appears to be in a strong financial position. Actual revenues were within 3% of budgeted revenues and actual expenses were under the budget by 6%. The school ended the year with a small, favorable cash position with very little long-term debt. It appears the school is in a position to maintain its solid finances. Auditors completed an Agreed-Upon Procedures report in the year ending June 30, 2006. Two issues were identified during the review that required adjustments; both issues were adjusted during the review process.
School Improvement

To improve student ISTEP+ performance, Options Charter School - Carmel has taken the following steps:

- We have added an ISTEP+ prep/pre-algebra class to the schedule to address the needs of students who come to us without the requisite basic computational and problem solving skills needed for mastery of Algebra I-1 standards.
- We follow a block eight (8) schedule; classes meet every other day, with the exception of Algebra I-1, which meets every day to accommodate those students who need extra time to learn and practice basic algebra skills.
- We offer an ISTEP+ prep/basic skills English class that students take in addition to their required English classes when they are deficient in basic reading comprehension and writing skills.

NWEA data were used to improve student achievement in the following ways:

- In addition to the classes listed above, all content area teachers incorporate mastery of the writing standards into their curriculum.
- Each student creates an ISP (Individual Service Plan) with the help of his/her advisor outlining specific academic goals they want to achieve based upon the NWEA results. Student ISP’s are shared with parents twice yearly during student-led parent/advisor conferences.

To address deficiencies that might affect AYP status for the 2007-2008 school year, Options Charter School - Carmel has taken the following actions:

- Since the spring of 2007, attendance has become a priority issue. We have implemented an attendance policy that has stricter consequences for non-compliance. Students serve after-school detentions for tardiness and unexcused absences from class, and serve in-school detentions for repeated offenses and truancies.
- There are also positive rewards for good behavior. At the end of each week, students are nominated by their advisors for the “Student of the Week” honor based upon three criteria: perfect attendance, currently passing all classes, and no discipline referrals. They receive a reward for being nominated. One student from that list is selected as the “Student of the Week” and he/she is in the running for the “Student of the Month” award - a gift card from a local business.
- As alternative students, social/emotional issues significantly impact school attendance and academic progress. This past spring the staff participated in a two-day training provided by Dr. Susan Albrecht, former director of the Virtual Special Education Cooperative, on Aggression Replacement Training. The three components of this program, including Skill Streaming, Moral Reasoning Training and Anger Control Training, are currently being implemented. With increased pro-social behaviors, our most difficult students will learn how to interact more appropriately with staff and peers, which will positively impact attendance and academic performance.
- As a result of the ever-increasing special education population, we have hired a special education coordinator who serves both the Noblesville and Carmel campuses. Her job is to coordinate student assessments, schedule and chair case conferences, and write IEP’s (Individualized Educational Programs). She also takes care of compliance issues for both schools. This allows the special education teachers at both schools to spend more time in the classrooms and instruct students one on one and in small groups as needed.

To improve the perceptions of their school in response to the results of the constituent survey, Options Charter School - Carmel has taken the following actions:

- Parents now receive a monthly newsletter reviewing past events and outlining special events to take place during the month.
- Our mission statement, core beliefs, expectations and misconceptions are now posted around the school and take a prominent place in the updated 2007-2008 Parent/Student Handbook.
- This year we have added a sports program that gives students an opportunity to compete in soccer, cross-country and basketball with other small private high schools and charter schools throughout the state.
- This year the Noblesville and Carmel school’s PTO’s are working together to become a 501 c3 corporation. They are planning joint fund-raisers and activities designed to involve more parents in the organization and spread positive PR about both schools.
- We are making a greater effort to publicize school-wide projects and events that paint a more positive image of the Options Charter School. One such service-learning project is planned for the evening of October 4th to benefit the Third Phase Homeless Center in Noblesville. Over 30 students have erected a “Homeless City” in a local park and will be staying there overnight to promote an awareness of homelessness in Hamilton County. Local newspapers and television stations have been contacted for coverage of the event.
Student Demographics

Figure O-1: Race/Ethnicity Percentages: 2006-2007

Figure O-2: Percentages of Students Qualifying for Free & Reduced Lunch: 2006-2007

Figure O-3: Percentages of Students in Special Education: 2006-2007

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education
### Program Statistics

#### Table O-1: Attendance Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Options Charter School - Carmel</th>
<th>Carmel - Clay Schools</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table O-2: Percentages Passing ISTEP+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>Options CS - Carmel</th>
<th>C. Clay</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
<th>Options CS - Carmel</th>
<th>C. Clay</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
<th>Options CS - Carmel</th>
<th>C. Clay</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages are not calculated for grades in which less than 10 students were tested.*

#### Table O-3: PL 221

**ACADEMIC PROBATION**

- **Performance:** 28%
- **Improvement:** 0.0%

#### Table O-4: Annual Yearly Progress

**OVERALL DETERMINATION:** NO  
**ATTENDANCE:** YES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education*

#### Table O-5: NWEA Percent Meeting Target Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Language Arts</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
<td>% Met Target Growth Rate</td>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: NWEA*
Constituent Surveys

Figure O-4: Overall, how satisfied are you with the charter school?

- Parent (n=20)
  - Very Satisfied: 10.0%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 18.2%
  - Neutral: 9.1%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 18.2%
  - Very Satisfied: 90.0%

- Staff (n=11)
  - Very Satisfied: 18.2%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 54.5%
  - Neutral: 18.2%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 10.0%

Figure O-5: How likely are you to... Recommend the school to friends & colleagues?

- Parent (n=20)
  - Extremely Likely: 3.0%
  - Very Likely: 45.5%
  - Somewhat Likely: 27.3%
  - Not Very Likely: 18.2%

- Staff (n=11)
  - Extremely Likely: 3.0%
  - Very Likely: 45.5%
  - Somewhat Likely: 27.3%
  - Not Very Likely: 18.2%

Figure O-6: How likely are you to... Return to the school next year?

- Parent (n=20)
  - Extremely Likely: 5.0%
  - Very Likely: 40.0%
  - Somewhat Likely: 27.3%
  - Don't Know: 5.0%

- Staff (n=11)
  - Extremely Likely: 5.0%
  - Very Likely: 45.5%
  - Somewhat Likely: 27.3%
  - Don't Know: 9.1%
Figure O-7: How likely are you to... Increase your support of the school?

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Academic Program

Figure O-8: How satisfied are you with the overall quality of education?

Figure O-9: Your overall evaluation of... Curriculum/academic program

Figure O-10: Our school has a high quality academic program
Figure O-11: Your overall evaluation of... Quality of teaching/instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=20)</th>
<th>Staff (n=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure O-12: Our school uses sound, rigorous educational practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=20)</th>
<th>Staff (n=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure O-13: How would you rate the overall quality of education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=20)</th>
<th>Staff (n=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure O-14: How would you compare the overall quality of education to that of other schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=20)</th>
<th>Staff (n=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much Better</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Better</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the Same</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Worse</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Organization/Providing Services

Figure O-15: Our school has effective administration

![Graph showing responses of parents and staff to the statement about effective administration.]

Figure O-16: All members of the school community understand the mission of the school

![Graph showing responses of parents and staff to the statement about understanding the mission.]

Figure O-17: Our school has the resources to achieve its mission

![Graph showing responses of parents and staff to the statement about resource availability.]

Our school has effective administration.

All members of the school community understand the mission of the school.

Our school has the resources to achieve its mission.
Figure O-18: Your overall evaluation of... Individualized student attention

Figure O-19: Your overall evaluation of... Support services (e.g. counseling, healthcare, etc.)

Figure O-20: Your overall evaluation of... Services provided to the special needs students (e.g. ESL, disabilities, etc.)

Figure O-21: Our school is safe for students

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Options Charter School - Noblesville

“Belong-Believe-Achieve”

9945 Cumberland Pointe Road
Noblesville, IN 46060
(317) 815-2098

www.optionsined.org

Grades Served . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .9-12
2006-2007 Enrollment . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .109

Year Opened: 2006-2007
Final Year in Current Contract: 2012-2013

Mission
The purpose of Options Charter School – Noblesville is to provide a caring community for those students who are seeking an alternative to traditional high school programs. Their focus is on the educational success and the health and wellness of each student. Options’ goal is to develop responsible individuals who are skilled problem solvers and caring, productive citizens.

Educational Program
The purpose of Options Charter School is accomplished through an educational program that meets the Indiana Academic Standards for a Core 40 diploma. Teachers in this small learning environment are able to focus on the students’ learning styles, talents, developmental levels, and emotional needs. It is a place where those students who have disengaged from the learning process can re-engage, and those students who need a non-traditional approach to learning can flourish. The curriculum, developed by the teachers with input from students, parents, and the business community, is based on 12 exit standards that have been developed by the state.
Demographic Summary

The Options Charter School – Noblesville opened its doors in the fall of 2006. The student population is similar to the surrounding schools in the Noblesville district in its lack of diversity and low numbers of students in need of economic assistance (Figure P-1 & P-2). This nearly all-White high school reflects the demographics of its local community, if not the statewide averages. It differs, however, in the percentage of students receiving special education services. At 35%, Options-Noblesville has double the percentage of these students found in Noblesville schools or in the statewide average. Please note that graduation statistics for 2007 were not available from the Indiana Department of Education at the time of this report’s publication.

Academic Progress

The September, 2006 ISTEP+ testing took place only weeks after the school first opened. Any percent passing rates are a reflection of the students’ previous schools, not Options-Noblesville. The 2007 testing will provide a better indication of the school’s success. Many of the students given the NWEA assessment in both the fall and spring (71%) met their target growth rate in language arts (Table P-3). About 40% met their target growth rate in reading, but only a quarter of students did so in math.

Constituent Survey

Very few parents (n=17) or staff (n=8) responded to the 2006-2007 Constituent Survey. Of those who did, most expressed satisfaction with the school overall (Figure P-4) and most were supportive of the school (Figures P-5 – Figures P-7). Of the parents and staff who responded to the survey, few gave the academic program the highest ratings (Figures P-8 – P-14), although ratings were generally positive. Administration was effective according to most of the respondents (Figure P-15). Most respondents felt that members of the school community understood the school’s mission and that it had the resources it needed to accomplish the mission (Figures P-16 – P-17). Students were adequately served according to a majority of those who responded to the survey (Figures P-18 – P-21).

Financial Review

Actual revenues at Options Charter School-Noblesville exceeded budget by 12% and actual expense levels met budget. As is normal for a first-year school due to the state of Indiana’s funding structure, the school incurred a significant net loss for the year. The school met Ball State University Office of Charter Schools’ expectations. Options Charter School-Noblesville’s debt level is reasonable for a school completing its first year. The school’s enrollment is projected to increase by 18% in the 2007-2008 school year, which will improve its revenues. Options Charter School-Noblesville, is scheduled to be audited by the State Board of Accounts during the 2007-2008 financial year.
School Improvement

To improve student ISTEP+ performance, Options Charter School - Noblesville has taken the following steps:

- ISTEP+ data has been used to establish individualized goals for students in their ISP’s (Individualized Service Plans).
- We offer an ISTEP+ prep/basic skills English class that students take in addition to their required English classes when they are deficient in basic reading comprehension and writing skills.

NWEA data were used to improve student achievement in the following ways:

- In addition to the classes listed above, all content area teachers incorporate mastery of the writing standards into their curriculum.
- Each student creates an ISP (Individual Service Plan) with the help of his/her advisor outlining specific academic goals they want to achieve based upon the NWEA results. Student ISP’s are shared with parents twice yearly during student led parent/advisor conferences.

To address deficiencies that might affect AYP status for the 2007-2008 school year, Options Charter School - Noblesville has taken the following actions:

- As a result of the ever-increasing special education population, we have hired a special education coordinator that serves both the Noblesville and Carmel campuses. Her job is to coordinate student assessments, schedule and chair case conferences, and write IEP’s (Individualized Educational Programs). She also takes care of compliance issues for both schools. This allows the special education teachers at both schools to spend more time in the class rooms and instructing students one on one and in small groups as needed.
- Attendance has become a priority issue. We have implemented an attendance policy that has stricter consequences for non-compliance. Students with attendance problems are addressed through a partnership that includes school officials, parents, local law enforcement, and the probation department.
- There are also positive rewards for good behavior. Each week students may be honored based upon three criteria: perfect attendance, currently passing all classes, and no discipline referrals. Raffles are held for prizes donated by local and national organizations for this purpose.

To improve the perceptions of their school in response to the results of the constituent survey, Options Charter School - Noblesville has taken the following actions:

- Beginning in October, parents receive a monthly newsletter reviewing past events and outlining special events to take place during the month.
- This year we have added a sports program that gives students an opportunity to compete in soccer, cross-country and basketball with other small private high schools and charter schools throughout the state.
- This year the Noblesville and Carmel school’s PTO’s are working together to become a 501 c3 corporation. They are planning joint fund-raisers and activities designed to involve more parents in the organization and spread positive PR about both schools.
- We are making a greater effort to publicize school-wide projects and events that paint a more positive image of the Options Charter School.
Student Demographics

Figure P-1: Race/Ethnicity Percentages: 2006-2007

Figure P-2: Percentages of Students Qualifying for Free & Reduced Lunch: 2006-2007

Figure P-3: Percentages of Students in Special Education: 2006-2007

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education
## Program Statistics

### Table P-1: Attendance Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Options Charter School - Noblesville</th>
<th>Noblesville Schools</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table P-2: Percentages Passing ISTEP+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>Options CS - Noblesville</th>
<th>Nbls.</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
<th>Options CS - Noblesville</th>
<th>Nbls.</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
<th>Options CS - Noblesville</th>
<th>Nbls.</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: Indiana Department of Education

### Table P-3: NWEA Percent Meeting Target Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>READING</th>
<th>LANGUAGE ARTS</th>
<th>MATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
<td>% Met Target Growth Rate</td>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
<td>% Met Target Growth Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: NWEA
Constituent Surveys

Figure P-4: Overall, how satisfied are you with the charter school?

- **Parents (n=17)**
  - Very Satisfied: 5.9%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 23.5%
  - Neutral: 25.0%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 11.8%
  - Not Satisfied: 75.0%

- **Staff (n=8)**
  - Very Satisfied: 58.8%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 25.0%
  - Neutral: 11.8%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 5.9%
  - Not Satisfied: 23.5%

Figure P-5: How likely are you to... Recommend the school to friends & colleagues?

- **Parents (n=17)**
  - Extremely Likely: 5.9%
  - Very Likely: 11.8%
  - Somewhat Likely: 11.8%
  - Not Likely: 29.4%
  - Don’t Know: 41.2%

- **Staff (n=8)**
  - Extremely Likely: 12.5%
  - Very Likely: 25.0%
  - Somewhat Likely: 12.5%
  - Not Likely: 17.6%
  - Don’t Know: 37.5%

Figure P-6: How likely are you to... Return to the school next year?

- **Parents (n=17)**
  - Extremely Likely: 11.8%
  - Very Likely: 17.6%
  - Somewhat Likely: 17.6%
  - Not Likely: 52.9%

- **Staff (n=8)**
  - Extremely Likely: 12.5%
  - Very Likely: 37.5%
  - Somewhat Likely: 50.0%
  - Not Likely: 11.8%
Figure P-7: How likely are you to... Increase your support of the school?

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Academic Program

Figure P-8: How satisfied are you with the overall quality of education?

- **Parent (n=17)**
  - Very Satisfied: 5.9%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 17.6%
  - Neutral: 29.4%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 41.2%
  - Don't Know: 25.0%

- **Staff (n=8)**
  - Very Satisfied: 12.5%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 12.5%
  - Neutral: 25.0%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 25.0%
  - Don't Know: 31.3%

Figure P-9: Your overall evaluation of... Curriculum/academic program

- **Parent (n=17)**
  - Excellent: 12.5%
  - Very Good: 18.8%
  - Good: 31.3%
  - Fair: 37.5%

- **Staff (n=8)**
  - Excellent: 12.5%
  - Very Good: 25.0%
  - Good: 25.0%
  - Fair: 37.5%

Figure P-10: Our school has a high quality academic program

- **Parent (n=17)**
  - Strongly Agree: 12.5%
  - Agree: 31.3%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 31.3%
  - Disagree: 25.0%

- **Staff (n=8)**
  - Strongly Agree: 16.7%
  - Agree: 16.7%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 66.7%
Your overall evaluation of... Quality of teaching/instruction

Figure P-11:

Our school uses sound, rigorous educational practices

Figure P-12:

How would you rate the overall quality of education?

Figure P-13:

How would you compare the overall quality of education to that of other schools?

Figure P-14:

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Organization/Providing Services

Figure P-15: Our school has effective administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=17)</th>
<th>Staff (n=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure P-16: All members of the school community understand the mission of the school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=17)</th>
<th>Staff (n=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure P-17: Our school has the resources to achieve its mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=17)</th>
<th>Staff (n=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure P-18: Your overall evaluation of... Individualized student attention

![Graph showing evaluation results for individualized student attention]

Figure P-19: Your overall evaluation of... Support services (e.g. counseling, healthcare, etc.)

![Graph showing evaluation results for support services]

Figure P-20: Your overall evaluation of... Services provided to the special needs students (e.g. ESL, disabilities, etc.)

![Graph showing evaluation results for special needs services]

Figure P-21: Our school is safe for students

![Graph showing evaluation results for school safety]

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Mission
Timothy L. Johnson Academy was established to serve students who are at risk due to economic, educational, or social disadvantage. The academy provides a choice in the array of public education alternatives available to parents and children to better suit their individual needs. The academy provides a safe, secure, and welcoming environment that has teachers with expertise in specific subject areas dedicated to helping students master the core curriculum. The program provides students with experience-based, hands-on curriculum, an all-day kindergarten, and a focus on the fine and performing arts.

Educational Program
Timothy L. Johnson Academy’s curriculum is designed to encourage teachers to work in subject areas in which they are particularly well qualified. Teachers work collaboratively to design and map a sequence of instruction that correlates the content of the four core subject areas throughout the school year. The educational program emphasizes the performing arts as a way of addressing the needs of the whole child. Music, art, and drama are provided as a part of the regular curriculum.
**Demographic Summary**

Unlike the local Fort Wayne Community School district, which serves a diverse population, nearly all of Timothy L. Johnson Academy students are Black (Figure Q-1). More than half of Fort Wayne Community Schools’ students received free or reduced cost lunches in 2006-2007, a higher percentage than the statewide average, but lower than the 92% of Timothy L. Johnson Academy students (Figure Q-2). The school has a lower percentage of students in need of special education services than either the local schools or the statewide average (Figure Q-3).

**Academic Progress**

There is wide variability among the grades in the ISTEP+ percent passing rates (Table Q-2). Not enough 5th graders took the test to calculate a meaningful percentage. A particular problem appears to exist in the 4th and 8th grades, where dramatically low numbers differ greatly from other students in the school. Poor performance among students receiving free and reduced cost lunches is cited as the reason for not making AYP (Table Q-4). The school missed out on a PL 221 “Commendable Progress” status by not meeting AYP for two years in a row, resulting in a PL 221 status of “Academic Progress” (Table Q-3). Most of the students tested on NWEA in both fall and spring met their target growth rate in language arts (71%; see Table Q-5). About half of the students who took both tests met their target growth rate in both reading and math.

**Constituent Survey**

Responses to the 2006-2007 Constituent Survey were notably positive. Most parent and staff respondents were satisfied with the school overall (Figure Q-4). They would be comfortable recommending the school to friends and colleagues and were likely to return to the school the next year and increase their support for the school (Figures Q-5 – Q-7). Respondents appear to have been satisfied with the academics, administration, and support services at the school (Figures Q-8 – Q-21). Parent and staff respondents indicated fairly strong positive feelings about the school in nearly all areas.

**Financial Review**

Financially, Timothy L. Johnson Academy met Ball State University Office of Charter Schools’ expectations. It continues to maintain a good cash flow. The school utilized some of their cash surplus the past year to improve academic results. Timothy L. Johnson Academy appears financially strong with a steady enrollment. Auditors completed an Agreed-Upon Procedures Report for the year ending June 30, 2006 for the school. Four minor procedures were noted in the review that required action by the school. All procedures have been addressed.
School Improvement

To improve student ISTEP+ performance, Timothy L. Johnson Academy has taken the following steps:

- All teachers review ISTEP+ data upon receiving scores in December. The teachers complete an ISTEP+ worksheet, which helps them identify strengths and weaknesses of individual classes. Then they look at grade levels and finally the school as a whole.
- Teachers developed strategies to improve class, grade, and school areas of weakness, such as requiring students to explain orally and in writing their answers, daily use of constructed response journals, and a focus on written responses in reading.
- In addition, teachers in grades K-2 developed strategies for prevention including using test vocabulary more frequently and having students hear as well as see the words, modifying pacing guides to include measurement earlier in the year, stressing the process of finding answers, including examples, modeling, discussion, and explanation daily.
- Teachers have chosen the 6+1 Writing Traits model to create a more consistent writing atmosphere throughout the school.

NWEA data were used to improve student achievement in the following ways:

- Teachers completed an NWEA worksheet after each test administration, identifying strengths and weaknesses as well as the areas of highest growth and areas needing more growth in each of the classes. Using the data, teachers also identified the areas in which there were significant differences in abilities in the classroom.
- Teachers use the NWEA RIT scores to flexibly group students in math and use RIT scores and Lexile scores to group in reading.
- Students discuss their scores with their teachers to create individual goals and then are frequently encouraged to beat their goals.
- Strengths and weaknesses based on NWEA scores were similar to those seen on ISTEP+. The same strategies employed to increase achievement on ISTEP+ will help with increasing NWEA scores.

To address deficiencies that might affect AYP status for the 2007-2008 school year, Timothy L. Johnson Academy has taken the following actions:

- Each student in grades K-5 has a Personalized Education Plan specific to their grade level. The plan includes all testing scores, Multiple Intelligences, as well as academic, behavioral, and/or social goals for the student. Teachers use the plan to group students with similar needs including instruction at different grade levels.
- Attendance awards for students and parents are given on a quarterly basis in addition to the end of the year. Good attendance is mentioned frequently in the school bulletin as well as in classroom newsletters. Students mark their own attendance in the classrooms to develop a sense of responsibility.

To improve the perceptions of their school in response to the results of the constituent survey, Timothy L. Johnson Academy has taken the following actions:

- Parents have consistently indicated that improved transportation, adding a playground and increasing the utilization of technology in the classroom are priorities. This school year, TLJA has added a second bus to service parents more efficiently.
- A new playground has been installed.
- All classes are utilizing the mobile, wireless computer lab.
- All classes receive weekly visits from our technology consultant.
- Monthly electronic field trips are scheduled.
Student Demographics

Figure Q-1: Race/Ethnicity Percentages: 2006-2007

Figure Q-2: Percentages of Students Qualifying for Free & Reduced Lunch: 2006-2007

Figure Q-3: Percentages of Students in Special Education: 2006-2007

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education
### Table Q-1: Attendance Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Timothy L. Johnson Academy</th>
<th>Ft. Wayne Community Schools</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table Q-2: Percentages Passing ISTEP+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>ENGLISH/LA</th>
<th>MATH</th>
<th>BOTH ENGLISH &amp; MATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timothy L. Johnson</td>
<td>F.W. Indiana</td>
<td>Timothy L. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Percentages are not calculated for grades in which less than 10 students were tested.

### Table Q-3: PL 221

**ACADEMIC PROBATION**

- Performance: 30.1%
- Improvement: 6.0%

### Table Q-4: Annual Yearly Progress

**OVERALL DETERMINATION: NO**

**ATTENDANCE: YES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>PARTICIPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source:** Indiana Department Of Education

### Table Q-5: NWEA Percent Meeting Target Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>READING</th>
<th>LANGUAGE ARTS</th>
<th>MATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
<td>% Met Target Growth Rate</td>
<td># of Students Taking Subtest</td>
<td>% Met Target Growth Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Source:** NWEA
Constituent Surveys

Figure Q-4: Overall, how satisfied are you with the charter school?

Overall, how satisfied are you with the charter school?

- **Parent (n=51)**
  - Very Satisfied: 84.3%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 13.7%
  - Neutral: 2.0%

- **Staff (n=21)**
  - Very Satisfied: 66.7%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 33.3%
  - Neutral: 13.7%

Figure Q-5: How likely are you to... Recommend the school to friends & colleagues?

How likely are you to recommend the school to friends & colleagues?

- **Parent (n=51)**
  - Extremely Likely: 52.9%
  - Very Likely: 33.3%
  - Somewhat Likely: 13.7%

- **Staff (n=21)**
  - Extremely Likely: 55.0%
  - Very Likely: 30.0%
  - Somewhat Likely: 15.0%

Figure Q-6: How likely are you to... Return to the school next year?

How likely are you to return to the school next year?

- **Parent (n=51)**
  - Extremely Likely: 47.1%
  - Very Likely: 51.0%
  - Somewhat Likely: 2.0%
  - Don’t Know: 2.0%

- **Staff (n=21)**
  - Extremely Likely: 47.6%
  - Very Likely: 38.1%
  - Somewhat Likely: 4.8%
  - Don’t Know: 9.5%
Figure Q-7: How likely are you to... Increase your support of the school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=51)</th>
<th>Staff (n=21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Likely</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Likely</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Likely</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Academic Program

Figure Q-8: How satisfied are you with the overall quality of education?

- **Parent (n=51)**
  - Very Satisfied: 78.4%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 19.6%
  - Neutral: 2.0%

- **Staff (n=21)**
  - Very Satisfied: 61.9%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 33.3%
  - Neutral: 4.8%

Figure Q-9: Your overall evaluation of... Curriculum/academic program

- **Parent (n=51)**
  - Excellent: 4.1%
  - Very Good: 29.4%
  - Good: 25.5%
  - Neutral: 41.2%

- **Staff (n=21)**
  - Excellent: 28.6%
  - Very Good: 71.4%
  - Neutral: 2.0%

Figure Q-10: Our school has a high quality academic program

- **Parent (n=51)**
  - Strongly Agree: 7.8%
  - Agree: 58.8%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 33.3%

- **Staff (n=21)**
  - Strongly Agree: 9.5%
  - Agree: 76.2%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 14.3%
Figure Q-11: Your overall evaluation of... Quality of teaching/instruction

- Parent (n=51):
  - Excellent: 21.6%
  - Very Good: 33.3%
  - Good: 45.1%
  - Don’t Know/Not Applicable: 4.8%

- Staff (n=21):
  - Excellent: 23.8%
  - Very Good: 19.0%
  - Good: 61.9%
  - Don’t Know/Not Applicable: 9.5%

Figure Q-12: Our school uses sound, rigorous educational practices

- Parent (n=51):
  - Strongly Agree: 5.9%
  - Agree: 33.3%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 66.7%

- Staff (n=21):
  - Strongly Agree: 14.3%
  - Agree: 19.0%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 66.7%

Figure Q-13: How would you rate the overall quality of education?

- Parent (n=51):
  - Excellent: 15.7%
  - Very Good: 39.2%
  - Good: 45.1%

- Staff (n=21):
  - Excellent: 4.8%
  - Very Good: 28.6%
  - Good: 66.7%

Figure Q-14: How would you compare the overall quality of education to that of other schools?

- Parent (n=51):
  - Much Better: 15.7%
  - Somewhat Better: 21.6%
  - About the Same: 29.4%
  - Don’t Know: 33.3%

- Staff (n=21):
  - Much Better: 4.8%
  - Somewhat Better: 9.5%
  - About the Same: 14.3%
  - Don’t Know: 71.4%

Data Source: The Kensington Group
**Organization/Providing Services**

**Figure Q-15:** Our school has effective administration

- **Parent (n=51):**
  - Strongly Agree: 56.0%
  - Agree: 36.0%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 28.6%
  - Disagree: 14.3%
  - No Opinion: 2.0%

- **Staff (n=21):**
  - Strongly Agree: 66.7%
  - Agree: 28.6%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 4.8%
  - Disagree: 2.0%
  - No Opinion: 2.0%

**Figure Q-16:** All members of the school community understand the mission of the school

- **Parent (n=51):**
  - Strongly Agree: 66.7%
  - Agree: 31.4%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 2.0%
  - Disagree: 2.0%
  - No Opinion: 9.5%

- **Staff (n=21):**
  - Strongly Agree: 66.7%
  - Agree: 14.3%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 4.8%
  - Disagree: 4.8%
  - No Opinion: 9.5%

**Figure Q-17:** Our school has the resources to achieve its mission

- **Parent (n=51):**
  - Strongly Agree: 60.8%
  - Agree: 35.3%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 2.0%
  - Disagree: 2.0%
  - No Opinion: 2.0%

- **Staff (n=21):**
  - Strongly Agree: 85.7%
  - Agree: 14.3%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 2.0%
  - Disagree: 2.0%
  - No Opinion: 2.0%
Your overall evaluation of... Individualized student attention

Figure Q-18:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=51)</th>
<th>Staff (n=21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your overall evaluation of... Support services (e.g. counseling, healthcare, etc.)

Figure Q-19:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=51)</th>
<th>Staff (n=21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/Not Applicable</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your overall evaluation of... Services provided to the special needs students (e.g. ESL, disabilities, etc.)

Figure Q-20:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=51)</th>
<th>Staff (n=21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/Not Applicable</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our school is safe for students

Figure Q-21:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=51)</th>
<th>Staff (n=21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: The Kensington Group
COMMUNITY MONTESSORI of BSU Charter Schools

“Education from within”

4102 St. Joseph Road
New Albany, IN 47150
(812) 948-1000

www.shiningminds.com

Grades Served: K-8
2006-2007 Enrollment: 316
2005-2006 Enrollment: 286
2004-2005 Enrollment: 166
2003-2004 Enrollment: 124
2002-2003 Enrollment: 75
Enrollment at Capacity: 450

Year Opened: 2002-2003
Final Year in Current Contract: 2008-2009

Mission
Respecting children. Engaging families. Encouraging thoughts. Embracing the community. Community Montessori gives children an environment that respects all people and ideas. We also give families a vehicle to learn cooperatively, have fun, and promote peace with their children. As a school family we continue to expand our minds and use this knowledge to make an impact on our community.

Educational Program
Community Montessori is a comprehensive educational approach with a focus on knowing each individual learner and partnering in his/her continued growth in connecting knowledge for lifelong learning. Under guidance, children and teens in Community Montessori classrooms learn by making discoveries and asking questions while cultivating concentration, motivation, self-discipline, and a love of learning.
Demographic Summary

Ninety-one percent of Community Montessori students are White (Figure R-1), a higher percentage than the surrounding New Albany-Floyd County School district (85%) and significantly higher than the statewide average (77%). Few of Community Montessori’s students (3%) are eligible for free or reduced cost lunches (Figure R-2), indicating an advantaged population at the school. The school also has a lower percentage of students in need of special education services (9%) than either the local schools (19%) or the state average (17%).

Academic Progress

The percentage of students passing ISTEP+ (Table R-2) increases in the higher grades, with 4th-grade math seeing the lowest pass rates (55%) and 8th-grade English/LA the highest (100%). These high pass rates contributed to successfully meeting AYP requirements (Table R-4) and “Exemplary Progress” on PL 221 (Table R-3). NWEA testing allowed for measurements of students meeting their target growth rates for about half of the students at Community Montessori (Table R-5). Among these students, about a third met their target in reading and language arts and about a quarter did so in math.

Constituent Survey

One indication of the success of Community Montessori in involving its community members is seen in responses to the constituent survey. Many parents (n=105) and staff (n=29) responded to the survey and responses indicate a positive attitude about the school. Overall, 94% of parents and 97% of staff were satisfied with the school (Figure R-4). Most of these constituents would recommend the school to friends and colleagues and plan to return to the school.

Financial Review

Financially, the school exceeded Ball State University Office of Charter Schools’ expectations. It continues to maintain a solid financial position. Actual revenues exceeded budgeted revenues, and actual expenses were less than revenues, providing the school with a net income for the year. Debt is high compared to other charter schools due to new construction and the school’s decision to own its own building. The school has a favorable equity position and appears to be able to maintain strong finances. Auditors completed an Agreed-Upon Procedures Report for the year ending June 30, 2006 for Community Montessori. Two minor procedures were noted in the review that required action by the school. Both procedures have been corrected.
School Improvement

To improve student ISTEP+ performance, Community Montessori has taken the following steps:

- Community Montessori believes in supporting the individual learner. We work hard to dissect individual ISTEP+ information and teachers set individual goals for learners based on that information.
- Any child who does not pass an ISTEP+ test or who is at risk for not passing, has an individual plan created to support that process.
- We carefully review overall data and determine if there are certain areas that need support overall as a grade level. For example, when our third graders did not score very high one year in math, we realized that there were five questions on tally marks and that many teachers did not prioritize that concept. Therefore, teachers worked together to brainstorm ways to integrate this standard—children conducting surveys, teachers modeling how many children were absent, etc.
- Teaching staff are accountable for learner improvement annually through our Differentiated Salary Structure to determine their salary for the following year.

NWEA data were used to improve student achievement in the following ways:

- Teachers print out individual progress reports and share with parents. This sparks great discussion on integrating skills that are improving and gives families ideas on how to support learning a particular concept at home.
- Teaching staff utilize many reports for more detailed information for a group of learners to find strength areas and overall goal areas.
- Teaching staff are accountable for learner improvement annually through our Differentiated Salary Structure to determine their salary for the following year.
- Overall, we believe the best way to promote student achievement is to know each individual learner and understand his/her strengths and goal areas.
  - We set individual goals for each child/teen based on the Indiana State Standards.
  - We also set individual moral/emotional/social goals to promote reflection, positive self-esteem, and personal responsibility.
  - We are diligent with supporting each with learning in problem solving and questioning strategies to gain deeper understanding and encourage lifelong learning.

To address deficiencies that might affect AYP status for the 2007-2008 school year, Community Montessori has taken the following actions:

- Although Community Montessori continues to meet AYP, we are consistently conscious about the criteria and strive to be proactive in this process.
- We have instilled higher standards this year for attendance and are emailing/calling families by 9:30 everyday if we have not heard from them.
- We have an amazing team of staff members who support children who are absent during testing and work with our exceptional learners to support individual accommodations.
Student Demographics

Figure R-1: Race/Ethnicity Percentages: 2006-2007

Figure R-2: Percentages of Students Qualifying for Free & Reduced Lunch: 2006-2007

Figure R-3: Percentages of Students in Special Education: 2006-2007

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education
Program Statistics

Table R-1: Attendance Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Community Montessori</th>
<th>New Albany-Floyd County Schools</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table R-2: Percentages Passing ISTEP+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>ENGLISH/LA</th>
<th>MATH</th>
<th>BOTH ENGLISH &amp; MATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Montessori</td>
<td>New Albany</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table R-3: PL 221

EXEMPLARY PROGRESS

- Performance: 74.1%
- Improvement: 12.9%

Table R-4: Annual Yearly Progress

OVERALL DETERMINATION: YES

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education

Table R-5: NWEA Percent Meeting Target Growth Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Students Taking Subtest</th>
<th>READING</th>
<th>% Met Target Growth Rate</th>
<th># of Students Taking Subtest</th>
<th>LANGUAGE ARTS</th>
<th>% Met Target Growth Rate</th>
<th># of Students Taking Subtest</th>
<th>MATH</th>
<th>% Met Target Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: NWEA
Constituent Surveys

**Figure R-4:** Overall, how satisfied are you with the charter school?

**Figure R-5:** How likely are you to... Recommend the school to friends & colleagues?

**Figure R-6:** How likely are you to... Return to the school next year?
COMMUNITY MONTESSORI of BSU Charter Schools

Figure R-7: How likely are you to... Increase your support of the school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parent (n=105)</th>
<th>Staff (n=29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Likely</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Likely</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Likely</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Likely</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not At All Likely</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Academic Program

Figure R-8: How satisfied are you with the overall quality of education?

- Parent (n=105):
  - Very Satisfied: 78.8%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 14.4%
  - Neutral: 1.0%
  - Somewhat Dissatisfied: 3.8%
  - Don’t Know: 1.9%

- Staff (n=29):
  - Very Satisfied: 51.7%
  - Somewhat Satisfied: 48.3%
  - Don’t Know: 1.0%

Figure R-9: Your overall evaluation of... Curriculum/academic program

- Parent (n=105):
  - Excellent: 50.5%
  - Very Good: 11.4%
  - Good: 33.3%
  - Fair: 7.1%
  - Don’t Know/Not Applicable: 1.9%

- Staff (n=29):
  - Excellent: 53.6%
  - Very Good: 17.9%
  - Good: 21.4%
  - Fair: 7.1%
  - Don’t Know/Not Applicable: 6.9%

Figure R-10: Our school has a high quality academic program

- Parent (n=105):
  - Strongly Agree: 51.4%
  - Agree: 37.1%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 1.9%
  - Disagree: 5.7%
  - Strongly Disagree: 1.0%

- Staff (n=29):
  - Strongly Agree: 44.8%
  - Agree: 34.5%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 1.9%
  - Disagree: 13.8%
  - Strongly Disagree: 6.9%
Your overall evaluation of... Quality of teaching/instruction

Figure R-11:

- **Parent** (n=105):
  - Excellent: 58.1%
  - Very Good: 30.5%
  - Good: 24.1%
  - Fair: 27.6%
  - Poor: 7.6%

- **Staff** (n=29):
  - Excellent: 48.3%
  - Very Good: 24.1%
  - Good: 27.6%
  - Fair: 24.1%
  - Poor: 2.9%

Our school uses sound, rigorous educational practices

Figure R-12:

- **Parent** (n=105):
  - Strongly Agree: 41.4%
  - Agree: 67.6%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 32.4%
  - Disagree: 10.5%
  - No Opinion: 4.8%

- **Staff** (n=29):
  - Strongly Agree: 43.8%
  - Agree: 44.8%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 37.9%
  - Disagree: 6.7%
  - No Opinion: 4.8%

How would you rate the overall quality of education?

Figure R-13:

- **Parent** (n=105):
  - Excellent: 54.3%
  - Very Good: 32.4%
  - Good: 21.0%
  - Fair: 10.0%
  - Don't Know: 1.0%

- **Staff** (n=29):
  - Excellent: 41.4%
  - Very Good: 34.5%
  - Good: 6.9%
  - Fair: 34.5%
  - Don't Know: 8.6%

How would you compare the overall quality of education to that of other schools?

Figure R-14:

- **Parent** (n=105):
  - Much Better: 67.6%
  - Somewhat Better: 21.0%
  - About the Same: 10.5%
  - Somewhat Worse: 4.8%
  - Don't Know: 5.7%

- **Staff** (n=29):
  - Much Better: 55.2%
  - Somewhat Better: 34.5%
  - About the Same: 6.9%
  - Somewhat Worse: 3.4%
  - Don't Know: 10.5%

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Organization/Providing Services

Figure R-15: Our school has effective administration

- Parent (n=105):
  - Strongly Agree: 2.9%
  - Agree: 8.6%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 34.3%
  - Disagree: 51.4%

- Staff (n=29):
  - Strongly Agree: 6.9%
  - Agree: 34.3%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 58.6%

Figure R-16: All members of the school community understand the mission of the school

- Parent (n=105):
  - Strongly Agree: 1.0%
  - Agree: 5.7%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 41.0%
  - Disagree: 52.4%

- Staff (n=29):
  - Strongly Agree: 3.4%
  - Agree: 3.4%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 24.1%
  - Disagree: 69.0%

Figure R-17: Our school has the resources to achieve its mission

- Parent (n=105):
  - Strongly Agree: 1.0%
  - Agree: 3.9%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 13.6%
  - Disagree: 40.8%

- Staff (n=29):
  - Strongly Agree: 3.6%
  - Agree: 14.3%
  - Neither Agree nor Disagree: 14.3%
  - Disagree: 67.9%
Figure R-18: Your overall evaluation of... Individualized student attention

Data Source: The Kensington Group

Figure R-19: Your overall evaluation of... Support services (*e.g.* counseling, healthcare, etc.)

Data Source: The Kensington Group

Figure R-20: Your overall evaluation of... Services provided to the special needs students (*e.g.* ESL, disabilities, etc.)

Data Source: The Kensington Group

Figure R-21: Our school is safe for students

Data Source: The Kensington Group
RURAL COMMUNITY ACADEMY of BSU Charter Schools

“A Public School Where Every Child Soars”

P. O. Box 85
Graysville, IN 47852
(812) 382-4500
www.rcsi.k12.in.us

Grades Served ................. K-8
2006-2007 Enrollment ............ 123
2005-2006 Enrollment ............ 99
2004-2005 Enrollment ............ 91
Enrollment at Capacity ........... 180

Year Opened: 2004-2005
Final Year in Current Contract: 2010-2011

Mission
The purpose of the Rural Community Academy is to provide rural students with a top-quality educational program using a place-based approach. With careful attention to the social dynamics and cultural values of the rural setting, the Rural Community Academy seeks to instill students with self-confidence, practical skills, pride of place, and excellent academic abilities through differentiated instruction, strong parental support, and continuous interaction with the local community. Students will be equipped to excel in their academic, personal, and social lives long after their attendance at this school.

Educational Program
The educational program of Rural Community Academy will use local community resources, both people and places, textbooks, and computer-aided learning tools to meet state standards. All students will have the advantage of small class sizes, individualized lessons, and differentiated instruction in order to succeed and contribute back to the community.
Demographic Summary
Rural Community Academy serves an all-White population similar to other schools in its local community, but without the diversity of the statewide average (Figure S-1). The percentages of students receiving free and reduced cost lunches at the school, its local community, and the state are all very similar (Figure S-2). Nearly 30% of students at Rural Community Academy require special education services (Figure S-3), almost double the average in the state.

Academic Progress
ISTEP+ percent passing rates are lower than the state average and lower than the local Southwest School Corporation (Table S-2). Rates hover around 50% passing in all grades. Although Rural Community Academy met AYP requirements (Table S-4) for the second year in a row, improvement statistics slipped. The school was placed on PL 221 “Academic Probation” because of a drop in average percent passing from the previous year (Table S-3). More than half of students tested met their NWEA target growth rate in reading and language arts, and nearly half met their target in math.

Constituent Survey
Both staff and parent respondents to the 2006-2007 Constituent Survey reported being very satisfied with and supportive of the school (Figures S-4 – S-7). Positive ratings abound for the school’s academic program (Figures S-8 – S-14). Although parent and staff respondents felt that the school had effective administration (Figure S-15), there was some concern among staff respondents that the school did not have sufficient resources to accomplish its mission (Figure S-17). Parent respondents who know about support services were positive, but several staff respondents rated such services as counseling and health services as inadequate (Figure S-19). Services for students with special needs were rated positively (Figure S-20).

Financial Review
Financially, Rural Community School exceeded Ball State University Office of Charter Schools’ expectations. It utilized excellent cash management to improve its budget, resulting in a positive net income position. The school completed the year with a positive cash balance and a balance sheet that contains minimal long-term debt. The school’s enrollment is projected to increase by 40% in the 2007-2008 school year, which will improve revenues and qualify the school for a low-interest common school loan. Auditors completed an Agreed-Upon Procedures report for the year ending June 30, 2006 for Rural Community School. Thirteen procedures were noted in the auditor’s report; all procedures were corrected.
School Improvement

To improve student ISTEP+ performance, Rural Community Academy has taken the following steps:

- **General**
  - Reviewed test-taking skills with students.
  - Illustrated study skills.
  - Discussed note-taking skills with students.
- **Identified Title I NCLB students**
  - Focused on reading and language arts skills.
  - Provided paraprofessional aides for tutoring and assistance.
  - Assessed success of inclusion program to determine if more 1:1 instruction is needed.
  - Continuously developed Title I curriculum that focuses on primary at-risk children.
- **Incentives to reading curriculum**
  - Utilized Accelerated Reader quizzes for additional reading.
  - Utilized incentives for those who participate in Accelerated Reading.

NWEA data were used to improve student achievement in the following ways:

- **Curriculum Development and Improvement**
  - 5th – 8th Grades
    1. Students placed in classes by their abilities.
    2. Utilized the tools of NWEA called DesCartes that show—based upon how a student scores—three areas of what the student knows, what the student doesn’t know, and what the student needs to know—all based upon the Indiana State Educational Standards.
  - Kindergarten – 4th
    1. Provided paraprofessional aides for tutoring and assistance.
    2. Hired a part-time Title I NCLB teacher to only work with struggling students.
- **Professional Development**
  - Training on many facets of NWEA.
  - Training on DesCartes (tools of NWEA) tied to Indiana State Educational Standards.
- **Classroom Assessment**
  - NWEA assessment moved to three times per year.
  - Utilized NWEA testing three times per year and then analyze individual and group test performance, delving deeper into layers of available reports.
  - Tracked NWEA test scores by each student over time and identify areas to improve.

To address deficiencies that might affect AYP status for the 2007-2008 school year, Rural Community Academy has taken the following actions:

- Developed Attendance Policy.
- Developed a Reward Program to achieve 95% of attendance.
- Provided more individualized instruction for students.

To improve the perceptions of their school in response to the results of the constituent survey, Rural Community Academy has taken the following actions:

- **Community Feedback**
  - We receive excellent press from our small-town, rural newspaper.
  - We utilize the NWEA as a marketing tool.
- **Parent Feedback**
  - We utilize a parent and community committee to provide suggestions and ideas.
  - Our open door policy involves parents and community in the education of our students and in their testing and evaluation.
Student Demographics

Figure S-1: Race/Ethnicity Percentages: 2006-2007

Figure S-2: Percentages of Students Qualifying for Free & Reduced Lunch: 2006-2007

Figure S-3: Percentages of Students in Special Education: 2006-2007

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education
### Program Statistics

**Table S-1: Attendance Rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Rural Community Academy</th>
<th>Southwest School Corporation</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table S-2: Percentages Passing ISTEP+**

#### ENGLISH/LA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>Rural Community</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MATH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>Rural Community</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BOTH ENGLISH & MATH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>Rural Community</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table S-3: PL 221**

| ACADEMIC PROBATION | Performance: 59.1% | Improvement: -1.3% |

**Table S-4: Annual Yearly Progress**

OVERALL DETERMINATION: YES

Data Source: Indiana Department Of Education

**Table S-5: NWEA Percent Meeting Target Growth Rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Students Taking Subtest</th>
<th>READING</th>
<th>LANGUAGE ARTS</th>
<th>MATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Met Target Growth Rate</td>
<td>% Met Target Growth Rate</td>
<td>% Met Target Growth Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: NWEA
Constituent Surveys

Figure S-4: Overall, how satisfied are you with the charter school?

Overall, how satisfied are you with the charter school?

- **Parent (n=54)**: 96.3% Very Satisfied, 16.7% Somewhat Satisfied, 1.9% Neutral
- **Staff (n=18)**: 77.8% Very Satisfied, 16.7% Somewhat Satisfied, 1.9% Neutral

Figure S-5: How likely are you to... Recommend the school to friends & colleagues?

How likely are you to... Recommend the school to friends & colleagues?

- **Parent (n=54)**: 88.9% Extremely Likely, 33.3% Very Likely, 7.4% Somewhat Likely, 3.7% Neutral
- **Staff (n=18)**: 61.1% Extremely Likely, 33.3% Very Likely, 61.1% Somewhat Likely, 3.7% Neutral

Figure S-6: How likely are you to... Return to the school next year?

How likely are you to... Return to the school next year?

- **Parent (n=54)**: 88.9% Extremely Likely, 33.3% Very Likely, 61.1% Somewhat Likely, 3.7% Neutral
- **Staff (n=18)**: 61.1% Extremely Likely, 33.3% Very Likely, 61.1% Somewhat Likely, 3.7% Neutral
**RURAL COMMUNITY ACADEMY of BSU Charter Schools**

**Figure S-7:** How likely are you to... Increase your support of the school?

![Bar chart showing responses of parents and staff to the question about increasing support of the school.](image)

Data Source: The Kensington Group
Academic Program

Figure S-8: How satisfied are you with the overall quality of education?

Figure S-9: Your overall evaluation of... Curriculum/academic program

Figure S-10: Our school has a high quality academic program
Figure S-11: Your overall evaluation of... Quality of teaching/instruction

- **Parent (n=54)**
  - Excellent: 59.6%
  - Very Good: 38.5%
  - Good: 1.9%
  - Total: 100%

- **Staff (n=18)**
  - Excellent: 44.4%
  - Very Good: 44.4%
  - Total: 88.8%

Data Source: The Kensington Group

Figure S-12: Our school uses sound, rigorous educational practices

- **Parent (n=54)**
  - Strongly Agree: 61.1%
  - Agree: 37.0%
  - No Opinion: 1.9%
  - Total: 100%

- **Staff (n=18)**
  - Strongly Agree: 61.1%
  - Agree: 38.9%
  - Total: 100%

Data Source: The Kensington Group

Figure S-13: How would you rate the overall quality of education?

- **Parent (n=54)**
  - Excellent: 59.3%
  - Very Good: 35.2%
  - Good: 5.6%
  - Total: 100%

- **Staff (n=18)**
  - Excellent: 50.0%
  - Very Good: 38.9%
  - Total: 88.9%

Data Source: The Kensington Group

Figure S-14: How would you compare the overall quality of education to that of other schools?

- **Parent (n=54)**
  - Much Better: 81.5%
  - Somewhat Better: 7.4%
  - About the Same: 7.4%
  - Much Worse: 3.7%
  - Total: 100%

- **Staff (n=18)**
  - Much Better: 66.7%
  - Somewhat Better: 16.7%
  - About the Same: 16.7%
  - Total: 100%

Data Source: The Kensington Group
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Organization/Providing Services

Figure S-15: Our school has effective administration

Figure S-16: All members of the school community understand the mission of the school

Figure S-17: Our school has the resources to achieve its mission
Figure S-18: Your overall evaluation of... Individualized student attention

Figure S-19: Your overall evaluation of... Support services *(e.g. counseling, healthcare, etc.)*

Figure S-20: Your overall evaluation of... Services provided to the special needs students *(e.g. ESL, disabilities, etc.)*

Figure S-21: Our school is safe for students

Data Source: The Kensington Group
# APPENDIX A

## COMPARISON of BSU Sponsored Charter Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year Opened</th>
<th>Ethnic Minority</th>
<th>Free Lunch</th>
<th>Reduced Lunch</th>
<th>Passing ISTEP Math</th>
<th>Passing ISTEP E/LA</th>
<th>Students Special ED</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Stability Teachers</th>
<th>Teacher Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Average</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>$47,832.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Century</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>$39,732.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campagna</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>$36,392.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSoD</td>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>$34,197.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Mont</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>$24,296.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECLCS</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>$36,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECUEA</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>$36,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galileo</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>$34,291.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Lighthouse</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>$36,207.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geist Mont.</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>$34,057.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvington</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>$33,270.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIPP</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>$56,840.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Comm.</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>$24,653.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options-Carmel</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>$39,465.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options-Noblesville</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$37,444.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Comm.</td>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>$30,605.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thea Bowman</td>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>$38,859.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLJ</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>$30,292.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veritas</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>$27,642.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGLCS</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$37,474.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PL 221 Designations: Exem=Exemplary Progress; Comm=Commendable Progress; Prog=Academic Progress; Watch=Academic Watch; Prob=Academic Probation

CSoD=Charter School of the Dunes; ECLCS=East Chicago Lighthouse Charter School; ECUEA=East Chicago Urban Enterprise Academy; TLJ=Timothy L. Johnson Academy; WGLCS=West Gary Lighthouse Charter School
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charter School</th>
<th>Pupil/Teacher Ratio</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>Full-Time Teachers</th>
<th>AYP</th>
<th>PL 221</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>NWEA Reading # taken/% met target</th>
<th>NWEA Language # taken/% met target</th>
<th>NWEA Math # taken/% met target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Average</strong></td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Century</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Prob</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>146/51%</td>
<td>125/50%</td>
<td>125/26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campagna</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Prob</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>25/48%</td>
<td>24/46%</td>
<td>26/19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOd</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Prog</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>159/45%</td>
<td>159/48%</td>
<td>159/27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Mont.</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Exem</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>177/37%</td>
<td>150/33%</td>
<td>171/25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECLCS</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>22/18%</td>
<td>44/39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECUEA</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Exem</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>158/30%</td>
<td>121/28%</td>
<td>157/31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galileo</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Exem</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>67/57%</td>
<td>43/63%</td>
<td>64/63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Lighthouse</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>236/54%</td>
<td>212/59%</td>
<td>237/46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geist Mont.</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>25/48%</td>
<td>22/32%</td>
<td>25/20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvington</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Watch</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>319/54%</td>
<td>280/59%</td>
<td>315/48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIPP</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>30/40%</td>
<td>66/32%</td>
<td>66/47%</td>
<td>66/50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Comm.</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Prob</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>19/58%</td>
<td>17/53%</td>
<td>30/20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options-Carmel</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>30/40%</td>
<td>66/32%</td>
<td>66/47%</td>
<td>66/50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options-Noblesville</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>19/58%</td>
<td>17/53%</td>
<td>30/20%</td>
<td>30/20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Comm.</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Prog</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>66/32%</td>
<td>66/47%</td>
<td>66/50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thea Bowman</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Exem</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>392/36%</td>
<td>346/42%</td>
<td>388/22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLJ</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Prog</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>87/51%</td>
<td>63/71%</td>
<td>78/46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veritas</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Exem</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>110/34%</td>
<td>83/48%</td>
<td>104/42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGLCS</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>174/29%</td>
<td>127/54%</td>
<td>168/43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Too few students to count

PL 221 Designations: Exem=Exemplary Progress; Comm=Commendable Progress; Prog=Academic Progress; Watch=Academic Watch; Prob=Academic Probation

CSod=Charter School of the Dunes; ECLCS=East Chicago Lighthouse Charter School; ECUEA=East Chicago Urban Enterprise Academy; TLJ=Timothy L. Johnson Academy; WGLCS=West Gary Lighthouse Charter School
### Please indicate your school below.

- 21st Century at Gary
- Campagna Academy
- Charter School of the Dunes
- Community Montessori
- East Chicago Lighthouse Charter School
- East Chicago Urban Enterprise Academy
- Geist Montessori Academy
- New Community School
- Thea Bowman Leadership Academy
- Timothy L. Johnson Academy
- West Gary Lighthouse Charter School
- Veritas Academy
- Galileo Charter School
- Gary Lighthouse Charter School
- Irvington Community School
- KIPP LEAD College Preparatory Academy
- Rural Community Academy

### 1. Please indicate your role with the school? (indicate all that apply)

- Parent/Guardian
- Board member
- Administrator
- Staff

### 2a. How would you rate the overall quality of education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2b. How would you compare the overall quality of education to that of other schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Much Better</th>
<th>Somewhat Better</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>Somewhat Worse</th>
<th>Much Worse</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2c. How satisfied are you with the overall quality of education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Please read each of the following statements and indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement as it relates to your school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. All members of the school community understand the mission of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Our school has a caring environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Our school communicates student performance to parents/guardians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d. Our school continuously improves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e. Our school holds teachers accountable for student performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f. Expectations are clearly defined for all members of the school community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3g. Our school makes a comprehensive assessment of student achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3h. Our school has a positive school spirit/climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3i. Our school has high expectations for teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3j. Our school is safe for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3k. Our school uses sound, rigorous educational practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3l. Our school has a high quality academic program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3m. Our school has all members of the school community focused on the mission of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3n. Our school has the appropriate level of discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3o. Our school has the resources to achieve its mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p. Our school has a mission-driven academic program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3q. Our school has an effective board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r. Our school uses a team approach to education that involves the entire school community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s. Our school spends more time than other schools on academics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3t. Our school empowers teachers to make decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3u. Our school has effective administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v. Our school is financially stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3w. All members of the school community are proud of our school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x. Our school uses innovative educational practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Please indicate your overall evaluation of each of the following aspects of the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a. School board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. Enrollment/admissions process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c. Quality of teaching/instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d. School administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate your overall evaluation of each of the following aspects of the school. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4e. Teacher professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f. School facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4g. Individualized student attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4h. Access to/use of computers and other technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4i. Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4j. Support services (e.g. counseling, healthcare, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4k. Faculty/teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4l. Services provided to special needs students (e.g. English as a second language, disabilities, academically challenged, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4m. School safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4n. Communication about student learning/achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4o. Student development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4p. Opportunities for parental involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4q. Curriculum/academic program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r. Transportation services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4s. Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4t. Student-teacher ratio/class size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4u. Food service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v. School size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4w. Teacher decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4x. Location of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4y. School material and supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4z. Classroom management (e.g. student behavior, discipline, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How likely are you to . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Not Very Likely</th>
<th>Not at all Likely</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a. Recommend the school to friends and colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Return to the school next year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Increase your support of the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5d. Overall, how satisfied are you with this charter school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>One child</th>
<th>Two children</th>
<th>Three or more children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Please indicate how many children you have in the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Please indicate the gender(s) of your student(s) in the school</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Please indicate the grade level(s) of your student(s).</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What is your child(ren)’s race/ethnicity? Please indicate all that apply.</td>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Please indicate your gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for taking time to provide us with your views and opinions of the school community. The survey is very easy to complete. Simply click on the response that best represents your opinion for each question or type your comments in response to the narrative questions. Thank you for taking time and for your effort to provide us with your opinions.
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