

Core Question 3: Is the organization effective and well-run?

The Governance and Leadership Performance Framework, outlined in Core Question 3, gauges the academic and operational leadership of schools. Core Question 3 consists of four indicators designed to measure schools on how well their school administration and board of directors comply with the terms of their charter agreement, applicable laws, and authorizer expectations. CQ3 reports are informed by observations during board meetings as well as a variety of artifacts and documentation, including board meeting minutes, board rosters, compliance documents, and the charter agreement.

Note: The Governance & Leadership Performance Framework was revised ahead of the 2019-20 school year. For this reason, historical ratings for the prior version of the framework are not included in this report. Core Question 3 reports from previous years may be found on OEI's [website](#).

Summary of Ratings							
Indicator	Year 1 2020-21	Year 2 2021-22	Year 3 2022-23	Year 4 2023-24	Year 5 2024-25	Year 6 2025-26	Year 7 2026-27
3.1. Does the board practice strong governance oversight?	MS	ES	ES	ES	ES		
3.2. Is the board active, knowledgeable, diverse, and does it work toward a strategic vision?	MS	ES	ES	ES	ES		
3.3. Does the organization satisfactorily comply with governance obligations?	MS	MS	MS	ES	ES		
3.4. Is the school leader strong in their academic and organizational leadership?	MS	ES	MS	MS	ES		

3.1. Does the board practice strong governance oversight?		
Does Not Meet Standard	The board does not meet standard on two or more sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.	
Approaching Standard	The board either 1) approaches standard for all three sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for two sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator, 3) approaches standard for two sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator, 4) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, approaches for one, and does not meet for one; and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.	
Meets Standard	The board either 1) meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator, 2) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, meets for one, and approaches or does not meet standard for one, 3) exceeds standard for two sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator, 4) exceeds standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator, 5) meets standard for all sub-indicators.	
Exceeds Standard	The board exceeds standard for at least two sub-indicators and meets standard for one.	
Sub-indicators	Rating	
3.1a. The board exercises relentless focus on student academic outcomes.	DNMS	- The board is unable to gauge whether students are on track; or - The board does not have an active academic committee.
	AS	- The board was engaged during academic performance discussions. - The board did not regularly discuss disaggregated data.
	MS	The board did three of the following: - Centered student academic outcomes in discussions. - Discussed disaggregated academic data regularly. - Worked with school leadership to adjust course when needed. - Has an academic committee that regularly meets with school leadership review academic data and reports to the full board.
	ES	The board did all the following: - Centered student academic outcomes in discussions. - Discussed disaggregated academic data regularly. - Worked with school leadership to adjust course when necessary. - Has an academic committee that regularly meets with school leadership to review academic data and reports to the full board.
3.1b. The board has active committees with clear goals.	DNMS	- There is no evidence of active committees; or - Committee goals do not align to school-specific goals; or - The board has committees, but there is minimal to no evidence progress to goals was shared.
	AS	The board has two of the following: - Active committees rooted in student/school-level success. - Each committee has goals aligned to student/school-level success. - Committees share progress to goals with recommendations to full board when necessary. - At a minimum, committees in academics and finance.
	MS	The board has three of the following: - Active committees rooted in student/school-level success. - Each committee has goals aligned to student/school-level success.

Core Question 3 Report: 2024-25
Emma Donnan Elementary & Middle School

		- Committees share progress to goals with recommendations to full board when necessary. - At a minimum, committees in academics and finance.
	ES	The board has all the following: - Active committees rooted in student/school-level success. - Each committee has goals aligned to student/school-level success. - Committees share progress to goals with recommendations to full board when necessary. - At a minimum, committees in academics and finance.
3.1c. The board has evaluation systems in place to monitor itself and school leadership.	DNMS	- The organization is missing all evaluations; or - The board did not submit a school leader succession plan.
	AS	- The organization is missing two or more required evaluations; or - The board has an outdated school leader succession plan on file.
	MS	The organization did all the following: - The organization completed all but one of the required evaluations. - The board has an updated school leader succession plan on file.
	ES	The organization did all the following: - The board evaluated the school leader. - The school leader conducted a self-assessment. - The board conducted a self-assessment. - The board evaluated its education service provider, if applicable. - The board has an updated school leader succession plan on file.
Basis for Rating/Additional Details		
During the 2024-25 school year, Emma Donnan Elementary and Middle School was overseen by Adelante Schools' eight-member nonprofit board. The board maintained a total of three committees, including academics, finance, and governance. The full board met bi-monthly while committees met on the alternating months and reported out at each full board meeting. All required evaluations were completed and submitted. Artifacts and Data Sources: Board Meeting Minutes, Charter Achievement Portal (CAP), Board Observation		
3.2. Is the board active, knowledgeable, diverse, and does it work toward a strategic vision?		
Does Not Meet Standard	The board does not meet standard on one or both sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.	
Approaching Standard	The board either 1) approaches standard for one or both sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for one sub-indicator and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator, 3) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator; and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.	
Meets Standard	The board either 1) meets standard for both sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for one sub-indicator and exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, or 3) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator and approaches standard for one sub-indicator.	
Exceeds Standard	The board exceeds standard for both sub-indicators.	
Sub-indicators	Rating	
3.2a. The board has diverse members with essential skillsets where all members are contributing.	DNMS	The board did most of the following: - Board experiences lack diverse and strategic skills. - The board met quorum at less than 80% of meetings. - Board committees were rarely represented in meetings.

Core Question 3 Report: 2024-25
Emma Donnan Elementary & Middle School

	AS	The board did most of the following: - Board experiences include one of the following skillsets: law, finance, or academics. - The board met quorum at 80% of meetings. - Committees were represented at 80% of meetings.
	MS	The board did most of the following: - Board members mostly reflect the student population or measurable goals were set for recruitment. - Board experiences include two of the following skillsets: law, finance, or academics. - The board met quorum at 90% of meetings. - Committees were represented at 90% of meetings.
	ES	The board did all the following: - Board members reflect the student population or measurable goals were set for recruitment. - Board experiences include law, finance, and academics. - The board met quorum at 100% of meetings. - Committees and members were represented and contributing at every meeting.
3.2b. The board uses clear and accurate data as part of a formal tracking system to monitor school health.	DNMS	The board does not have goals and/or a way to monitor their progress.
	AS	The board did most of the following: - There is no evidence of a formal tracking system in place. - Targets include a combination of academic, finance, and operational indicators. - The board has general goals, but only assesses progress once per year.
	MS	The board did most of the following: - The board exercises oversight of the financial and operational health of the school using clear and accurate data and a consistent set of metrics. - At minimum, targets include academic, finance, and operational indicators. - The board sets annual goals and discusses progress towards goals at least quarterly.
	ES	The board did all the following: - Exercised tight oversight of the health of the school using clear and accurate data and a consistent set of metrics. - At minimum, targets included academic, finance, and operational indicators. - Set annual goals and discusses progress towards goals at all board meetings.
Basis for Rating/Additional Details		
In the 2024-25 school year, Emma Donnan began the year with eight board members with backgrounds in law, finance, nonprofit, and more. One new member was added during the year, while two members rolled off or resigned. Overall, the board's composition reflected the student population in both demographics and skill sets. The board met quorum at 100% of board meetings with a representative of each committee present at every board meeting. The board began the school year with annual governance, financial, and operation goals that were closely aligned with the school's overarching goals. To ensure progress, the board committed to providing regular updates, actively monitoring outcomes, and maintaining its goal dashboard throughout the year. Artifacts and Data Sources: Board Meeting Minutes, Board Roster, Board Goals Dashboard, Board Observation		
3.3. Does the organization satisfactorily comply with governance obligations?		
Does Not Meet Standard	The organization does not meet standard on two or more sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.	

Approaching Standard	The organization either 1) approaches standard for all four sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator, 3) approaches standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator, 4) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, meets for one, approaches for one, and does not meet for one; and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.	
Meets Standard	The organization either 1) meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for two sub-indicators, or 2) meets standard for three sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator, 3) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, meets for one, and approaches for two sub-indicators, 4) meets standard for all sub-indicators.	
Exceeds Standard	The organization exceeds standard for one sub-indicator and meets standard for the rest.	
Sub-indicators	Rating	
3.3a. Compliance Document Submission	DNMS	The organization submitted fewer than 75% of compliance documents on-time.
	AS	The organization submitted 75-85% of compliance documents on-time.
	MS	The organization submitted 86-94% of compliance documents on-time.
	ES	The organization submitted at least 95% of compliance documents on-time.
3.3b. Charter Compliance	DNMS	The organization was out of compliance with multiple sections of its charter and/or applicable law or was unable to resolve several violations during the school year.
	AS	The organization was out of compliance with one or more sections of its charter and/or applicable law but worked to resolve the issue(s) during the school year.
	MS	The organization remained in compliance with all sections of its charter and applicable laws.
3.3c. Compliance with OEI's Incident Communication Policy	DNMS	In the event of a material incident, the organization did not comply with OEI's Incident Communication Policy.
	MS	In the event of a material incident, the organization complied with OEI's Incident Communication Policy.
3.3d. Compliance with Indiana Open Door Law	DNMS	The board failed to comply with IODL on multiple occasions and/or did not resolve issues at subsequent meetings.
	AS	The board failed to comply with IODL at one meeting but resolved issues at subsequent meetings.
	MS	The board complied with IODL at all meetings.
Basis for Rating/Additional Details		
Emma Donnan's overall on-time compliance submission rate is determined by dividing the total number of compliance items due throughout the year by the total school's total on-time document submissions. The school achieved a submission rate of 100%. The board continued to demonstrate compliance with all sections of its charter and relevant laws. No material incidents occurred, and the board maintained regular communication with OEI in addition to scheduled meetings. The board also remained fully compliant with all components of the IODL throughout the school year. Artifacts and Data Sources: Board Meeting Minutes, Charter Achievement Portal (CAP), School Documentation, Board Observation		
3.4. Is the school and/or network leader strong in their academic and organizational leadership?		

Does Not Meet Standard	The organization does not meet standard on two or more sub-indicators with no evidence of a credible plan to address the issues.	
Approaching Standard	The organization either 1) approaches standard for all four sub-indicators, 2) meets standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator, 3) approaches standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds standard for one sub-indicator, meets for one, approaches for one, and does not meet for one; and may or may not have a credible plan to address the issues.	
Meets Standard	The organization either 1) meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for two sub-indicators, or 2) meets standard for three sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator, 3) exceeds standard for three sub-indicators and does not meet standard for one sub-indicator 4) exceeds standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for two sub-indicators 5) meets standard for all sub-indicators.	
Exceeds Standard	The organization exceeds standard for at least two sub-indicators and meets standard for the rest.	
Sub-indicators	Rating	
3.4a. School and/or network leaders show a clear track record of success	DNMS	The organization has an average of Does Not Meet Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
	AS	The organization has an average of Approaches Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
	MS	The organization has an average of Meets Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
	ES	The organization has an average of Exceeds Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
3.4b. School and/or network leaders are fully present and give data-driven updates to the board.	DNMS	- Attended fewer than 60% of board meetings. - Did not present on academic or financial outcomes or presentations were not accurate. - Did not present on school trends and/or there were no plans to address concerns.
	AS	- Attended 60% of board meetings. - Did not present on academic or financial outcomes or presentations were not accurate. - Informed the board when trends declined but did not adjust course accordingly.
	MS	- Attended 80% of board meetings. - Presented transparent and accurate academic and financial information. - Made mid-course adjustments to improve results when trends declined.
	ES	- Attended 100% of board meetings. - Presented transparent and accurate academic and financial information. - Made mid-course adjustments to improve results when trends declined.
3.4c. School and/or network leadership collaborates with the board to handle school-level complaints and concerns.	DNMS	- The board was unaware of several issues or concerns at the school level. - There is little to no evidence of collaboration to resolve issues.
	AS	- The board was not always aware of or brought on in a timely manner regarding school concerns or issues. - There is evidence of some collaboration between board and school leadership to resolve issues.
	MS	Leadership did at least two the following when concerns arose:

Core Question 3 Report: 2024-25
Emma Donnan Elementary & Middle School

		- Presented thorough data to the board. - Collaborated with the board to develop solutions that centered the best interests of students. - Resolved most school-level issues or complaints.
	ES	Leadership did all of the following when concerns arose: - Presented thorough data to the board. - Collaborated with the board to develop solutions that centered the best interests of students. - Resolved all school-level issues or complaints.
3.4d. The school and/or network maintains leadership stability in key administrative positions with a clear plan for succession.	DNMS	- School leadership was unstable with significant administrative turnover. - School leadership changes disrupted school operations, student success, or charter compliance.
	AS	- School leadership was unstable with minimal administrative turnover. - School leadership changes disrupted school operations, student success, or charter compliance.
	MS	- School leadership was stable with minimal administrative turnover. - School leadership changes had minimal disruption on school operations, student success, or charter compliance.
	ES	- School leadership was stable with minimal administrative turnover. - School leadership changes did not disrupt school operations, student success, or charter compliance.
Basis for Rating/Additional Details		
For the 3.4a sub-indicator, the results of the 2023-24 Core Question 1 Academic Accountability Report (the most recent available) were reviewed and averaged. CQ1 reports are based on test data—both state-audited and school-reported—as well as attendance data, test data broken out by student subgroup, and test data that compares the school’s performance to that of the students who would have been assigned to the school based on their address. The school had a promising year, with a notable achievement of 83.3% of third graders passing IREAD-3. For additional information on academic progress, you can find the report below. Meeting minutes and board meeting observations show that the school leadership team, including the Executive Director, Chief Operations Officer, and more, attended all board meetings and provided updates as needed based on clear, accurate data. Artifacts and Data Sources: 2023-24 Emma Donnan Core Question 1 Academic Accountability Report		