Minutes of the Board of Directors
November 17, 2025

The meeting was convened by Bill Harris at 4:03 p.m. at Avondale Meadows Academy. The following were present:

Board:

Jake Crouch	Marielle Rujevcan
Carlston Elliott	Jetta Vaugh - Phone
Bill Harris	
Sarah Lofton	
Abby McDonough - Phone	

Votes were taken by verbal role call for each topic requiring a vote. All Motions were carried unanimously.

Staff/Others:

Darius Adamson, Executive Director	Aunye Hockett, Principal, AMA - Phone
Carvis Herron, Director of Operations	Bilen Mulugeta, Principal, VAR-MS
Kandis Pearson, Director of Academics	Ciara Jones, Principal, AMMS
Janie Seivers, Director of Business Affairs	Alycia Villecco, Principal, VAR-EL
Kristen Stratton, Director of Student Services	Tammy Chaney – Milestone Accounting - phone
	Jennifer McVey – Barnes Dennig CPA

Public Comments:
Connect To Purpose:

This year's Pajama Drive is moving full speed ahead. We are gathering sizes for every student and have begun making purchases. Thanks to Blue and Co, we received ~ $1000 in donations!

Approval of Minutes

The September 30, 2025 board meeting minutes were presented.

MOTION: Approve the September 30, 2025 minutes as presented.
Jacob Crouch made the motion, Sarah Lofton seconded. Motion carried.

Finance Committee Brief:

UNITED SCHOOLS OF INDIANAPOLIS
Financial Statement Summary
For Period Ending October 31, 2025

Cash on Hand:	2,384,251	Days Cash on Hand		
Investments:	140,654		All Funds	Unrestricted
Total Funds Available:	2,524,905		(OEI)	(Bond)
Restricted net of OEI/Vital:	978,736	AMA:	88	32
Unrestricted	1,546,169	VAR:	81	53
		AMMS:	76	53
		USI:	136	-53
		Consolidated:	89	34

Outstanding Receivables:	713,062	Debt Service Coverage projection:	
Outstanding Payables:	289,385	Budgeted for 6/30/26:	0.70
		Projected for 6/30/26:	0.42
		Required:	1.10

Net Operating Income:

Avondale Meadows	(155,952)	Budgeted:	(177,112)
Vision Academy	(228,759)	Budgeted:	(167,031)
Avondale Meadows MS	(32,837)	Budgeted:	(59,693)
USI	(421,842)	Budgeted:	(98,076)
Consolidated	(839,390)		(501,913)

REVENUE:
- Overall Revenue: over budget by $194k after extraordinary income recognition for VITAL
- Private Funding: under budget by $117k
- Federal Funding: over budget by $294k
- State Funding: under budget by $282k
- Overall Net Income (Loss) is ($839k) after extraordinary income and expenses

EXPENSES:
- Overall expenses are $531k over budget after extraordinary expenses

MOTION: Approve the October 31, 2025 financials as presented.
Sarah Lofton made the motion, Jacob Crouch seconded. Motion carried.

- Audit Results - Jennifer McVey from Barnes Dennig CPA's presented the FY25 Audit results. Once again, there were no matters to be reported due to compliance issues, internal control issues or findings in the financial statements. This was another clean audit!

MOTION: Motion to approve the FY25 Audited Financial Statements, as presented.
Jacob Crouch made the motion, Carlston Elliott seconded. Motion carried.

- Health Insurance Premiums – IU Health is getting out of the insurance business so USI will switch to Anthem for employee coverage. We are still negotiating rates but it looks as if there will be little to no increase in premiums. Unfortunately, we do need to increase the employee portion of the premiums. Janie and Mr. Adamson are still working to finalized the amounts. Open Enrollment begins after Thanksgiving so all of the details will be worked out by then and communicated to the staff. We are pleased with the both the policies and premiums proposed.

- Budget Modifications - The Finance Team continues to work through the current budget, presenting multiple scenarios to help finish stronger this fiscal year.

    o We are expecting to hear if we have been awarded the $3.75M grant from Lilly.
    o We have made a few personnel reductions simply by not filling open positions, thus keeping us from cutting anyone from our current staff.
    o We have cut expenses and secured additional funding in a variety of ways, all allowing us to help the bottom line.
    o This is a moving target with new factors to consider daily. Mr. Adamson, is evaluating the Lilly budget that was submitted with the grant application to ensure the staffing matches the program.

Governance Committee Brief:

- Annual Goals
    o Maintain Board membership of 8-10 members
    o Recruit Board members who reflect the communities we serve
    o Maintain annual rating of Meet or Exceed Standard on Core Question 3.

- Review Core Question 3. See Addendum A.

Academic Committee Brief:

- AMA had their Core Question 4 site visit for their mid-charter review. The team gave positive feedback offering great encouragement our staff.

- Dashboards:

Principal Highs and Lows
AMA High: Operation Warm provided winter coats for every student!, creative approach helping our students dealing with grief, Great site review (top 5) Low: Suspension rate, staff internalization of lessons, keeping the standard high
AMMS High: Reduced OSS rates from prior year, reduced tardies from prior month, attendance seeing steady increase, evidence of strong instruction. Low: BOY data showed sing digit projected proficiency
VAR-EL High: Growing Community and University Partnerships, iReady Success, Strong attendance momentum, realignment of Tier 1 and Tier 2 Instruction, strong Instruction Coach presence in classrooms Low:
VAR-MS High: Improved staff and student attendance, 97% Parent Engagement, stronger Tier 1 instruction Low: Teacher need to improve in preparation and execution of lessons to capitalize on the 94% engagement from students.

Meeting adjourned at 5:04 pm.

ATTEST: _Sarah P. Lofton_____   02/23/2026_____
       Sarah Lofton, Secretary   Date

Addendum A

OFFICE of EDUCATION INNOVATION

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. CQ 3 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 14 2019-20	Year 15 2020-21	Year 16 2021-22	Year 18 2022-23	Year 19 2023-24	Year 20 2024-25	Year 21 2025-26
3.1. Does the board practice strong governance oversight?				ES	ES	**ES**	
3.2. Is the board active, knowledgeable, diverse, and does it work toward a strategic vision?	MS	ES	ES	ES	ES	**MS**	
3.3. Does the organization satisfactorily comply with governance obligations?	MS	MS	MS	MS	MS	**MS**	
3.4. Is the school leader strong in their academic and organizational leadership?				MS	ES	**MS**	

OFFICE of EDUCATION INNOVATION

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.

	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, Avondale Meadows Academy, Avondale Meadows Middle School, and Vision Academy were overseen by United Schools of Indianapolis' (USI) eight-member nonprofit board.

The board maintained a total of four committees, including governance, finance, development, and academics. The full board met bi-monthly, while committees met on the off months and all reported out at each 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.
	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, USI began the year with eight board members with backgrounds in finance, academics, HR, and more. Two board members were added, while one board member rolled off. Overall, the board's composition reflected the student population in both demographics and skill sets but would benefit from adding a board member with a legal background to replace the background of the board member who rolled off.

The board met quorum at 100% of board meetings with a representative of each committee present at every board meeting. Although the board had a dashboard to monitor network-wide goals, it was not actively maintained by the full board beyond school-level participation. Additionally, the dashboard did not include financial goals and assessed the network-wide dashboard once 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

USI's overall on-time compliance submission rate is determined by dividing the total number of compliance items due throughout the year by the school's total on-time document submissions. The network achieved a submission rate of 96%.

USI had a Notice of Deficiency issued during the 2022-23 school year for AMA and AMMS based on academic performance. The required actions were then updated during the 2023-24 school year, and those actions are still ongoing. USI did not experience any material incidents and upheld 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 outside of neglecting to notice one meeting.

Artifacts and Data Sources: Board Meeting Minutes, Charter Achievement Portal (CAP), School Documentation, Board Observation

3.4. Is the 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:

		• 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

Academic accountability reports for each school may be found in the supplemental information below. For this sub-indicator, prior academic results are reviewed and used to determine a school-specific rating. School ratings are then averaged to determine an overall 3.4a rating for the network.

Meeting minutes and board meeting observations show that the school leadership team, including the Executive Director, Director of Academics, each school principal, and more attended all board meetings and provided updates as needed based on clear, accurate data.

Artifacts and Data Sources: Board Meeting Minutes, Board Observation, 2023-24 Core Question 1 Academic Accountability Reports

Supplemental Information

This section includes school-specific information for sub-indicator 3.4a, presented in order of school age.

Avondale Meadows Academy

3.4a. The school leader shows a clear track record of success	
Does Not Meet Standard	The school has an average of Does Not Meet Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
Approaching Standard	The school has an average of Approaches Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
Meets Standard	The school has an average of Meets Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
Exceeds Standard	The school has an average of Exceeds Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
Basis for Rating/Additional Details	
For this 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 challenging year, with notable challenges in ELA and math proficiency with an overall 8.3% of students meeting their growth goals or proficiency on ILEARN. For additional information on academic progress, you can find the report here.	

Vision Academy

3.4a. The school leader shows a clear track record of success	
Does Not Meet Standard	The school has an average of Does Not Meet Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
Approaching Standard	The school has an average of Approaches Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
Meets Standard	The school has an average of Meets Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
Exceeds Standard	The school has an average of Exceeds Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
Basis for Rating/Additional Details	
For this 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 challenging year, with notable challenges in ELA and math proficiency with an overall 10.3% of students meeting their growth goals or proficiency on ILEARN. Although, the school did outperform students assigned schools in both ELA and math proficiency and growth which is a notable achievement. For additional information on academic progress, you can find the report here.	

Avondale Meadows Middle School

3.4a. The school leader shows a clear track record of success	
Does Not Meet Standard	The school has an average of Does Not Meet Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
Approaching Standard	The school has an average of Approaches Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
Meets Standard	The school has an average of Meets Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
Exceeds Standard	The school has an average of Exceeds Standard for its most recent academic accountability report.
Basis for Rating/Additional Details	

For this 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 challenging year, with notable challenges in ELA and math proficiency with an overall 5.5% of students meeting their growth goals or proficiency on ILEARN. The school did see improvement with outperforming students assigned schools in terms of ELA proficiency, math growth, and ELA growth than the year prior but stayed below students assigned schools in math proficiency.

For additional information on academic progress, you can find the report here.