

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, and consolidated network reports were created starting for 2022-23. 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		
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	MS	MS		
3.4. Is the school leader strong in their academic and organizational leadership?				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) meets 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) meets standard for two sub-indicators and approaches standard for one sub-indicator, 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 the other.	
Sub-indicators	Rating	
3.1a. The board exercises relentless focus on student academic outcomes.	DNMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The board is unable to gauge whether students are on track; or The board does not have an active academic committee.
	AS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The board was engaged during academic performance discussions. The board did not regularly discuss disaggregated data.
	MS	The board did three of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 review academic data and reports to the full board.
3.1b. The board has active committees with clear goals.	DNMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active committees rooted in student/school-level success. Each committee has goals aligned to student/school-level success.

3.1.c. The board has evaluation systems in place to monitor itself and school leadership.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
	DNMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organization is missing all evaluations; or The board did not submit a school leader succession plan.
	AS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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

The nine-member nonprofit board for the United Schools of Indianapolis network operated Avondale Meadows Academy, Avondale Middle School, and Vision Academy at Riverside during the 2023-24 school year. The organizer is also known as Avondale Meadows Academy, Inc.

During the school year, the board maintained four committees in academics, finance, governance, and development. Committees met regularly outside of scheduled board meetings providing updates and reporting out progress toward annual goals at full board meetings.

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

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, 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	
	DNMS	The board did most of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board experiences lack diverse and strategic skills. The board met quorum at less than 80% of meetings. Board committees were rarely represented in meetings.

3.2a. The board has diverse members with essential skillsets where all members are contributing.	AS	The board did most of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The board does not have goals and/or a way to monitor their progress.
	AS	The board did most of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 2023-24 school year, United Schools of Indianapolis began the year with nine board members with backgrounds including law, finance, education, accounting, and healthcare. The board added three new board members and had four members who rolled off, resulting in an eight-member board. The board met quorum at 100% of board meetings with a representative of each committee present at every board meeting. The board members represent the student population in terms of demographics and skillset.

The board began the school year with a comprehensive set of annual academic, financial, and governance objectives that were closely aligned with the school's overarching goals. To ensure diligent progress, the board committed to quarterly assessments, actively monitoring, and updating their goal dashboard throughout the year.

Artifacts and Data Sources: Board Meeting Minutes, Board Roster, Board Goals Dashboard

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, 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 at 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 submitted throughout the year by the school's total on-time document submissions. USI achieved a submission rate of 98%.

USI had a Notice of Noncompliance issued during the 2022-23 school year based on academic performance and has completed 65% of their required actions. The additional required actions are still ongoing. USI did not experience any material incidents and upheld regular communication with OEI in addition to scheduled meetings. Additionally, the board maintained compliance with all components of the IODL throughout the school year.

Artifacts and Data Sources: Charter Achievement Portal (CAP), School Documentation

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, 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attended 80% of board meetings. Presented transparent and accurate academic and financial information. Made mid-course adjustments to improve results when trends declined.
	ES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attended 100% of board meetings. Presented transparent and accurate academic and financial information. Made mid-course adjustments to improve results when trends declined.
	DNMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The board was not always aware of or brought on in a timely manner regarding school concerns or issues.

3.4c. School and/or network leadership collaborates with the board to handle school-level complaints and concerns.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School leadership was unstable with significant administrative turnover. School leadership changes disrupted school operations, student success, or charter compliance.
	AS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School leadership was unstable with minimal administrative turnover. School leadership changes disrupted school operations, student success, or charter compliance.
	MS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School leadership was stable with minimal administrative turnover. School leadership changes had minimal disruption on school operations, student success, or charter compliance.
	ES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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, attended all board meetings and provided updates as needed based on clear, accurate data.

Artifacts and Data Sources: Board Meeting Minutes and Observation, USI’s 2022-23 Core Question 1 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	
<p>For this sub-indicator, the results of the 2022-23 Core Question 1 Academic Accountability Report (the most recent available) were reviewed and averaged. CQ1 reports are based on state test data, both state-audited and school reported; attendance data, test data broken out by student subgroup, and test data that compares the school's performance to that of schools' students would've been assigned to attend based on their address. AMA had a challenging year with meeting proficiency and growth goals in both ELA and math but saw significant growth in their attendance rate compared to the prior year.</p> <p>For additional information on academic progress, you can find the report here.</p>	

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	
<p>For this sub-indicator, the results of the 2022-23 Core Question 1 Academic Accountability Report (the most recent available) were reviewed and averaged. CQ1 reports are based on state test data, both state-audited and school reported; attendance data, test data broken out by student subgroup, and test data that compares the school's performance to that of schools' students would've been assigned to attend based on their address. VA saw success in their proficiency and growth data in both ELA and math compared to their students' assigned schools, but overall had challenges in meeting both ELA and math goals.</p> <p>For additional information on academic progress, you can find the report here.</p>	

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	
<p>For this sub-indicator, the results of the 2022-23 Core Question 1 Academic Accountability Report (the most recent available) were reviewed and averaged. CQ1 reports are based on state test data, both state-audited and school reported; attendance data, test data broken out by student subgroup, and test data that compares the school's performance to that of schools' students would've been assigned to attend based on their address. AMMS had a promising year in terms of providing their students with an equitable education based on subgroup but had overall challenges in meeting both ELA and math goals.</p> <p>For additional information on academic progress, you can find the report here.</p>	