

Core Question 2: Is the organization in sound fiscal health?

The Financial Performance Framework, outlined in Core Question 2, gauges both near term financial health and longer term financial sustainability while accounting for key financial reporting requirements.


2.1. Short-term Health: Does the school demonstrate the ability to pay its obligations in the next 12 months?							
Indicator Targets	Does not meet standard	The school does not meet standard on 2 or more of the five sub-indicators shown below.					
	Approaching standard	The school approaches standard for all 5 sub-indicators shown below, OR meet standard on 3 sub-indicators, while approaching on the remaining 2 OR meets standard on 4 sub-indicators, while not meeting standard for the final sub-indicator.					
	Meets standard	The school meets standard for 4 sub-indicators shown below, while approaching standard on the final sub-indicator.					
	Exceeds standard	The school meets standard for all 5 sub-indicators.					
2.1 Rating	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	Year 12	Year 13	Year
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-
	DNMS	DNMS					
Sub-indicator Ratings	Sub-indicator	Sub-indicator targets				Result	Rating
	Enrollment Ratio	DNMS	Enrollment ratio is less than or equal to 89%			48%	DNMS
		AS	Enrollment ratio is between 90 – 98%				
		MS	Enrollment ratio equals or exceeds 99%				
	February Enrollment Variance	DNMS	Enrollment ratio is less than or equal to 89%			114%	MS
		AS	Enrollment ratio is between 90 – 95%				
		MS	Enrollment ratio equals or exceeds 95%				
	Current Ratio	DNMS	Current ratio is less than or equal to 1.0			2.25	MS
		AS	Current ratio is between 1.0 – 1.1				
		MS	Current ratio equals or exceeds 1.1				
	Days Cash on Hand	DNMS	Days cash on hand is less than or equal to 30			22	DNMS
		AS	Days cash on hand is between 30-45				
		MS	Days cash on hand equals or exceeds 45				
Debt Default	DNMS	Default or delinquent payments identified				Meets	MS
	MS	Not in default or delinquent					

Hope Academy received a rating of **Does Not Meet Standard** for Core Question 2.1 for the 2014-15 school year.

Based on data from the September 2014 count day, the school **did not meet standard** for the enrollment targets stated in its charter agreement, enrolling 29 students despite promising to serve 60 students in its charter. The school added four students between September and February, and therefore **met standard** for February Enrollment Variance.

The school had more current assets than current liabilities (those due in the next 12 months) and as a result **met standard** for this sub-indicator.


Enrollment Variance Ratio



Hope Academy ended the year with 22 days of cash on hand. This means that if payments to the school had stopped or been delayed post June 30, 2015, the school would have been able to operate for 22 more days. As a result, the school **did not meet standard** for this indicator.

Finally, the school successfully met its debt obligations based on the information that Blue and Company, the school's auditor, provided. Since the school **did not meet standard** for two out of five of the sub-indicators, it **Does Not Meet Standard** for core question 2.1.

Days Cash on Hand



2.2. Long-term Health: Does the organization demonstrate long-term financial health?							
Indicator Targets	Does not meet standard	The school does not meet standard on any of the 3 sub-indicators OR meets standard on 1 sub-indicator but does not meet standard on the remaining 2.					
	Approaching standard	The school meets standard on 2 of the sub-indicators while not meeting on the third, OR approaches standard on all 3 sub-indicators.					
	Meets standard	The school meets standard on 2 of the sub-indicators and approaches standard on the third.					
	Exceeds standard	The school meets standard for all 3 sub-indicators.					
2.2 Rating	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	Year 12	Year 13	Year
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-
	ES	ES					
Sub-indicator Ratings	Sub-indicator	Sub-indicator targets				Result	Rating
	Aggregate Three-Year Net Income	DNMS	Aggregate 3-year net income is negative.			\$166,707 (aggregate)	MS
		AS	Aggregate 3-year net income is positive, but most recent year is negative.				
		MS	Aggregate three year net income is positive, and most recent year is positive.			\$62,398 (current year)	
	Debt to Asset Ratio	DNMS	Debt to Asset ratio equals or exceeds .95			.33	MS
		AS	Debt to Asset ratio is between .9 - .95				
		MS	Debt to Asset ratio is less than or equal to .9				
	Debt Service Coverage (DSC) Ratio	DNMS	DSC ratio is less than or equal to 1.05			N/A	N/A
		AS	DSC ratio is between 1.05-1.2				
		MS	DSC ratio equals or exceeds 1.2				

Hope Academy received a rating of **Exceeds Standard** for Core Question 2.2 for the 2014-15 school year.

The school **met standard** for the net income sub-indicator. It had an aggregate three-year net income of **\$166,707** and a current year net income of **\$62,398**. It should be noted, however, that the school required significant contributions and donations from Fairbanks in order to meet standard on this indicator. During the 2014-15 school year, the school received a \$385,709 donation and a \$253,706 equity transfer from Fairbanks in order to end the year with positive net income. Additionally, the school received \$93,747 in contributions.


Without all of these mechanisms, the school would have operated at a \$670,764 loss. The school has gone through similar procedures over the past several years. Currently, Fairbanks and the school are working on implementing a three year plan towards financial sustainability for the school.

The school also **met standard** on the debt to asset ratio sub-indicator. The school had a ratio of **.33** meaning that its total assets exceeded its total debts.

Finally, the school had no long-term liabilities. Therefore, it was not necessary to calculate the debt service coverage ratio.

Because the school met standard on all of the possible sub-indicators, Hope Academy received a rating of **Exceeds Standard** for the 2014-2015 school year.

Three-Year Net Income



2.3. Does the organization demonstrate it has adequate financial management and systems?							
Indicator Targets	Does not meet standard		The school does not meet standard on 1 of the sub-indicators.				
	Approaching standard		The school meets standards on 1 sub-indicator, but approaches standard for the remaining sub-indicator.				
	Meets standard		The school meets standard on both sub-indicators.				
2.3 Rating	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	Year 12	Year 13	Year 14
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
	MS	MS					
Sub-indicator Ratings	Sub-indicator	Sub-indicator targets					Rating
	Financial Audit	DNMS	The school receives an audit with multiple, significant deficiencies, materials weakness, or has an ongoing concern.				MS
		AS	The school receives a clean audit opinion with few significant deficiencies noted, but no material weaknesses.				
		MS	The school receives a clean audit opinion.				
	Financial Reporting Requirements	DNMS	The school fails to satisfy financial reporting requirements.				MS
		AS	The school satisfies all financial reporting requirements.				

Hope Academy received a rating of **Meets Standard** for Core Question 2.3 for the 2014-15 school year.

The school **met standard** for its annual accrual based audit because it received a clean audit report with no material weaknesses or significant deficiencies.

In addition, the school **met standard** for its on time financial reporting, as it submitted 77% of its financial compliance documents into OEI in a timely manner. It should be noted, however, that while the school did turn in their audit to SBOA before the November 30, 2015 deadline, they did not submit it to OEI until December 30th, 2015.

By **meeting standard** on these sub-indicators, Hope Academy received a rating of **Meets Standard** for Core Question 2.3 for the 2014-2015 school year.