

SCHOOL OVERVIEW

Rainier Valley Leadership Academy (RVLA)

6020 Rainier Ave S, Seattle, WA 98118	
School Contact	(206) 659-0956
School Website	http://myrvla.org
Neighborhood Location	Seattle Public Schools
Leadership	Chief Executive Officer: Baionne Coleman
School Mission	We fulfill our vision by ensuring scholars are college and career ready by providing an anti-racist education, opportunities for collaborative problem solving, and community leadership experiences.
Education Program Terms & Design Elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching and Instruction: Students will experience effective teaching aligned to our teaching framework and multiple assessments to measure growth and inform instruction. • College-going Culture: Students will experience college-going culture by participating in academic counseling, accessing college tours, and taking college preparatory core content. • Eliminating Barriers to Learning: Students will access the academic intervention, counseling and clinical services as necessary to break down the barriers to learning. • Promoting Leadership and Life Skills: Students will learn a broad set of tools to prepare them for college and beyond through student leadership opportunities, partnerships with community programs, and attending an Advisory program that will build students' academic behaviors and college awareness.
Grades Served	6-11
First Year of Operation	2017 - 18
Total Student Enrollment	158 Students

2020-21 Student Demographics

STUDENT GROUPS

Special Education	23.4%
Limited English	12.0%
Low Income	77.8%

GENDER

Male	51.9%
Female	48.1%

RACE / ETHNICITY

Asian	1.9%
Black / African American	71.5%
Hispanic / Latino of any race(s)	14.6%
Two or More Races	9.5%
White	2.5%

INTRODUCTION

Charter renewal marks a critical juncture for a school, and the renewal decision is one of the Charter School Commission's most important responsibilities as a charter school authorizer. At renewal, the Commission must determine whether a school has met its public commitments to the children and families it serves, as well as to the community. The renewal process requires thorough analyses of a comprehensive body of quantitative and qualitative data based on annual performance reviews over the charter term; the school's renewal application; and a renewal site visit. It culminates in a Commission decision to renew or non-renew the charter.

This performance report constitutes the first stage of the renewal process which begins in the spring of the year before the contract expires. This report summarizes the school's performance record to date based on data required by the charter contract and the Commission's school performance standards. The report identifies weaknesses and concerns that might adversely impact the Commission's renewal decision or the length of a renewal term. This report *does not* contain a recommendation regarding charter renewal because the Commission does not yet have all information relevant to that decision. The school has thirty days to respond to this report.¹

The school may respond to the performance report. In reviewing responses, the Commission will give particular attention and weight to factual corrections, clarifications, and updates for which the school provides documentation. In addition, the school must submit a renewal application. The renewal application provides an opportunity to go beyond the data contained in the performance report in supporting the school's case for renewal. It is also an opportunity to describe improvements that the school has undertaken or plans to undertake. The renewal application will also ask the school to articulate plans for the coming charter term, particularly with respect to plans that would require material changes to the existing contract terms.²

In the fall of the school's renewal year, the Commission will conduct a renewal site visit. The site visit provides an important opportunity for the Commission to experience a school's day-to-day operation, to observe the culture, and to gather qualitative and quantitative evidence that helps to document and illuminate school performance. When charter renewal is at stake, the visit plays a particularly important role in providing context for the school's overall record of performance and its plans for a new charter term.

Following completion of the renewal visit, the Commission will prepare a renewal inspection report followed by a renewal recommendation report. The renewal recommendation will present a recommendation for renewal or non-renewal and will summarize the evidence basis for the recommendation including relevant evidence from the performance report, the school's renewal application, the renewal visit, and any additional relevant performance information. The Commission is tentatively scheduled to make all renewal decisions before the end of the calendar year.³ Schools will have an opportunity to respond; to present testimony and supporting documents at a public meeting; to

¹ See R.C.W. § 28A.710.190(2).

² See R.C.W. § 28A.710.190(3).

³ The sequencing and timeline for each stage of the renewal process will be based on the Commission's published Renewal Application Timeline (dated 5/21/21); however, the Commission will adapt this schedule based on school and Commission operational constraints in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

have legal representation; and to call witnesses. The Commission will document all decisions in writing with the reasons for the decision.⁴

Renewal Process Timeline		
Date	Timeframe	Activity
March - May of School's 4 th Year of Operation (2021)	March - May	Authorizer staff meets with each charter school to discuss the school's charter contract renewal, including the school's performance in comparison to the expectations established in the authorizer's performance frameworks
May 21		Authorizer issues performance report and contract renewal application guidance to charter school and posts performance report to authorizer's website OR Authorizer notifies charter school that it is ineligible for renewal based on reason(s) outlined in WAC 108-40-090; school may appeal this decision within 20 days of notice issuance; a public proceeding and authorizer action (per WAC 108-40-100) would replace the remainder of this timeline.
June 21	Within 30 days ⁵ of receipt of authorizer issued performance report	Charter school may submit a response to the performance report
July 12	July 12 - November 30	Public comment period opens
July 12		Charter school deadline to notify authorizer of intent to apply (NOI) for renewal of charter contract or cease operations at the expiration of charter contract term
August 6		Charter school renewal application deadline
September 3	August 16-September 3	Authorizer and charter school staff meet and develop renewal inspection priorities
October 15		Charter school renewal inspection deadline
November 1	Within 14 days of renewal inspection	Authorizer issues renewal inspection report
November 15	Within 10 days of receipt of renewal inspection report	Charter School may submit to the authorizer a written response to the renewal inspection report
November 30		Public comment deadline
November 19		Authorizer staff recommendation reports released to authorizing body (CSC or district board)
December 10	Within 20 Days of receipt of recommendation report	Charter school request to respond to recommendation report deadline
December 16		Authorizer resolution meeting
June 30, 2022	December 17 – June 30	Establish the terms for the next charter contract; authorizing board and charter board both vote in public meetings to ratify new contract

⁴ See R.C.W. § 28A.710.190(3)-(4).

⁵ Any reference to days (30, 20, 14, and 10) are defined as calendar days, excluding holidays, not working days.

REPORT LAYOUT

The report is structure in alignment with the three Performance Frameworks: Academic, Organizational and Financial. The school's performance is summarized by framework, including the Commission's assessment of that performance. The last section of the report contains information regarding concerns the Commission has regarding a charter school's performance that, if not remedied, may jeopardize the school's position in seeking renewal.

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

The school’s academic performance is based on the standards and targets established in the Academic Performance Framework (APF) consistent with the requirements of Washington’s charter school law. The APF contains measures and metrics for student academic proficiency, student academic growth, achievement gaps, attendance, high school graduation rates and postsecondary readiness, and school-specific measures where applicable.⁶

The APF contains measures that have been grouped according to:

- 1. STATE AND FEDERAL ACCOUNTABILITY RESULTS answering the question:**
Is the charter school meeting performance expectations based on the Washington School Improvement Framework?
- 2. GEOGRAPHIC COMPARISONS answering the question:**
How are charter school students performing compared to the schools that students would otherwise attend?
- 3. COMPARISON TO SCHOOLS SERVING SIMILAR STUDENTS answering the question:**
How are charter school students performing compared to schools serving similar students?
- 4. SCHOOL SPECIFIC ACADEMIC GOALS answering the question:**
Did the school meet its school specific academic goals?

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE RATINGS

The APF measures combine or “roll up” to an overall academic rating. The overall rating is based on the school’s cumulative record of academic performance; however, the Commission gives particular attention to performance trends and weighs recent performance more heavily.⁷ The overall rating helps provide clarity to schools and the public about the school’s academic performance and standing. It helps to ensure consistency in Commission decision-making and support parents as they navigate their public school options. Following are the rating tiers:

RATINGS

Tier	Rating	Performance
1	Exceeds Standard	School is exceeding performance expectations and is on par with the highest-performing schools in the state.
2	Meets Standard	School is consistently meeting performance expectations.
3	Does Not Meet Standard	School shows weakness in one or more academic areas. Possible intervention.
4	Falls Far Below Standard	School is consistently failing to meet academic performance expectations. Likely intervention; possible revocation.

NOTE: If a school does not have at least one year of SBA data or if more than one of the four indicators is missing, an overall tier rating will not be calculated.

⁶ See R.C.W. § 28A.710.170 (requiring school performance provisions based on a performance framework and specifying categories for measures and metrics).

⁷ As mentioned above and below, the impact that the COVID-19 pandemic has had on performance data is a critical consideration for the Commission for this year’s renewal process.

RENEWAL TIERS

Based upon the most current data combined with trend data from the life cycle of the current charter contract term, charter schools whose Academic Performance Framework scores result in:

- A Tier 1 or 2 are presumed to be renewed;
- A Tier 3 rating, renewal is in question; and
- A Tier 4 rating, non-renewal is presumed.

Data for academic performance derive primarily from results of the state's annual public school assessments. State assessment results from a school year are typically available in the fall of the following school year. The academic performance section of this report is based on data from the first three years of the school's operation. The Commission will incorporate data from the fourth year, 2020-21, as part of the renewal recommendation in the fall of 2021. To the extent that 2020-21 state accountability data are not available due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the renewal recommendation will be based on data through the 2018-19 school year supplemented with more recent interim and qualitative data as the Commission deems necessary and appropriate.

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE RESULTS

RVLA

	INDICATOR	MEASURE	Weight	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
1a	WSIF Score	All Students	50%	N/A	D	N/A
		Subgroups		N/A	D	N/A
2a1	Proficiency Geographic Comparison	ELA	50%	F	F	N/A
		Math		F	D	N/A
		Science		N/A	N/A	N/A
2a2	Proficiency Subgroup Geog. Comparison	ELA	20%	F	D	N/A
		Math		D	M	N/A
		Science		N/A	N/A	N/A
2b1	Student Growth Geog. Comparison	ELA	20%	F	F	N/A
		Math		E	E	N/A
2b2	Student Subgroup Growth Geog. Comparison	ELA	20%	D	F	N/A
		Math		E	E	N/A
2c1	Grad Rate Geog. Comparison	All	20%	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Subgroup		N/A	N/A	N/A
2d	EL Progress Geog. Comparison	All	20%	F	F	N/A
		Subgroups		N/A	N/A	N/A
2e	Reg. Attendance Geog. Comparison	All	20%	M	M	N/A
		Subgroups		M	D	N/A
2f	9th graders on track Geog. Comparison	All	20%	N/A	F	N/A
		Subgroups		N/A	D	N/A
2g	Dual Credit Geog. Comparison	All	20%	N/A	F	N/A
		Subgroups		N/A	F	N/A
3a	Proficiency Regression	ELA	15%	F	F	N/A
		Math		D	M	N/A
		Science		N/A	N/A	N/A
3b	Grad Rate Regression		15%	N/A	N/A	
4a	School Specific Goals	#1	15%	M	D	N/A
		#2		N/A	D	N/A
Overall Tier Rating				N/A	3	N/A

E	Exceeds Standard
M	Meets Standard
D	Does Not Meet Standard
F	Falls Far Below Standard

PERCEIVED WEAKNESSES OR CONCERNS:

For this year's charter contract renewal process, it is critical that the Commission consider the impact that the COVID-19 pandemic has had on students, families, schools and data systems. While schools responded admirably to the crisis by ensuring students and families were supported, the assessment and data systems that the state and Commission use to determine a school's impact on student academic achievement were not so responsive. The primary assessment (Smarter Balanced Assessment) that the state and the Commission uses to measure student academic outcomes was not administered during the 2019-20 or the 2020-21 school years.

Adding to this challenge is the fact that RVLA, as an organization, restructured itself under new leadership at the beginning of the 2019-20 school-year. RVLA's organizational restructure, which the Commission approved, was designed to address many of the challenges RVLA faced when it was managed by Green Dot Public Schools Washington State (Green Dot). This lack of data presents both an opportunity and a challenge for both the Commission and RVLA regarding the actual impact that RVLA is having on student academic outcomes. RVLA's ability to work with Commission staff to provide additional qualitative and quantitative information regarding student academic outcomes will be critical to the Commission's ability to fully assess RVLA's academic programming. Commission staff look forward to working with RVLA throughout the renewal process to ensure that RVLA's impact is collectively understood.

For 2018-19, the most recent year for which comprehensive academic data are available for the current term, Rainier Valley Leadership Academy (RVLA) earned a Tier 3 (Does Not Meet) performance rating. Among the driving factors in the school's low performance rating were the school's overall and subgroup Washington School Improvement Framework (WSIF) performance ratings (Does Not Meet). Geographic comparisons for English Language Arts (ELA) proficiency and growth for all students (Does Not Meet and Falls Far Below, respectively) and disaggregated by student subgroups (Falls Far Below) also contributed to RVLA's Tier 3 rating. RVLA's geographic comparison outcome data for English Learners, 9th Grade on Track and dual credit attainment (Falls Far Below for each indicator) further contributed to the Tier 3 performance rating.

Notwithstanding that overall performance fell short of expectations, RVLA has notable bright spots in its 2018-19 academic outcomes. Students' subgroup proficiency, growth in math, and subgroup growth in math were strong in relation to the schools that RVLA students would otherwise have attended. Across all student groups, growth in 2018-19 was highest for Black/African American students.

While the school's 2018-19 academic performance data falls below expectations, a deeper analysis of the student growth data in ELA does provide the Commission information that RVLA's academic program is supporting student growth that the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) defines as 'typical'. This typical growth exists for all subgroups of students:

Group	ELA Median Growth Percentile SBA 2018-19			
	School	Assigned School*	Meets Standard?	
2b.1 All Students	44.5	56.0	Far Below	
American Indian/Alaskan Native	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Asian	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Black/African American	44.0	52.8	Far Below	
Hispanic/Latino	48.5	51.8	Not Met	
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	
White	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Two or More Races	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Students with Disabilities	40.0	53.8	Far Below	
English Language Learners	38.5	54.2	Far Below	
Low-Income	43.0	53.4	Far Below	
Female	42.0	57.7	Far Below	
Male	49.0	53.9	Far Below	
Overall Rating 2b.2			Far Below	
OSPI growth ranges:	Low (1-33)	Typical (34-49)	Typical (50-66)	High (67-99)
* The Assigned School Comparison (ASC) is the average performance of the assigned schools, weighted by the number of charter school students assigned to each school. N/A indicates insufficient number of students to report data.				

The bright spot for RVLA is their student math outcomes. RVLA’s math outcomes indicate that students are growing at a high typical rate for all subgroups of students except for Black/African American students who are growing at a high rate:

Group	Math SBA 2018-19		
	School	Assigned School*	Meets Standard?
2b.1 All Students	63.0	53.3	Exceeds
American Indian/Alaskan Native	N/A	N/A	N/A
Asian	N/A	N/A	N/A
Black/African American	67.0	48.1	Exceeds
Hispanic/Latino	53.0	47.0	Exceeds
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A
White	N/A	N/A	N/A
Two or More Races	N/A	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities	61.0	51.5	Exceeds

English Language Learners	58.0	52.9	Exceeds	
Low-Income	61.0	51.2	Exceeds	
Female	65.5	55.2	Exceeds	
Male	61.0	50.8	Exceeds	
Overall Rating 2b.2			Exceeds	
OSPI growth ranges:	Low (1-33)	Typical (34-49)	Typical (50-66)	High (67-99)
* The Assigned School Comparison (ASC) is the average performance of the assigned schools, weighted by the number of charter school students assigned to each school. N/A indicates insufficient number of students to report data.				

For the 2018-19 Academic Performance Report, RVLA did provide several responses to the ratings they received. RVLA reminded the Commission that it was undergoing a management re-organization and was making a series of personnel changes along with professional development offerings to staff that were designed to address the identified performance weaknesses. Additionally, RVLA recognized the challenges they faced and indicated a strong desire and strategy on how to not only address their students' needs but to restore trust with students and their families given the changes that RVLA was experiencing. These responses are important for the Commission to consider as it moves forward with its renewal decision.

Overall, the school's academic outcomes to date raise concerns about whether RVLA meets the Commission's academic performance criteria for charter renewal; however, it is also important to highlight the positive aspects of performance and to consider how the management change has and will continue to impact student performance.

ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE

“Organizational performance” refers to the school’s outcomes with respect to its legal obligations. The organizational performance standards measure the school’s compliance with legal and ethical requirements that are common to all charter schools. By focusing on common legal requirements, the organizational performance standards maximize each school’s operational autonomy consistent with the legislature’s intent for charter schools to serve as public school alternatives to traditional common schools.⁸ This framework articulates these obligations in six categories: Education Program; Financial Management & Oversight; Governance & Reporting; Students, Parents & Employees; School Environment; and Other Obligations. Each category has subcategories aligned to the school’s obligations as articulated in the charter contract.

The Commission uses a binary rating system to assess organizational performance. The school either “meets” or “does not meet” the requirement. This binary system is consistent with the notion that the school either meets or does not meet minimum expectations for the various requirements such as reporting deadlines or healthy and safety or procedural obligations for students with disabilities.

ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE RATINGS

No school or organization is perfect, and the existence of one or more “does not meet” ratings does not, in and of itself, indicate unsatisfactory organizational performance. The Commission looks for organizational performance that is predominantly compliant with no areas of repeated non-compliance. Based upon the most current data combined with trend data analysis from the life cycle of the current charter contract term:

- **Renewal is presumed** if a charter school’s performance meets the established expectations or whose actions demonstrates that remedies regarding deficiencies were successfully implemented.
- **Nonrenewal is presumed** if a charter school’s performance does not meet expectations or whose actions did not demonstrate that remedies were implemented regarding identified deficiencies.

The Commission rates organizational performance based primarily on data and results from the State Auditor’s Accountability Audit. This report is typically available 18 months following completion of the school’s July 1 to June 30 fiscal year. Thus, this section of the renewal report is based on results from the school’s first two years of operation (2017-18 and 2018-19). Where the state Accountability Audit raises concerns, the Commission will update with more current, unaudited compliance information. In addition, the Commission’s final renewal recommendation will incorporate organizational performance information from the school’s 2018-19 Accountability Audit.

Where there have been instances of non-compliance, the Commission staff will consider the following in the organizational performance analysis:

- 1) **Seriousness of the compliance issue.** For example, breach of health and safety requirements would generally be a more serious issue than the late filing of a report.
- 2) **Number and duration of non-compliance issues (non-communication or inability to work with Commission).** The Commission staff will weigh repeated non-compliance more heavily in its overall assessment.

⁸ See R.C.W. § 28A.710.020.

- 3) **Timeliness of the remedy.** If the school has remedied the issue promptly on its own initiative or following notification from the Commission, the Commission staff will weigh the violation less severely than if the school has not remedied the issue promptly.
- 4) **Current status.** Although the Commission considers the school's complete performance history relevant and applicable, it will generally weigh recent performance and current compliance status more heavily than past performance.

ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE RESULTS

RVLA

	INDICATOR	MEASURE	2017-18	2018-19
1a	Education Program	Material Terms of Charter Contract	M	M
1b		Education Requirements	M	M
1c		Students with Disabilities Rights	M	M
1d		English Language Learner Rights	M	M
2a	Financial Management & Oversight	Financial Reporting and Compliance	M	M
2b		Generally Accepted Accounting Principles	M	M
3a	Governance & Reporting	Governance Requirements	M	M
3b		Management Accountability	M	M
3c		Reporting Requirements	D	M
4a	Students, Parents & Employees Rights	Rights of Students	M	M
4b		Recurrent Enrollment	N/A	D
4c		Teacher and Staff Credentials	M	M
4d		Employee Rights	M	M
4e		Background Checks	M	M
5a	School Environment	Facilities and Transportation	M	M
5b		Health and Safety	M	M
5c		Information Management	M	M
6a	School Specific Goals	#1	M	D
6b		#2	M	N/A

PERCEIVED WEAKNESSES OR CONCERNS:

For the first two years of RVLA's existence, it was managed and supported by Green Dot. At the end of the 2018-19 school-year, Green Dot surprised its community and the Commission by announcing its decision to cease operations at two of the three charter public schools it was operating in Washington and to establish a new management structure and plan for RVLA. After a thorough process that included input from the RVLA community, the Commission at the request of Green Dot, agreed to the new management structure at RVLA. This agreement was codified via a charter contract amendment on January 30, 2020. While this agreement was codified in January, the new management structure was in place at the beginning of the 2019-20 school-year.

Due to the reporting processes and structures within Washington state, the impact that this new management structure is having on RVLA's organizational performance is not fully known; however, preliminary data gathered through the Commission quarterly school reviews and quarterly board observations indicate that RVLA's performance is on track to meet Commission expectations.

Beyond the current anecdotal information, this performance report also contains information about the first two years of RVLA's existence. During its first year of operation, RVLA met all but one of the Commission's expectations for organizational performance. For the area that did not meet Commission expectations, Reporting Requirements (late on 7 of 24 required submission), RVLA implemented changes that resulted in the school meeting expectations the following year. As for 2018-19, RVLA did not meet expectations on one measure (Recurrent Enrollment) and their organizational School Specific Goal.

Recurrent enrollment measures the number of students continuously enrolled from one year to the next. RVLA's recurrent enrollment target for 2018-19 was 74.61% but RVLA only attained a rate of 57.38%. RVLA's response explained that RVLA's new school facility was not ready for students at the beginning of the year, thus delaying the start of the school year. According to RVLA, this delay in opening caused some parents to withdraw their students.

RVLA's 2018-19 school specific goal measured the percentage of parents that would recommend RVLA to a friend (goal of 80%) with a target response rate of 35%. The school reported a response rate of 15% but had a 97% of parents recommending the school to a friend.

In sum, RVLA has had few organizational performance issues, has remedied those issues promptly, and is currently in good standing. Therefore, the school's overall record to date does not raise any concerns that would affect the school's ability to meet the organizational performance criteria for contract renewal.

FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

“Financial performance” refers to an assessment of a charter school’s financial health and viability. The Commission’s financial performance framework summarizes a school’s financial health based on two types of measures: “near term” indicators (measuring current viability) and “sustainability” indicators (measuring longer-term viability). The near-term indicators include Current Ratio, Unrestricted Days’ Cash, and Debt Default. The sustainability indicators include Total Margin, Debt-to-Asset Ratio, and Cash Flow. The Commission also considers enrollment variance as an informational measure but does not rate performance on this indicator. The measures incorporate historical (three-year) trends, current status, and future prospects in a way that, taken together, the measures provide an overall picture of financial health and identify areas of potential concern.

FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE RATINGS

For each of the measures, the Commission has based targets on industry standards for not-for-profit financial management and authorizer best practices. The Commission uses data from the school’s year-end audited financial statements along with more current financial data from unaudited quarterly financial reports. The calculations are based on *all* school funds, not just the general fund. Some financial measures have different targets for the early years of operation (years 1-2) from subsequent years (years 3 and beyond) to reflect the realities of start-up financial operations. Thus, the ratings for years 1-2 are based on slightly different criteria from the ratings beginning in year 3.

The Commission rates financial performance based on the school’s audited financials as conducted either by the State Auditor’s Office or by an independent financial audit consistent with the requirements of the charter contract and charter school law. This financial performance review is based on the three years of audited financials that are currently available. The Commission reviews but does not formally evaluate the school’s unaudited financials for the current school year unless it has identified a prior cause for concern. The final renewal recommendation will incorporate findings from the school’s 2019-20 audited financials.

Renewal Presumptions

Based upon the most current data combined with trend data analysis from life cycle of the current charter contract term:

- **Renewal is presumed** if a charter school’s financial performance demonstrates historic and future viability. In other words, a school who has demonstrated an ability to generate sufficient income to meet operating expenses and debt commitments is presumed to be renewed.
- **Nonrenewal is presumed** if a charter school’s financial performance demonstrates historic and future financial insolvency. In other words, a school that has demonstrated and/or is projecting an inability to pay its debts is presumed to be nonrenewed.

FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE RESULTS

RVLA

	INDICATOR	MEASURE	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
1a	Near Term Indicators	Current Ratio	M	M	M
1b		Unrestricted Days Cash	D	M	M
1c		Debt Default	M	M	M
2a	Sustainability Indicators	Total Margin	D	M	M
2b		Debt to Asset Ratio	D	D	M
2c		Cash Flow	N/A	M	M
	Info Only	Enrollment Variance	D	D	D

PERCEIVED WEAKNESSES OR CONCERNS:

While RVLA struggled in their first two years of operation to meet the Commission’s sustainability indicator standards for financial performance, the most recent financial performance indicates that RVLA has turned the corner.

Many of RVLA’s early struggles were due to a combination of RVLA’s long-term debt obligations (facilities leases and pension liabilities) and not meeting their student enrollment targets. RVLA struggled during its first two years of operation to accurately predict the number of students that it would serve during a given school year.

The Commission uses enrollment variance for informational purposes because the school can remedy enrollment shortfalls through appropriate adjustments to revenue assumptions and expenditure plans. Nevertheless, enrollment that is less than 85% of projections indicates that the school’s per pupil revenues will be 15% below expectations, putting the school at potential financial risk. RVLA’s variance has been below this threshold for the last three years and has yet to rise above 72%.

To the extent that actual enrollment varies significantly from the projections, the school needs to make appropriate and commensurate adjustments to its assumptions and plans for revenues and expenditures. Judging from its performance on the other financial indicators over the last year, RVLA was able to make effective financial adjustments in response to its enrollment shortfalls. Thus, while the Commission will continue to monitor the school’s enrollment variance, RVLA’s overall record to date does not raise any concerns that would affect the school’s meeting the financial performance criteria for contract renewal.



MAILING ADDRESS

P.O. Box 40996, Olympia, WA 98504-0996

STREET ADDRESS

1068 Washington Street SE, Olympia, WA 98501

CHARTERSCHOOL.WA.GOV

PHONE

(360) 725-5511

EMAIL

charterschoolinfo@k12.wa.us

