



Rule 17g-7 Information Disclosure Form

Ratings

Series 2014A HR BBB (G) Stable Outlook

The Rating Action Commentary (RAC) associated with this disclosure form is an integral part of the form.

Ratings

Symbol, Number, or Score in the Rating Scale used by HR Ratings - Rule 17g-7(a)(1)(ii)(A)

Table with 4 columns: Entity/Instrument, Rating Action, Rating Type, Rating Code. Row 1: Arlington Higher Education Finance Corporation Education Revenue Bonds, Trinity Basin Preparatory, Inc. Series 2014A, Upgrade, Long Term Rating, HR BBB (G) / Stable

Contacts: Mauricio Azoños, Public Finance Manager, mauricio.azonos@hrratings.com; José Luis Cano, Vice-President Corporates / ABS, joseluis.cano@hrratings.com

Procedure/Methodology

Version of the Procedure or Methodology used to Determine the Credit Rating - Rule 17g-7(a)(1)(ii)(B)

The methodology used to determine the credit rating is listed below:

- Rating Methodology for Charter Schools Credit Risk Evaluation, February 13, 2015 https://www.hrratings.com/docs/metodologia/New%20Charter%20Schools%20Methodology%20R.pdf

Definition

The assigned rating indicates that the issue or issuer offers moderate safety for timely payment of debt obligations and maintains moderate credit risk on a global scale, with weakness in the ability to pay under adverse economic scenarios.

Methodology Assumptions & Principles

Main Assumptions and Principles Used in Constructing the Procedures and Methodologies to Determine Credit Rating, including Qualitative Methodologies and Quantitative Inputs and (for structured products only) Assumptions on Correlation of Defaults Across Underlying Assets - Rule 17g-7 (a)(1)(ii)(C)

Principles:

The bonds rated are considered as a general obligation of the entity. Therefore the methodology mentioned before is based on the evaluation of the credit quality of the whole entity. The rating process consists of two basic components:

- Determination of the Initial Rating or Quantitative analysis:

HR Ratings makes a quantitative analysis of audited financial statements that provides insight of the financial administration of the entity. Taking in consideration the historical analysis and guidance given by the entity of the projected financial statements, HR Ratings projects, for the next five years, the financial statements in a base and a stress scenario. In order to validate guidance given by the entity, it is compared with historical data and guidance given in past years.

Another important concept in the Charter Schools methodology is the projection of enrollment which HR Ratings makes considering also guidance given based on historical information, expansion plans, demand and competition. Enrollment determines the federal and state recourse that the school receives.

Once projections are made, our model calculates the Free Cash Flow (FCF), which is the core concept in order to calculate the four metrics that determine the initial rating. These four metrics are: i) Debt Service Coverage Ratio ("DSCR"), ii) DSCR with cash, iii) Years of Payment and iv) "MALC". The model calculates a weighted average between these metrics and between years in both base and stress scenarios, then these two numbers are weighted to obtain one that is associated to a rating.



- Qualitative Adjustments to the initial rating:

Based on a qualitative analysis that takes in consideration various factors that could have an impact on the entity's credit risk, the initial rating may have a multi-notch adjustment. These factors are:

a) Management and future debt instrument issuance: HR Ratings takes in consideration the strength and diversity of the management team and the board of directors by analyzing each member's experience and field of expertise. On the other hand, the analysis takes into account a responsible policy of debt issuance.

b) Demographic trends and competition: The demand factor is key to determine enrollment that defines most of the income that the school receives. Demographic trends in the areas where the school is located are key to determining demand, as well as the competition that the school faces with their counterparts.

c) Academic performance and other services: One of the main qualitative risks is the revocation of the charter, this can be a result of poor academic performance. The student grades and other measurements of academic performance are obtained by public sources from a third party.

d) State regulation and legislation: Another risk of revocation of the charter comes from any change in the state regulation and legislation, this could also lead to an adjustment in the initial rating.

Assumptions:

- **State and Federal Revenue:** Our analysis assumes a certain level of stability in the state and federal revenue received by Charter Schools, in which they depend to operate.
- **State Legislation:** We assume that the legislation that allows Charter Schools to operate will not have any change that could generate trouble in the operation of the school or to the revocation of the charter.
- **Debt Issuance Policy:** HR Ratings assumes that the school management will follow the policy of debt issuance, in order of not having changes in the financial projected metrics.
- **Expansion Plans:** The school will be able to meet the expansion plans in order to reach the enrollment numbers incorporated in the financial model.
- **Academic Performance:** The school will be able to maintain the academic performance required by the regulation to keep the charter license.

### Rating Limitations

#### **Potential Limitations of the Credit Rating – Rule 17q-7(a)(1)(ii)(D)**

Limitations:

- HR Ratings does not validate, guarantee or certify the accuracy, correctness or completeness of any information and is not responsible for any errors or omissions or for results obtained from the use of such information.
- Ratings and/or opinions assigned by HR Ratings are based on an analysis of the creditworthiness of an entity, issue or issuer, and do not necessarily imply a statistical likelihood of default.
- The credit ratings do not opine on the liquidity of the issuer's securities or stock.
- The credit ratings do not consider the possible loss severity on an obligation default.
- The credit ratings are not an opinion of the market value of any issuer's securities or stock, or the possibility that this value suffer a deterioration.

### Information Uncertainty

#### **Information on the Uncertainty of the Credit Rating – Rule 17q-7(a)(1)(ii)(E)**

The Analysis Committee noted no material limitations on the reliability, accuracy and quality on the data relied on in determining the credit rating.

The Analysis Committee noted no material limitations on the scope of historical data or on the accessibility to certain documents or other information that would have better informed any credit rating listed in this disclosure form.



#### Use of Third Party Due Diligence

##### **Use of Third Party Due Diligence Services – Rule 17q-7(a)(1)(ii)(F)**

HR Ratings did not use third party due diligence services for the rating actions listed on Page 1.

#### Service/Remittance Reports Use

##### **Use of Servicer or Remittance Reports to Conduct Surveillance of the Credit Rating – Rule 17q-7(a)(1)(ii)(G)**

HR Ratings does not use Servicer or Remittance Reports to conduct surveillance of the rating actions listed on Page 1.

#### Data Relied Upon

##### **Description of Types of Data About any Obligor, Issue, Security or Money Market Instrument Relied Upon for Determining Credit Rating – Rule 17q-7(a)(1)(ii)(H)**

The most important information used for the rating is:

- Audited financial statements of the last seven years.
- Projections provided by the school administration of the financial statements for the next six years.
- Historical and projected data of enrollment by grade and by campus.
- Legal documentation of the bond (Trust Indenture, Loan Agreement, Supplemental Master Indenture)
- Information obtained from the school management of future strategies of enrollment, financial administration, expansion plans and improvement in academic performance.
- Public information related to state legislation, academic performance and demographic trends and competition.

#### Information Quality

##### **Overall Assessment of Quality of Information Available and Considered in Determining Credit Rating – Rule 17q-7(a)(1)(ii)(I)**

The quality of the information provided by the entity is considered to be consistent with the quality observed in ratings that use a similar methodology.

#### Conflicts of Interest

##### **Information Relating to Conflicts of Interest – Rule 17q-7 (a)(1)(ii)(J)**

The rating was solicited by the entity or issuer, or on its behalf, and therefore, HR Ratings has received the corresponding fees for the rating services provided. The following information can be found on our website at [www.hrratings.com](http://www.hrratings.com): (i) The internal procedures for the monitoring and surveillance of our ratings and the frequency with which they are formally updated, (ii) the criteria used by HR Ratings for the withdrawal or suspension of the maintenance of a rating, and (iii) the procedure and process of voting on our Analysis Committee.

#### Potential Rating Volatility

##### **Explanation or Measure of Potential Volatility to the Credit Rating – Rule 17q-7(a)(1)(ii)(K)**

The main factors that could lead to the volatility of the rating are:

- **Inability to meet enrollment targets:** If the school is not able to follow their expansion plans and this results in the inability to reach the enrollment projections incorporated in our base or stress scenario that could lead to a decrease in the rating due to the fact that enrollment is vital to determine the federal and state funding that the school receives.



- **Changes in the strategy of debt issuance:** In order to elaborate financial projections HR Ratings makes some assumptions of the debt issuance policy of the entity taking into consideration guidance given by the school. Levels of debt are essential to determine the credit rating of the entity, therefore if levels of debt issuance changes from what HR Ratings expected in either scenario, the credit rating may also change.
- **Changes in state funding levels, or statutory changes in state open-enrollment charter School funding:** Modification in the criteria that determines the levels of funding that the charter schools receives may result in the deterioration of financial metrics.
- **Failure to meet financial projections in base or stress scenarios that could lead to a change in Free Cash Flow levels:** In case of suffering any deviation in the financial projections, the metrics calculated would also change and therefore the rating may also change.
- **Revocation or non-renewal of the academy's charter:** One of the main qualitative risks is the revocation of the charter as a result of different reasons. The most important would be a considerable deterioration of student academic performance. This would result in the suspension of operations of the charter and very likely in the default of their obligations.

### Rating Performance

#### **Historical Performance and Expected Probability of Default and Expected Loss in Event of Default – Rule 17q-7(a)(1)(ii)(L)**

For historical performance of each rating listed in the disclosure form, click on the link in the ratings table presented on Page 1.

Our credit ratings need to be understood as rankings of the relative creditworthiness of different entities or credits. Creditworthiness takes into consideration both the ability and willingness to meet debt obligations in the manner prescribed in the relevant documentation. Default refers to the noncompliance of previously agreed obligations.

As our ratings measure relative creditworthiness they do not necessarily reflect any specific statistical probability of default. In order to make more valid rankings of creditworthiness our different methodologies will apply stress case scenarios to complement our base case analysis.

### Sensitivity to Assumptions

#### **Assumptions made by HR Ratings in determining announced credit ratings and examples of how assumptions impact the rating – Rule 17q-7(a)(1)(ii)(M)**

Assumptions:

- **State and Federal Revenue:** Our analysis assumes a certain level of stability in the state and federal revenue received by Charter Schools, in which they depend to operate.
- **State Legislation:** We assume that the legislation that allows Charter Schools to operate will not have any change that could generate trouble in the operation of the school or to the revocation of the charter.
- **Debt Issuance Policy:** HR Ratings assumes that the school management will follow the policy of debt issuance, in order of not having changes in the financial projected metrics.
- **Expansion Plans:** The school will be able to meet the expansion plans in order to reach the enrollment numbers incorporated in the financial model.
- **Academic Performance:** The school will be able to maintain the academic performance required by the regulation to keep the charter license.



#### Representations & Warranties

#### **Representations, Warranties and Enforcement Mechanisms Available to Investors – Rule 17g-7(a)(1)(ii)(N)**

The reporting of representations, warranties, and enforcement mechanisms does not apply to any of the credit ratings listed in this disclosure form.

#### Attestation

#### **Attestation – Rule 17g-7(a)(1)(ii)(N)**

With respect to each credit rating in this disclosure form, José Luis Cano, who served on the rating committee and is thus a person with responsibility for each credit rating action announced in the associated Rating Action Commentary, state that to the best of their knowledge:

- No part of the credit rating was influenced by any other business activities;
- The credit rating was based solely upon the merits of the obligor, security or money market instrument being rated and any relevant credit enhancement; and
- The credit rating was an independent evaluation of the risks and merits of the obligor, security or money market instrument and any relevant credit enhancement

This attestation is based on (i) on all relevant material reviewed by the committee chair in connection with each rating action announced in this RAC; (ii) the committee chair's participation in the rating committee that determined each credit rating action announced in this RAC; and (iii) attestations provided to the committee chair by all other voting members of the rating committee as part of the rating process.

*/s/ José Luis Cano Vice President Corporates / ABS*



**Credit  
Rating  
Agency**

A NRSRO Rating\*

# Arlington Higher Education HR BBB- (G)

Education Revenue Bonds Series 2014

Trinity Basin Preparatory, Inc.

U.S. Public Finance  
August 9, 2017

## HR Ratings Senior Management

### Management

#### Chairman of the Board

Alberto I. Ramos +52 55 1500 3130  
alberto.ramos@hrratings.com

#### Vice- President

Aníbal Habeica +52 55 1500 3130  
anibal.habeica@hrratings.com

#### Chief Executive Officer

Fernando Montes de Oca +52 55 1500 3130  
fernando.montesdeoca@hrratings.com

### Analysis

#### Chief Credit Officer

Felix Boni +52 55 1500 3133  
felix.boni@hrratings.com

#### Chief Operating Officer

Álvaro Rangel +52 55 8647 3835  
alvaro.rangel@hrratings.com

#### Public Finance / Infrastructure

Ricardo Gallegos +52 55 1500 3139  
ricardo.gallegos@hrratings.com

#### Financial Institutions / ABS

Fernando Sandoval +52 55 1253 6546  
fernando.sandoval@hrratings.com

Roberto Ballinez +52 55 1500 3143  
roberto.ballinez@hrratings.com

#### Corporates / ABS

Luis Quintero +52 55 1500 3146  
luis.quintero@hrratings.com

#### Methodologies

Alfonso Sales +52 55 1500 3140  
[alfonso.sales@hrratings.com](mailto:alfonso.sales@hrratings.com)

José Luis Cano +52 55 1500 0763  
joseluis.cano@hrratings.com

### Regulation

#### Chief Risk Officer

Rogelio Argüelles +52 181 8187 9309  
rogelio.arguelles@hrratings.com

#### Head Compliance Officer

Laura Mariscal +52 55 1500 0761  
laura.mariscal@hrratings.com

Rafael Colado +52 55 1500 3817  
rafael.colado@hrratings.com

### Business Development

#### Business Development

Francisco Valle +52 55 1500 3134  
francisco.valle@hrratings.com



Credit  
Rating  
Agency

# Arlington Higher Education HR BBB- (G)

Education Revenue Bonds Series 2014

Trinity Basin Preparatory, Inc.

U.S. Public Finance  
August 9, 2017

A NRSRO Rating\*

Mexico: Avenida Prolongación Paseo de la Reforma #1015 torre A, piso 3, Col. Santa Fe, México, D.F., CP 01210, Tel 52 (55) 1500 3130.  
United States: One World Trade Center, Suite 8500, New York, New York, ZIP Code 10007, Tel +1 (212) 220 5735.

*\*HR Ratings de México, S.A. de C.V. (HR Ratings), is a Credit Rating Agency authorized by the National Banking and Securities Commission (CNBV), registered by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) as a Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organization (NRSRO) for the assets of public finance as described in clause (v) of section 3 (a) (62) (A) of the US Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and certified as Credit Rating Agency (CRA) by the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA).*

The rating was solicited by the entity or issuer, or on its behalf, and therefore, HR Ratings has received the corresponding fees for the rating services provided. The following information can be found on our website at [www.hrratings.com](http://www.hrratings.com): (i) The internal procedures for the monitoring and surveillance of our ratings and the periodicity with which they are formally updated, (ii) the criteria used by HR Ratings for the withdrawal or suspension of the maintenance of a rating, and (iii) the procedure and process of voting on our Analysis Committee.

HR Ratings de México SA de CV (HR Ratings) ratings and/or opinions are opinions of credit quality and/or regarding the ability of management to administer assets; or opinions regarding the efficacy of activities to meet the nature or purpose of the business on the part of issuers, other entities or sectors, and are based exclusively on the characteristics of the entity, issuer or operation, independent of any activity or business that exists between HR Ratings and the entity or issuer. The ratings and/or opinions assigned are issued on behalf of HR Ratings, not of its management or technical staff, and do not constitute an investment recommendation to buy, sell, or hold any instrument nor to perform any business, investment or other operation. The assigned ratings and/or opinions issued may be subject to updates at any time, in accordance with HR Ratings' methodologies.

HR Ratings bases its ratings and/or opinions on information obtained from sources that are believed to be accurate and reliable. HR Ratings, however, does not validate, guarantee or certify the accuracy, correctness or completeness of any information and is not responsible for any errors or omissions or for results obtained from the use of such information. Most issuers of debt securities rated by HR Ratings have paid a fee for the credit rating based on the amount and type of debt issued. The degree of creditworthiness of an issue or issuer, opinions regarding asset manager quality or ratings related to an entity's performance of its business purpose are subject to change, which can produce a rating upgrade or downgrade, without implying any responsibility for HR Ratings. The ratings issued by HR Ratings are assigned in an ethical manner, in accordance with healthy market practices and in compliance with applicable regulations found on the [www.hrratings.com](http://www.hrratings.com) rating agency webpage. There Code of Conduct, HR Ratings' rating methodologies, rating criteria and current ratings can also be found on the website.

Ratings and/or opinions assigned by HR Ratings are based on an analysis of the creditworthiness of an entity, issue or issuer, and do not necessarily imply a statistical likelihood of default, HR Ratings defines as the inability or unwillingness to satisfy the contractually stipulated payment terms of an obligation, such that creditors and/or bondholders are forced to take action in order to recover their investment or to restructure the debt due to a situation of stress faced by the debtor. Without disregard to the aforementioned point, in order to validate our ratings, our methodologies consider stress scenarios as a complement to the analysis derived from a base case scenario. The rating fee that HR Ratings receives from issuers generally ranges from US\$1,000 to US\$1,000,000 (or the foreign currency equivalent) per issue. In some instances, HR Ratings will rate all or some of the issues of a particular issuer for an annual fee. It is estimated that the annual fees range from US\$5,000 to US\$2,000,00 (or the foreign currency equivalent).