

# Birdville Independent School District

2008 Schools FIRST Rating

Public Hearing

September 25, 2008 – 7:00 p.m.



# What is FIRST?

- ◆ Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas
- ◆ Created by Texas Education Agency in response to Senate Bill 875 of the 76<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature in 1999 to measure the performance of school districts' financial resources
- ◆ Rating system expanded from 21 to 24 indicators
- ◆ Rating calculations based on data from the 2006-2007 fiscal year



# Determination of Rating

- ◆ Ratings are determined by the number of points earned on the 24 indicators:
  - Superior Achievement
    - ◆ 75-85 points and “YES” answer on indicator 7
  - Above Standard Achievement
    - ◆ 65-74 points or  $\geq 75$  points and “NO” answer on indicator 7
  - Standard Achievement
    - ◆ 55-64 points
  - Substandard Achievement
    - ◆  $< 55$  points or “NO” answer on one default indicator



# Birdville ISD

## Superior Achievement

District scored 85 out of 85 possible points

Superior Rating 6 Years In A Row!!



# Indicators

1. Was the total fund balance less reserved fund balance greater than zero in the general fund?

YES – 2006-2007 General Fund Balance \$45,854,693  
(balance reduced by \$639M in reserves)

2. Was the total unrestricted net asset balance in the governmental activities column in the statement of net assets greater than zero?

YES – 2006-2007 Unrestricted net asset balance  
\$56,236,482



# Indicators (continued)

3. Were there no disclosures in the annual financial report and/or other sources of information concerning default on bonded indebtedness obligations?

YES – The district has not defaulted on bonded indebtedness.

4. Was the annual financial report filed within one month after the November 27 deadline?

YES – The 2006-2007 annual financial report was filed with TEA on November 21, 2007. The due date was December 28, 2007.



# Indicators (continued)

5. Was there an unqualified opinion in the annual financial report?

YES – The district received an unqualified opinion on the 2006-2007 annual financial report. This is the highest rating a district can receive.

6. Did the annual financial report not disclose any instances of material weakness in internal controls?

YES – The District's 2006-2007 annual financial report did not disclose any instances of material weakness in internal controls.



# Indicators (continued)

7. Did the district's academic rating exceed academically unacceptable?

YES – The district's academic rating for 2006-2007 exceeded academically unacceptable.

8. Was the three-year average percent of total tax collections (including delinquent) greater than 98 percent?

YES – The District's three-year average percent of total tax collections (including delinquents) was 99.75 percent.



# Indicators (continued)

9. Did the comparison of PEIMS data to like information in the annual financial report result in an aggregate variance of less than 3 percent of expenditures per fund type?

YES – Due to the fiscal year change for 2006-2007, the district was exempted from this indicator.

10. Were debt related expenditures (net of IFA and/or EDA allotment) less than \$250 per student?

YES – The district was exempted from this indicator since property taxes collected per penny of tax effort is greater than \$200,000 per student.



# Indicators (continued)

11. Was there no disclosure in the annual audit report of material noncompliance?

YES – There was no disclosure in the 2006-2007 annual audit report of material noncompliance.

12. Did the district have full accreditation status in relation to financial management practices?

YES – The district had full accreditation status in relation to financial management practices.



# Indicators (continued)

13. Was the percent of operating expenditures expended for instruction more than 65 percent (functions 11, 36, 93, and 95) (phased in over 3 years-55 percent for 2006-2007)?

YES – For 2006-2007, the percent of operating expenditures expended for instruction was 63.72 percent which exceeds the phased in percentage of 55.

(function 11-instruction, function 36-extra curricular, function 93-shared service arrangements, function 95-JJAEP)



# Indicators (continued)

14. Was the percent of operating expenditures expended for instruction more than or equal to 65 percent (functions 11, 12, 31, 33, 36, 93, and 95)?

YES – For 2006-2007, the percent of operating expenditures expended for instruction was 69.36 percent.

(function 11-instruction, function 12-library, function 31-counselors, function 33-nurses, function 36-extra curricular, function 93-shared service arrangements, function 95-JJAEP)



# Indicators (continued)

15. Was the aggregate of budgeted expenditures and other uses less than the aggregate of total revenues, other resources and fund balance in the general fund?

YES

16. If the district's aggregate fund balance in the general fund and capital projects fund was less than zero, were construction projects adequately financed?

YES – The district's 2006-2007 aggregate fund balance in the general fund and capital projects fund was greater than zero.



# Indicators (continued)

17. Was the ratio of cash and investments to deferred revenues in the general fund greater than or equal to 1:1?

YES – The ratio of cash and investments to deferred revenues in the general fund for 2006-2007 was greater than 1:1.

18. Was the administrative cost ratio less than the threshold ratio?

YES – The administrative cost ratio for 2006-2007 was 7.59 percent. The maximum percentage for district's with greater than 10,000 ADA was 11.05 percent.



# Indicators (continued)

19. Was the ratio of students to teachers within the ranges shown according to district size?

YES – The ratio of students to teachers for 2006-2007 was 16.0105. The range was 13.5 to 22.

20. Was the ratio of students to total staff within the ranges shown according to district size?

YES – The ratio of students to total staff for 2006-2007 was 11.3502. The range was 7 to 14.



# Indicators (continued)

21. Was the total fund balance in the general fund more than 50 percent and less than 150 percent of optimum according to the fund balance and cash flow calculation worksheet in the annual financial report?

YES – The total fund balance for 2006-2007 in the general fund was 88.737 of optimum fund balance.

22. Was the decrease in undesignated unreserved fund balance less than 20 percent over the two fiscal years?

YES – The undesignated unreserved fund balance increased during the last two fiscal years.



# Indicators (continued)

23. Was the aggregate total of cash and investments in the general fund more than zero?

YES – Cash and Investments at the end of 2006-2007 were \$52,755,617.

24. Were investment earnings in all funds (excluding debt service fund and capital projects fund) more than \$20 per student?

YES – Investment earnings for 2006-2007 were \$140.73 per student.





**PERFECT SCORE!!**

# Five Additional Disclosures

1. Superintendent's Employment Contract in place during the public hearing
2. Reimbursements Received by the Superintendent and Board Members for Fiscal Year 2007
3. Outside Compensation and/or Fees Received by the Superintendent for Professional Consulting and/or Other Personal Services for Fiscal Year 2007



# Five Additional Disclosures

4. Gifts Received by the Executive Officer and Board Members (and First Degree Relatives, if any) in Fiscal Year 2007
5. Business Transactions Between School District and Board Members for Fiscal Year 2007



# Disclosure No. 1

## Superintendent's Employment Contract

The 2008 superintendent's contract is posted on the Birdville ISD website



# Disclosure No. 2

## Reimbursements Received by the Superintendent and Board Members for Fiscal Year 2007 (including amounts paid on-behalf of the Superintendent and Board members)

All reimbursements received by the Superintendent and the Board Members for the twelve months ending August 31, 2007 are listed by category on the following worksheet.



# Disclosure No. 2 (continued)

For the Twelve-Month Period Ended August 31, 2007									
Description of Reimbursements	Superintendent	Sherry Dunn	Dolores Webb	Joe Tolbert	Wanda Strong	David Pokluda	Richard Davis	Ralph Kunkel	
Meals	\$ 1,797	\$ 180	\$ 37	\$ 137	\$ -	\$ 517	\$ -	\$ 208	
Lodging	2,949	707	6	353	-	2,463	-	1,934	
Transportation	2,920	249	277	606	-	918	-	1,563	
Motor Fuel	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Other (includes registration fees)	1,450	744	103	703	-	1,480	-	789	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$ 9,116</b>	<b>\$ 1,880</b>	<b>\$ 423</b>	<b>\$ 1,800</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 5,378</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 4,494</b>	



# Disclosure No. 3

## Outside Compensation and/or Fees Received by the Superintendent for Professional Consulting and/or Other Personal Services for Fiscal Year 2007

No outside compensation and/or fees for professional consulting and/or other personal services were received by the Superintendent during fiscal year 2007.



# Disclosure No. 4

Gifts Received by the Executive Officer and Board Members (and First Degree Relatives, if any) in Fiscal Year 2007 (gifts with an economic value of \$250 or more in the aggregate)

No gifts with an economic value of \$250 or more in the aggregate were received by any executive officer or board member (or first degree relatives) during fiscal year 2007.



# Disclosure No. 5

## Business Transactions Between School District and Board Members for Fiscal Year 2007

<u>Company</u>	<u>Board member</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Lift Aids	Richard Davis	\$27,841

