

# Birdville Independent School District

2007 Schools FIRST Rating

Public Hearing

September 27, 2007 – 7:00 p.m.



# What is FIRST?

- ◆ Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas
- ◆ Created by Texas Education Agency to measure financial strengths
- ◆ Similar to AEIS
- ◆ Includes 21 indicators

# Determination of Rating

◆ Ratings are determined by the number of Indicators answered No:

- 0-2 Superior Achievement
- 3-4 Above Standard Achievement
- 5-6 Standard Achievement
- 7+ or “No” to Critical Indicators (1,2, and 3)

# Birdville ISD

## Superior Achievement

21 out of 21 Indicators Answered “Yes”

Superior Rating 5 Years In A Row!!



# Indicators

1. Total fund balance less reserved fund balance > \$0.

YES – General Fund Balance = \$35,384,303  
(balance reduced by \$750M in reserves)

2. No Disclosures in the Annual Financial Report?

YES – BISD had zero disclosures in the audit.



# Indicators (continued)

3. Was the audit filed within one month of the January 28<sup>th</sup> deadline?

YES – The audit was received by the Texas Education Agency on December 18, 2006.

4. Was there an “Unqualified Opinion” in the Annual Financial Report?

YES – The District received an “Unqualified Opinion” on the audit. An “Unqualified Opinion” is the best opinion you can receive.



# Indicators (continued)

5. Did the audit not disclose any instances of material weaknesses in Internal Controls?

YES – The audit reported no instances of material weaknesses in Internal Controls.

6. Was the percent of Total Tax Collections greater than 96%

YES – The District's total tax collection rate (including delinquents) was 99.69%.





# Indicators (continued)

7. Did the comparison of PEIMS data to actual data result in a variance of less than 4% of expenditures per fund type?

YES – The actual variance was 0%

8. Were debt related expenditures (net of IFA and EDA) less than \$770 per student?

YES – Debt related expenditures were \$687 per student.





# Indicators (continued)

9. Were there no disclosures in the audit report of Material Noncompliance?

YES – There were no disclosures in the audit report of material noncompliance.

10. Did the District have full accreditation status in relation to financial management practices? (e.g. No master or monitor)

YES – No master or monitor assigned.



# Indicators (continued)

11. Was the percent of operating expenditures for instruction greater than 54%

YES – The percent of operating expenditures for instruction (Function 11 Only) = 59.42% > 54%

12. Were budgeted expenditures less than budgeted revenues plus fund balance?

YES - \$35,566,817 > \$0



# Indicators (continued)

13. Was the aggregate fund balance in the general fund and the capital projects fund greater than zero in order to adequately finance construction projects?

YES – The aggregate fund balance in the general fund and capital projects fund = \$66,813,117 > \$0



# Indicators (continued)

14. Was the ratio of cash and investments to deferred revenue in the general fund  $>$  or  $=$  to 1:1?

YES – Cash (\$42,215,679)  $>$  Deferred Revenue (\$9,290,256)

15. Was the administrative cost ratio less than standard in state law?

YES – 7.47% (BISD)  $<$  11.05% (state standard)



# Indicators (continued)

16. Was the ratio of students to teachers within allowable ranges?

YES – Ratio of 16.0723 is within range of 13.5 and 22

17. Was the ratio of students to total staff within allowable ranges?

YES – Ratio of 11.379 is within range of 6.6 and 14



# Indicators (continued)

18. Was total fund balance in the General Fund more than 50% and less than 150% of the Optimum in the Annual Financial Report?

YES – The fund balance of \$36,127,523 is within 50% and 150% of the Optimum Fund balance.





# Indicators (continued)

19. Was the decrease in unreserved, undesignated fund balance less than 20% over two fiscal years?

YES – Decrease < 20%

20. Was the total of cash and investments greater than \$0 in the general fund?

YES – Cash and Investments = \$42,215,679





# Indicators (continued)

21. Were investment earnings in all funds greater than \$15 per student?

YES – Investment earnings of \$3,554,830 equals \$158.12 per student, > \$15.





**PERFECT SCORE!!**

# Five New Disclosures

1. Superintendent's Employment Contract
2. Reimbursements Received by the Superintendent and Board Members for Fiscal Year 2006
3. Outside Compensation and/or Fees Received by the Superintendent for Professional Consulting and/or Other Personal Services for Fiscal Year 2006



# Five New Disclosures

4. Gifts Received by the Executive Officer and Board Members (and First Degree Relatives, if any) in Fiscal Year 2006
5. Business Transactions Between School District and Board Members for Fiscal Year 2006



# New Disclosure No. 1

## Superintendent's Employment Contract

The 2007 superintendent's contract is posted on the Birdville ISD website



# New Disclosure No. 2

## Reimbursements Received by the Superintendent and Board Members for Fiscal Year 2006

All reimbursements received by the Superintendent and the Board Members for the twelve months ending August 31, 2006 are listed by category on the following worksheet.



# New Disclosure No. 2 (continued)

## Reimbursements Received by the Superintendent and Board Members for Fiscal Year 2006

For the Twelve-Month Period Ended August 31, 2006								
Description of Reimbursements	Superintendent	Wanda Strong	David Pokluda	Sherry Dunn	Joe Tolbert	Delores Webb	Richard Davis	Ralph Kunkel
Meals	\$ 1,371	\$ 170	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 302	\$ -	\$ 54
Lodging	2,838	1,379				1,139		1,162
Transportation	2,154	280				586		720
Other (includes registration fees)	1,402	745				620		620
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$ 7,765</b>	<b>\$ 2,574</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 2,647</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 2,556</b>





# New Disclosure No. 3

## Outside Compensation and/or Fees Received by the Superintendent for Professional Consulting and/or Other Personal Services for Fiscal Year 2006

No outside compensation and/or fees for professional consulting and/or other personal services were received by the Superintendent during fiscal year 2006.



# New Disclosure No. 4

Gifts Received by the Executive Officer and Board Members (and First Degree Relatives, if any) in Fiscal Year 2006 (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 2006.



# New Disclosure No. 5

## Business Transactions Between School District and Board Members for Fiscal Year 2006

Only one Board Member had business transactions with Birdville ISD during Fiscal Year 2006.

Richard Davis	\$8,452
---------------	---------

