

Birdville Independent School District

2019 SCHOOL FIRST RATING

PUBLIC HEARING

OCTOBER 24, 2019 – 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 76th Texas Legislature in 1999 and amendments under House Bill 5 of the 83rd Texas Legislature in 2013 to achieve quality performance in the management of school districts' financial resources.
- Rating calculations are based on data from the 2017–18 fiscal year.

Objectives

- Achieve quality performance in the management of school district's financial resources.
 - ◆ Assess the quality of financial management in Texas public schools.
 - ◆ Measure and report the extent to which financial resources are allocated for direct instructional purposes.
 - ◆ Fairly evaluate the quality of financial management decisions.
 - ◆ Openly report results to the general public.

Determination of Rating

The FIRST accountability rating system assigns one of four financial accountability ratings to Texas school districts, as follows:

- **A** for Superior Achievement (90–100)
- **B** for Above Standard Achievement (80–89)
- **C** for Meets Standard Achievement (60–79)
- **F** for Substandard Achievement (<60)

Birdville ISD

Superior Achievement

- BISD received a score of 96 (out of 100)
- BISD has received the top rating each year since inception of the rating system 17 years ago

Indicators

1. Was the complete annual financial report (AFR) and data submitted to TEA within 30 days of the November 27th deadline based on the school District's fiscal year end date of June 30th?
 - YES. The 2017–18 annual financial report was filed with TEA on November 19, 2018. (2016–17: Yes)

Indicators (continued)

- 2A. Was there an unmodified opinion in the AFR on the financial statements as a whole?
- YES. The District received an unmodified opinion on the 2017–18 annual financial report. This is the highest rating a district can receive. (2016–17: Yes)
- 2B. Did the external independent auditor report that the AFR was free of any instance(s) of material weaknesses in internal controls over financial reporting and compliance for local, state, or federal funds?
- YES. The District’s AFR was free of any instances of material weaknesses in internal controls over financial reporting compliance for local, state, or federal funds. (2016–17: Yes)

Indicators (continued)

3. Was the school district in compliance with the payment terms of all debt agreements at fiscal year end?
 - YES. The District was in compliance with the payment terms of all debt agreements at fiscal year end. (2016–17: Yes)

4. Did the school district make timely payments to the Teacher Retirement System (TRS), Texas Workforce Commission (TWC), Internal Revenue Service (IRS), and other government agencies?
 - YES. All TRS, TWC, IRS and other governmental agency payments were made in a timely manner. (2016–17: Yes)

Indicators (continued)

5. This indicator is not being scored for 2017–18. (2016–17: Yes)
6. Was the number of days of cash on hand and current investments in the general fund for the school district sufficient to cover operating expenditures (excluding facilities acquisition and construction)?
 - YES. The District's cash on hand and current investments was sufficient to cover operating expenditures. The District received a score of 10, the highest score for this indicator. (2016–17: Yes – 10 pts.)

Indicators (continued)

7. Was the measure of current assets to current liabilities ratio for the school district sufficient to cover short-term debt?
 - YES. The District's ratio of current assets to current liabilities was sufficient to cover short-term debt. The District received a score of 8 out of 10 for this indicator. (2016–17: Yes – 6 pts.)

8. Was the ratio of long-term liabilities to total assets for the school district sufficient to support long-term solvency? (If the district's change in students in membership over five years was 7% or more, then the district passes the indicator.)
 - YES. The District's ratio of long-term liabilities to total assets was sufficient to cover long-term solvency. The District received a score of 8 out of 10 points for this indicator. (2016–17: Yes – 8 pts.)

Indicators (continued)

9. Did the school district's general fund revenues equal or exceed expenditures (excluding facilities acquisition and construction)? If not, was the school district's number of days of cash on hand greater than or equal to 60 days?
 - YES. The District's general fund revenues exceeded general fund expenditures, and the days of cash on hand equaled 60 or more days. The District received a score of 10, the highest score for this indicator. (2016–17: Yes – 10 pts.)
10. Was the debt service coverage ratio sufficient to meet the required debt service?
 - YES. The District's debt service ratio is sufficient. The District received a score of 10, the highest score for this indicator. (2016–17: Yes – 10 pts.)

Indicators (continued)

11. Was the district's administrative cost ratio equal to or less than the threshold ratio?
 - YES. The District's administrative cost ratio was 6.48 percent. The District received a score of 10, the highest rating for this indicator (2016–17: Yes, at 6.24 percent)
12. Did the school district not have a 15 percent decline in the students-to-staff ratio over three years (total enrollment to total staff)?
 - YES. The District did not have a 15 percent decline in the student-to-staff ratio over three years. The District received a score of 10 out of 10 for this indicator. (2016–17: Yes – 10 pts.)

Indicators (continued)

13. Did the comparison of Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data to like information in the school district's AFR result in a total variance of less than three percent of all expenditures by function?
 - YES. The District's variance was less than three percent. The District received a score of 10 out of 10 points for this indicator. (2015–16: Yes – 10 pts.)

14. Did the external independent auditor indicate the AFR was free of any instance(s) of material noncompliance for grants, contracts, and laws related to local, state, or federal funds?
 - YES. The external independent auditor indicated the AFR was free of any instances of material non-compliance. The District received a score of 10 (10 Pass/0 Fail). (2016–17: Yes – 10 pts.)

Indicators (continued)

15. Did the school district not receive an adjusted repayment schedule for more than one fiscal year for an over allocation of Foundation School Program (FSP) funds as a result of a financial hardship?
- YES. The District did not receive an adjusted repayment schedule for more than one fiscal year for overpayment of FSP as a result of financial hardship. The District received a score of 10 for this indicator. (Pass/Fail) (2016–17: Yes – 10 pts.)

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 2017–18
3. Outside Compensation and/or Fees Received by the Superintendent for Professional Consulting and/or Other Personal Services for Fiscal Year 2017–18
4. Gifts Received by the Executive Officer and Board Members (and First Degree Relatives, if any) in Fiscal Year 2017–18
5. Business Transactions Between School District and Board Members for Fiscal Year 2017–18

Disclosure No. 1

Superintendent's Current Employment Contract

A copy of the superintendent's current employment contract is available on the District's website at:

- <https://www.birdvilleschools.net/Page/16971>

Disclosure No. 2

Reimbursements Received by the Superintendent and Board Members for Fiscal Year 2017–18
(including amounts paid on behalf of the Superintendent and Board Members)

For the Twelve-Month Period Ending June 30, 2018

Description of Reimbursements	Dr. Darrell G. Brown	Joe Tolbert	Kelvin Dilks	Whitney Harding	Jack McCarty	Richard Davis	Ralph Kunkel	Taylor Anderson	Kris Drees
Meals	\$ 595.77	\$ 245.91	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 128.28	\$ 241.98	\$ 183.43	\$ -	\$ -
Lodging	1,414.14	509.46	-	-	509.46	509.46	254.73	-	-
Transportation	1,873.40	496.20	75.00	69.14	426.55	396.64	521.31	62.27	-
Motor Fuel	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	1,980.00	1,665.00	1,270.00	430.00	1,315.00	915.00	2,025.00	500.00	375.00
Total	\$ 5,863.31	\$ 2,916.57	\$ 1,345.00	\$ 499.14	\$ 2,379.29	\$ 2,063.08	\$ 2,984.47	\$ 562.27	\$ 375.00

Note – The spirit of the rule is to capture all “reimbursements” for fiscal year 2017–18, regardless of the manner of payment, including direct pay, credit card, cash, and purchase order. Reimbursements to be reported per category include:

- Meals:** Meals consumed off of the school district’s premises, and in-district meals at area restaurants (excludes catered meals for board meetings).
- Lodging:** Hotel charges
- Transportation:** Airfare, car rental (can include fuel on rental), taxis, mileage reimbursements, leased cars, parking and tolls.
- Motor Fuel:** Gasoline
- Other:** Registration fees, telephone/cell phone, internet service, fax machine, and other reimbursements to, or on behalf of, the superintendent and board member(s) not defined above.

Disclosure No. 3

Outside Compensation and/or Fees Received by the Superintendent for Professional Consulting and/or Other Personal Services for Fiscal Year 2017–18

- No outside compensation and/or fees for professional consulting and/or other personal services were received by the superintendent during fiscal year 2017–18.

Disclosure No. 4

Gifts Received by the Executive Officer and Board Members (and First-Degree Relatives, if any) in Fiscal Year 2017–18 (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 members (or first-degree relatives) during fiscal year 2017–18.

Disclosure No. 5

Business Transactions Between School District and Board Members for Fiscal Year 2017–18

- None for Fiscal Year 2017–18

QUESTIONS?

