

School FIRST 2020 Report Public Hearing September 21, 2020

Rating based on 2018-19 data

Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

- FIRST is an accountability rating system developed by TEA in 1999 that holds school districts accountable for the quality of their financial management practices and actual improved performance.
- Ratings based on 15 indicators established by the Commissioner of Education.





Types of Ratings

- ❖ A for Superior Achievement is the highest possible score and recognizes the districts with the highest financial integrity.
- ❖ B for Above Standard Achievement indicates that the district has performed significantly above the minimum passing score.
- ❖ C for Standard Achievement is the minimum passing score and indicates that the district meets the minimum passing standard for financial integrity.
- ❖ F for Substandard Achievement indicates the school district did not pass FIRST for the applicable rating year

FIRST Indicator Categories

Critical Indicators

Indicators 1 - 5 Yes/No, Failure to meet requirements of any of these results in an overall F Substandard rating.

Solvency Indicators

Indicators 6 - 12, points range from 0 - 10

Financial Competence Indicators

Indicators 13 – 15, points range from 0 - 10

Indicator 1: Filing the Annual Financial Report and Electronic Data Feed

Was the complete annual financial report (AFR) and data submitted to the TEA within 30 days of the November 27 or January 28 deadline depending on the school district's fiscal year end date of June 30 or August 31, respectively?

Yes, the AFR was submitted 11/11/19

Indicator 2: Review the Annual Financial Report

2A. Was there an unmodified opinion in the AFR on the financial statements as a whole?

Yes, received a "clean audit"

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

Indicator 3: Default on Debt

Was the school district in compliance with the payment terms of all debt agreements at fiscal year end?

Yes

Indicator 4: Timely Payment

Did the school district make timely payments to the Teachers Retirement System (TRS), Texas Workforce Commission (TWC), Internal Revenue Service (IRS), and other government agencies?

Yes

Indicator 5: Unrestricted Net Asset Balance

Was the total unrestricted net asset balance (Net of the accretion of interest for capital appreciation bonds) in the governmental activities column in the Statement of Net Assets greater than zero?

This indicator is not being scored.

Indicator 6: Days Cash on Hand

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)?

>=90 days Score: 10 Points

Cash and Equivalents	42,984,497	*	265	_	125 40 days
Expenditures	125,110,566		303	=	125.40 days

Indicator 7: Current Assets to Current Liabilities

Was the measure of current assets to current liabilities ratio for the school district sufficient to cover short-term debt?

>=3.00

Current Assets	206,066,555	_	4.4200
Current Liabilities	46,515,327	_	4.4300

Indicator 8: Long-Term Liability to Total Assets Ratio

Was the ratio of long-term liabilities to total assets for the school district sufficient to support long-term solvency? (If the school district's change of students in membership over 5 years was 7 percent or more, then the school district passes this indicator.)

2019 Total Students	11,732
2015 Total Students	10,625
Five-Year Percent Change in Students	10.4%

Indicator 9: General Fund Expenditure Analysis

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)?

Total Revenue	127,194,209
Total Expenditures	125,110,566

Indicator 10: Debt Service Coverage Ratio

Was the debt service coverage ratio sufficient to meet the required debt service?

>=1.20

Total Revenues	160,189,971	
- Total Expenditures	152,189,176	
+ Debt Service (function codes 71, 72, and 73)	27,078,610	
+ Fund Code 599 (Debt Service fund balance)	29,786,348	
+ Function Code 81	0	
Subtotal	64,865,753 _	2.395
Debt Service (function codes 71, 72, and 73)	27,078,610	2.333

Indicator 11: Administrative Cost Ratio

Was the school district's administrative cost ratio equal to or less than the threshold ratio for ADA size 10,000 and above?

0.1105 to 0.0855

District Administrative Cost Ratio	0.097
Average Daily Attendance	11,026

Indicator 12: Student to Staff Ratio

Did the school district **not** have a 15 percent decline in the students to staff ratio over 3 years (total enrollment to total staff)? (If the student enrollment did not decrease, the school district will automatically pass this indicator.)

2018-2019 Total Enrollment	11,759
2016-2017 Total Enrollment	11,425

Indicator 13: PEIMS Data Quality

<u>Did the comparison of PEIMS data to like information in the school district's AFR result in a total variance of less than 3 percent of all expenditures by function?</u>

Difference of PEIMS data to District's AFR	116	_	0.0000
Expenditures	125,110,498	_	0.0000

Indicator 14: Material Noncompliance Noted On Annual Financial Report (AFR)

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?

Indicator 15: FSP Hardship

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?

Georgetown ISD 2019 Rating

Georgetown ISD received the highest possible rating of

A = Superior Achievement

With a score of 98 out of 100

Required Disclosures Board Member and Superintendent Disclosures (Fiscal Year 2018-19)

Superintendent's Employment Contract

A copy of the superintendent's current employment contract at the time of the School FIRST hearing is to be provided. In lieu of publication in the annual School FIRST financial management report, the school district may chose to publish the superintendent's employment contract on the school district's Internet site. If published on the Internet, the contract is to remain accessible for twelve months.

The Superintendent's Employment Contract is available on the District's webpage found at the following link:

https://www.georgetownisd.org/Domain/79

Reimbursements Received by the Superintendent and Board Members for Fiscal Year 2019

Description of Reimbursements	Fred Brent	Scott Stribling	Scott Alarcon	Andy Webb	Melanie Dunham	Marcos Gonzalez	David Phillips	Ben Stewart	Elizabeth McFarland
Meals	\$368.50	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Lodging	\$4,902.43	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$705.71	\$0.00	\$941.45	\$645.07	\$0.00
Transportation	\$1,788.62	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Motor Fuel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other (includes membership dues)	\$3,737.29	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$395.00	\$290.69	\$1,166.21	\$641.79	\$395.00
Total	\$10,796.84	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,100.71	\$290.69	\$2,107.66	\$1,286.86	\$395.00

Meals – Meals consumed off of the school district's premises, and in-district meals at area restaurants.

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 (or on-behalf of) to the superintendent and board member not defined above.

Board Member and Superintendent Disclosures

 Outside Compensation and/or Fees Received by the Superintendent for Professional Consulting and/or Other Personal Services in Fiscal Year 2019

None

• Gifts Received by the Executive Officer(s) and Board Members

For the Twelve- Month Period Ended June 30, 2019									
•	Fred Brent	Scott Stribling	Scott Alarcon	Andy Webb	Melanie Dunham	Marcos Gonzalez	David Phillips	Ben Stewart	Elizabeth McFarland
Summary Amounts	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Board Member and Superintendent Disclosures, cont.

 Business Transactions Between School District and Board Members for Fiscal Year 2019

For the Twelve- Month Period Ended									
June 30, 2019									
	Fred Brent	Scott Stribling	Scott Alarcon	Andy Webb	Melanie Dunham	Marcos Gonzalez	David Phillips	Ben Stewart	Elizabeth McFarland
Summary Amounts	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

RATING YEAR 2019-2020

DISTRICT NUMBER district#

Select An Option

Help



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2019-2020 RATINGS BASED ON SCHOOL YEAR 2018-2019 DATA - DISTRICT STATUS DETAIL

Nam	e: GEORGETOWN ISD(246904)	Publication Level 1: 8/6/2020 9:26:37 AM				
Statı	us: Passed	Publication Level 2: 8/6/2020 11:17:34 AM				
Ratii	ng: A = Superior	Last Updated: 8/6/2020 11:17:34 AM				
Distr	rict Score: 98	Passing Score: 60				
#	Indicator Description		Updated	Score		
L	Was the complete annual financial report (AFR) and data submitted to the TEA within 30 days of the November 27 or January 28 deadline depending on the school district's fiscal year end date of June 30 or August 31, respectively?					
2	Review the AFR for an unmodified opinion and material weaknesses. school district fails indicator number 2 if it responds "No" to indicator	·				
2.A	Was there an unmodified opinion in the AFR on the financial statemer Accountants (AICPA) defines unmodified opinion. The external indepersal opinion.)		3/30/2020 3:08:52 PM	Yes		
.В	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? (The AICPA defines material weakness.)					
	Was the school district in compliance with the payment terms of all din default in a prior fiscal year, an exemption applies in following year payment plan with the lender and the payments are made on schedul defaults that are not related to monetary defaults. A technical default or master promissory note even though payments to the lender, trust agreement between a debtor (= person, company, etc. that owes moback the debt.)	s if the school district is current on its forbearance or le for the fiscal year being rated. Also exempted are technical t is a failure to uphold the terms of a debt covenant, contract, t, or sinking fund are current. A debt agreement is a legal	3/30/2020 3:08:52 PM	Yes		
	Did the school district make timely payments to the Teachers Retirem Internal Revenue Service (IRS), and other government agencies?	nent System (TRS), Texas Workforce Commission (TWC),	3/30/2020 3:08:53 PM	Yes		
	This indicator is not being scored.					
				1 Multipli Sum		
	Was the number of days of cash on hand and current investments in operating expenditures (excluding facilities acquisition and construction)		3/30/2020 3:08:53 PM	10		
	Was the measure of current assets to current liabilities ratio for the se below.)	chool district sufficient to cover short-term debt? (See ranges	3/30/2020 3:08:53 PM	10		
	Was the ratio of long-term liabilities to total assets for the school dist district's increase of students in membership over 5 years was 7 perc See ranges below.		3/30/2020 3:08:54 PM	10		
	Did the school district's general fund revenues equal or exceed expen not, was the school district's number of days of cash on hand greater		3/30/2020 3:08:54 PM	10		
0	Was the debt service coverage ratio sufficient to meet the required de	ebt service? (See ranges below.)	3/30/2020 3:08:55	10		

11	Was the school district's administrative cost ratio equal to or less than the threshold ratio? (See ranges below.)	3/30/2020 3:08:56 PM	8
12	Did the school district not have a 15 percent decline in the students to staff ratio over 3 years (total enrollment to total staff)? (If the student enrollment did not decrease, the school district will automatically pass this indicator.)	3/30/2020 3:08:56 PM	10
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 3 percent of all expenditures by function?	3/30/2020 3:08:58 PM	10
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? (The AICPA defines material noncompliance.)	3/30/2020 3:08:58 PM	10
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?	3/30/2020 3:08:59 PM	10
			98 Weighted Sum
			1 Multiplier Sum
			98 Score

DETERMINATION OF RATING

A.	Did the district answer 'No' to Indicators 1, 3, 4, or 2.A? If so, the school district's rating is F for Substandard Achievement regardless of points earned.		
В.	Determine the rating by the applicable number of points. (Indicators 6-15)		
	A = Superior	90-100	
	B = Above Standard	80-89	
	C = Meets Standard	60-79	
	F = Substandard Achievement	<60	

No Rating = A school district receiving territory that annexes with a school district ordered by the commissioner under TEC 13.054, or consolidation under Subchapter H, Chapter 41. No rating will be issued for the school district receiving territory until the third year after the annexation/consolidation.

Home Page: Financial Accountability | Send comments or suggestions to FinancialAccountability@tea.texas.gov

THE <u>TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY</u>
1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734

FIRST 5.9.1.0