

Birdville Independent School District

2018 School FIRST Rating

Public Hearing

October 25, 2018 – 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 2016–17 fiscal year.

Objectives

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

Birdville ISD

Superior Achievement

BISD received a score of 94 (out of 100)

BISD has received the top rating each year since inception of the rating system 16 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 30?
 - YES. The 2016–17 annual financial report was filed with TEA on November 17, 2017. (2015–16: Yes)



Indicators (continued)

5. 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? (If the District's change of students in membership over five years was 10% or more, then the District passes this indicator.)
 - YES. The District's total unrestricted St .4(t)-0.92 atesal tsa

Indicators (continued)

6. Was the number of days of cash on hand and

Indicators (continued)

7. Was the measure of current assets to current liabilities ratio for the 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 6 out of 10 for this indicator. (2015–16: Yes – 8 pts.)

Indicators (continued)

8. Was the ratio of long-term liabilities to total assets for the district sufficient to support long-term solvency? (If the districts change in students in membership over five



Indicators (continued)

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. (2015–16: 10 pts)
11. Was the District's administrative cost ratio equal to or less than the threshold ratio?
 - YES. The District's administrative cost ratio was 6.24 percent. The District received a score of 10, the highest rating for this indicator (2015–16: Yes, at 6.11 percent)

Indicators (continued)

12. Did the school District not have a 15 percent decline in student-to-staff ratio over three years?
 - 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. (2015

Indicators (continued)

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). (2015–16: Yes)

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) (2015–16: 10).

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 2016–17
3. Outside Compensation and/or Fees Received by the Superintendent for Professional Consulting and/or Other Personal Services for fiscal year 2016–17
4. Gifts Received by the Executive Officer and Board Members (and First Degree Relatives, if any) in fiscal year 2016–17
5. Business Transactions Between School District and Board Members for Fiscal Year 2016–17

Disclosure No. 2

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

Note - H\Y'gd]f]h'cZ'h\Y'fi 'Y']g'hc'W'dhi fY'U' 'î fY]a Vi fgYa Ybhj' 'Zcf'Z]g'W' mYUf' &\$%* %ž'fY[UFX'Ygg'cZ'h\Y'a UbbYf'cZ'dUha Ybhž']bVM



Disclosure No. 5

Business Transactions Between School District and Board Members for Fiscal Year 2016–17

- None for Fiscal Year 2016–17

QUESTIONS?

