

# Friendswood Independent School District

## 2008 Annual Financial Management Report Schools FIRST

For the Year Ending August 31, 2007



Trish Hanks, Superintendent

George Rodgers, Assistant Superintendent

Alison Rendon, Executive Director of Business

**Friendswood Independent School District  
Schools FIRST Report  
For the Year Ending August 31, 2007**

**Table of Contents**

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2006-2007 Schools FIRST Report</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Overview of the Worksheet</b>	<b>5</b>
Indicators #1 - #3	5
Indicators #4 - #6	6
Indicators #7 - #9	7
Indicators #10 - #12	8
Indicators #13 - #15	9
Indicators #16 - #18	10
Indicators #19 - #21	11
Indicators #21 - #24	12
<b>Disclosures</b>	<b>13</b>
Schedule of Reimbursements	13
Schedule of Outside Compensation	14
Schedule of Gifts	15
Schedule of Business Transactions	16

## Introduction

During the 77<sup>th</sup> regular session of the Texas Legislature (2001), Senate Bill 218 was passed and signed into law shortly thereafter. This law requires every school district to prepare an annual financial accountability report. The goal of School FIRST is to improve the management of school districts' financial resources. The primary objective of the rating system is to assess the quality of financial management in Texas public schools. A secondary objective is to measure and report the extent of which financial resources in Texas public schools assure the maximum allocation possible for direct instructional purposes. Other objectives reflect the implementation of a rating system that fairly and equitably evaluates the quality of financial management decisions. Ratings are based on analysis of staff and student data for the school year and on budgetary and actual financial data for the fiscal year.

Many business-related issues are covered in this report. The primary tool, however, is the Financial Accountability Ratings Worksheet. Representatives of the Texas Education Agency (TEA), the Texas Business & Education Council (TBEC), and the Texas Association of School Business Officials (TASBO) developed this worksheet. It is administered by TEA and calculated on information submitted to the Agency via our PEIMS submission each year and other documentation procured by TEA. The accuracy of PEIMS data has always been critical on the student side of the submission, and this reporting requirement adds a high degree of importance to our finance submission each year.

Starting in the 2005-2006 fiscal year, the financial management report issued at the School FIRST hearing much contain certain required disclosures, in accordance with Title 19 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 109, Budgeting Accounting, and Auditing Subchapter AA, Commissioner's Rules concerning Financial Accountability Rating System. Those disclosures are as follows: (1) a copy of the Superintendent's current employment contract (this can be satisfied by placing the contract on the district website), (2) a summary schedule for the fiscal year of total reimbursements received by the superintendent and each board member, (3) a summary schedule for the fiscal year of the dollar amount compensation and/or fees received by the Superintendent from another school district or any outside entity in exchange for professional consulting and/or other personal services, (4) a summary schedule for the fiscal year of the total dollar amount by the executive officers and board members of gifts that had an economic value of \$250 or more, (5) a summary schedule for the fiscal year of the dollar amount by board member for the aggregate amount of business transactions with the school district.

Friendswood Independent School District's rating under Schools FIRST for the fiscal year ended August 31, 2007 was "Superior Achievement," with a score of 80 out of 85 points or 94 percent. This is the sixth year Texas school districts have been evaluated using the Schools FIRST worksheet and Friendswood ISD's sixth year achieving a Superior rating. The following information provided in this report briefly describes data used to calculate the rating and what each indicator means.



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2006-2007 DISTRICT STATUS DETAIL

Name: <b>FRIENDSWOOD ISD(084911)</b>		Publication Level 1: 6/9/2008 1:55:51 PM	
Status: <b>Passed</b>		Publication Level 2: 8/21/2008 1:46:21 PM	
Rating: Superior Achievement		Last Updated: 8/21/2008 1:46:21 PM	
District Score: 80		Passing Score: 55	
#	Indicator Description	Updated	Score
1	<u>Was The Total Fund Balance Less Reserved Fund Balance Greater Than Zero In The General Fund?</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:37 AM	Yes
2	<u>Was the Total Unrestricted Net Asset Balance (Net of Accretion of Interest on Capital Appreciation Bonds) In the Governmental Activities Column in the Statement of Net Assets Greater than Zero? (If the District's 5 Year % Change in Students was 10% more)</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:37 AM	Yes
3	<u>Were There No Disclosures In The Annual Financial Report And/Or Other Sources Of Information Concerning Default On Bonded Indebtedness Obligations?</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:38 AM	Yes
4	<u>Was The Annual Financial Report Filed Within One Month After November 27th or January 28th Deadline Depending Upon The District's Fiscal Year End Date (June 30th or August 31st)?</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:38 AM	Yes
5	<u>Was There An Unqualified Opinion in Annual Financial Report?</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:38 AM	Yes
6	<u>Did The Annual Financial Report Not Disclose Any Instance(s) Of Material Weaknesses In Internal Controls?</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:38 AM	Yes
			1 Multiplier Sum
7	<u>Did the Districts Academic Rating Exceed Academically Unacceptable?</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:38 AM	5

8	<u>Was The Three-Year Average Percent Of Total Tax Collections (Including Delinquent) Greater Than 98%?</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:38 AM	5
9	<u>Did The Comparison Of PEIMS Data To Like Information In Annual Financial Report Result In An Aggregate Variance Of Less Than 3 Percent Of Expenditures Per Fund Type (Data Quality Measure)?</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:38 AM	5
10	<u>Were Debt Related Expenditures (Net Of IFA And/Or EDA Allotment) &lt; \$250.00 Per Student? (If The District's Five-Year Percent Change In Students = Or &gt; 7%, Or If Property Taxes Collected Per Penny Of Tax Effort &gt; \$200,000 Per Student)</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:39 AM	5
11	<u>Was There No Disclosure In The Annual Audit Report Of Material Noncompliance?</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:39 AM	0
12	<u>Did The District Have Full Accreditation Status In Relation To Financial Management Practices? (e.g. No Conservator Or Monitor Assigned)</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:39 AM	5
13	<u>Was The Percent Of Operating Expenditures Expended For Instruction More Than 65%? (Functions 11, 36, 93, 95) (Phased in over three years, 55% for 2006-2007; 60% for 2007-2008; and 65% for 2008-2009)</u>	4/25/2008 11:59:58 AM	3
14	<u>Was The Percent Of Operating Expenditures Expended For Instruction More Than or equal to 65%? (Functions 11, 12, 31, 33, 36, 93, 95)</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:39 AM	3
15	<u>Was The Aggregate Of Budgeted Expenditures And Other Uses Less Than The Aggregate Of Total Revenues, Other Resources and Fund Balance In General Fund?</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:39 AM	5
16	<u>If The District's Aggregate Fund Balance In The General Fund And Capital Projects Fund Was Less Than Zero, Were Construction Projects Adequately Financed? (To Avoid Creating Or Adding To The Fund Balance Deficit Situation)</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:40 AM	5
17	<u>Was The Ratio Of Cash And Investments To Deferred Revenues (Excluding Amount Equal To Net Delinquent Taxes Receivable) In The General Fund Greater Than Or Equal To 1:1? (If Deferred Revenues Are Less Than Net Delinquent Taxes Receivable)</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:40 AM	5
18	<u>Was The Administrative Cost Ratio Less Than The Threshold Ratio?</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:40 AM	5
19	<u>Was The Ratio Of Students To Teachers Within the Ranges Shown Below According To District Size?</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:40 AM	5
20	<u>Was The Ratio Of Students To Total Staff Within the Ranges Shown Below According To District Size?</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:40 AM	5

21	<u>Was The Total Fund Balance In The General Fund More Than 50% And Less Than 150% Of Optimum According To The Fund Balance And Cash Flow Calculation Worksheet In The Annual Financial Report?</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:40 AM	5
22	<u>Was The Decrease In Undesignated Unreserved Fund Balance &lt; 20% Over Two Fiscal Years?(If 1.5 Times Optimum Fund Balance &lt; Total Fund Balance In General Fund Or If Total Revenues &gt; Operating Expenditures In The General Fund,Then District Receives 5 Points)</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:41 AM	5
23	<u>Was The Aggregate Total Of Cash And Investments In The General Fund More Than \$0?</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:41 AM	5
24	<u>Were Investment Earnings In All Funds (Excluding Debt Service Fund and Capital Projects Fund) More Than \$20 Per Student?</u>	4/18/2008 10:06:41 AM	4
			80 Weighted Sum
			1 Multiplier Sum
			80 Score

## DETERMINATION OF RATING

<b>A.</b>	Did The District Answer ' <b>No</b> ' To Indicators 1, 2, 3 Or 4? <b>OR</b> Did The District Answer ' <b>No</b> ' To Both 5 and 6? If So, The District's Rating Is <b>Substandard Achievement</b> .	
<b>B.</b>	Determine Rating By Applicable Range For summation of the indicator scores (Indicators 7-24)	
	<b>Superior Achievement</b>	75-85 and Yes to indicator 7
	<b>Above Standard Achievement</b>	65-74 or $\geq 75$ and No to indicator 7
	<b>Standard Achievement</b>	55-64
	<b>Substandard Achievement</b>	<55 or No to one default indicator

## Overview of the Worksheet

### Critical Indicators

Indicators 1 through 5 are considered critical indicators. This means any “No” response to indicators 1 through 4 or if there is a “No” response to indicators 5 and 6 the district’s rating is automatically “Substandard Achievement.”

#### Indicator #1

**Indicator:** Was the Total Fund Balance Less Reserved Fund Balance Greater than Zero in the General Fund?

**Indicator Goal:** To determine if the district has money set aside for emergencies or what we would consider “savings”.

**FISD Answer:** True, Total Fund Balance Less Reserves equaled \$7,740,165.

#### Indicator #2

**Indicator:** Was the Total Unrestricted Net Asset Balance (Net of Accretion of Interest on Capital Appreciation Bonds) in the Government Activities Column in the Statement of Net Assets Greater than Zero? (If the District’s 5 Year Percent Change in Students was 10 percent or more)

**Indicator Goal:** To determine if the district’s total assets exceeded the total liabilities

**FISD Answer:** True, Friendswood’s 5 year percent change in students did equal more than 10 percent so we were required to answer the indicator. Total unrestricted net asset balance equaled \$9,050,590.

#### Indicator #3

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

**Indicator Goal:** To determine if the district paid all payments for outstanding bonds during the year.

**FISD Answer:** True, Friendswood’s did not have any disclosures in the annual financial report for default on bonded indebtedness. FISD paid all outstanding bond debt required in a timely manner.

#### Indicator #4

**Indicator:** Was the annual financial report filed within one month after November 27<sup>th</sup> or January 28<sup>th</sup> deadline depending upon the district's fiscal year end date (June 30<sup>th</sup> or August 31<sup>st</sup>)?

**Indicator Goal:** To ensure the district's financial report is submitted in a timely manner.

**FISD Answer:** True, the annual financial report was received by the Texas Education Agency on January 29, 2008 and the deadline was February 28, 2008.

#### Indicator #5

**Indicator:** Was there an unqualified opinion in annual financial report?

**Indicator Goal:** To determine that the annual financial reported no corrections were needed in reporting of financial controls.

**FISD Answer:** True, the opinion expressed by our independent auditor on the August 31, 2007 annual financial report was unqualified.

#### Indicator #6

**Indicator:** Did the annual financial report not disclose any instance(s) of material weaknesses in internal controls?

**Indicator Goal:** To determine that the district was able to properly account for the use of public funds.

**FISD Answer:** True, Friendswood ISD had no internal weaknesses reported.



## All Other Indicators

### **Indicator #7**

**Indicator:** Did the district's academic rating exceed academically unacceptable?

**Indicator Goal:** To determine if the district's accreditation status is in good standing

**FISD Answer:** True, FISD was considered a Recognized district for the 2006-2007 school year.

### **Indicator #8**

**Indicator:** Was the three-year average percent of total tax collections (including delinquent) greater than 98 percent?

**Indicator Goal:** To determine how successful the district is in collecting taxes owed from businesses and homeowners in the community.

**FISD Answer:** 5 of 5 points, FISD surpassed the minimum requirement of 98 percent collected by collecting over 100 percent of total tax collections.

### **Indicator #9**

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

**Indicator Goal:** To determine the quality of data reported to TEA through PEIMS and in the annual financial report submission are consistent.

**FISD Answer:** 5 of 5 points, FISD had a 0 percent variance when comparing financial information reported through PEIMS to the information reported in the annual financial report submission.

### Indicator #10

**Indicator:** Were debt related expenditures (net of IFA and/or EDA allotment) less than \$250 per student? (If the district's five-year percent change in students equals or is greater than 7%, or if the property taxes collected per penny of tax effort is greater than \$200,00 then exception is met)

**Indicator Goal:** To show Legislature's intent for school districts to focus spending money on education, by limiting the amount of money districts can spend on debt for construction projects to \$250 per student.

**FISD Answer:** 5 of 5 points, FISD incurred five-year percent change in students of 8.2 percent, therefore, the exception was met. 2006-2007 debt related expenditures were \$468 per student.

### Indicator #11

**Indicator:** Was there no disclosures in the annual audit report of material noncompliance?

**Indicator Goal:** To determine if the district had disclosures listed of material non-compliance in the annual financial report.

**FISD Answer:** 0 of 5 points, FISD exceeded the budget in functional expenditure categories during the 2006-2007 year. This resulted in a disclosure of material noncompliance in the audit report.

### Indicator #12

**Indicator:** Did the district have full accreditation status in relation to financial management practices?

**Indicator Goal:** To determine if the district had no financial conservator or monitor assigned.

**FISD Answer:** 5 of 5 points, FISD has full accreditation status.

### Indicator #13

**Indicator:** Was the percent of operating expenditures expended for instruction more than 65% (Functions 11, 36, 93, 95)? Phased in over 3 years, 55 percent for 2006-2007; 60 percent for 2007-2008; and 65 percent for 2008-2009.

**Indicator Goal:** To determine if the district focuses the majority of it's funding on this functional definition of student instruction which includes instruction, co-curricular activities, shared service agreements, and payments to JJAEP programs.

**FISD Answer:** 3 of 3 points, FISD's expenditures under this calculated method was 60.2 percent.

### Indicator #14

**Indicator:** Was the percent of operating expenditures expended for instruction more than or equal to 65% (Functions 11, 12, 31, 33, 36, 93, 95)?

**Indicator Goal:** To determine if the district focuses the majority of it's funding on this functional definition of student instruction which includes instruction, instructional resources, guidance/counseling services, health services, co-curricular activities, shared service agreements, and payments to JJAEP programs.

**FISD Answer:** 3 of 3 points, FISD's expenditures under this calculated method was 65.8 percent.

### Indicator #15

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

**Indicator Goal:** To determine if the district's total expenditures for the fiscal year exceeded the total fund available.

**FISD Answer:** 5 of 5 points, FISD's total expenditures did not exceed the total funds available.

### Indicator #16

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

**Indicator Goal:** To determine if the district is able to construct facilities without depleting the fund balance.

**FISD Answer:** 5 of 5 points, FISD's aggregate fund balance in the general fund and capital projects fund was greater than zero.

### Indicator #17

**Indicator:** Was the ratio of cash and investments to deferred revenues (excluding amount equal to net delinquent taxes receivable) in the general fund greater than or equal to 1:1?

**Indicator Goal:** To determine if the district has adequate funds available to balance fund balance monies such as TEA overpayments or deferred revenues. The district should have funds balance money available and not spend money that is due back to the state.

**FISD Answer:** 5 of 5 points, FISD does has the appropriate level of cash available to cover any over payments or deferred revenues.

### Indicator #18

**Indicator:** Was the administrative cost ratio less than the threshold ratio?

**Indicator Goal:** To determine if the district did not exceed the cap on the percentage of their budget that can be spent on administration based on district size. For FISD the percentage allowed is 12.5 percent.

**FISD Answer:** 5 of 5 points, FISD had an administrative cost ration of 12.4 percent.

### Indicator #19

**Indicator:** Was the ratio of students to teachers within the ranges shown below according to district size?

**Indicator Goal:** To determine if the district's pupil-teacher ratio measures within the limits set forth by TEA. Based on the number of students, FISD is considered low with a 13:1 ratio and high with a 22:1 ratio

**FISD Answer:** 5 of 5 points, FISD pupil-teacher ratio was 16.35: 1

### Indicator #20

**Indicator:** Was the ratio of students to total staff within the ranges shown below according to district size.

**Indicator Goal:** To determine if the district's pupil-staff/teacher ratio measures within the limits set forth by TEA. Based on the number of students, FISD is considered low with a 6.8:1 ratio and high with a 14:1 ratio

**FISD Answer:** 5 of 5 points, FISD pupil-staff/teacher ratio was 8.72: 1

### Indicator #21

**Indicator:** 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?

**Indicator Goal:** To determine if the district's level of fund balance is adequate. TEA requires a minimum amount of fund balance and they also do not want an excessive amount of money sitting in fund balance.

**FISD Answer:** 5 of 5 points, FISD's fund balance was 109 percent of the calculated optimum fund balance.

### Indicator #22

**Indicator:** Was the decrease in undesignated unreserved fund balance less than 20 percent over two years? (If 1.5 times optimum fund is less than total fund balance in general fund or if total revenues are greater than operating expenditures in the general fund, then district receives 5 points)

**Indicator Goal:** To determine if the district's is utilizing fund balance dollars to pay for salaries or other operating expenses.

**FISD Answer:** 5 of 5 points, FISD's did not exceed 1.5 times optimum fund balance and total revenues are greater than total expenditures, therefore, we received 5 points.

### Indicator #23

**Indicator:** Was the aggregate total of cash and investments in the general fund more than zero?

**Indicator Goal:** To determine if the district has cash in the bank or in investments.

**FISD Answer:** 5 of 5 points, FISD has money in the bank and investments for reserves.

### Indicator #24

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

**Indicator Goal:** To determine if the district is investing money in order to gain income.

**FISD Answer:** 4 of 4 points, FISD has invested funds and received a return on investment equal to \$104.22 dollars per student in 2006-2007.

Friendswood Independent School District  
 Schools FIRST Report  
 For Year Ending August 31, 2007

Schedule of Reimbursements

Name	Meals	Lodging	Transportation	Fuel	Other	TOTAL
Trish Hanks	\$ 812.74	\$ 716.45	\$ 2,194.41	\$ -	\$ 266.90	\$ 3,990.50
Marta Bourgeois	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Brandon Burris	\$ 94.44	\$ 677.16	\$ 475.40	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,247.00
David Hearn	\$ 379.09	\$ 715.92	\$ 305.12	\$ -	\$ 92.00	\$ 1,492.13
Revecca Hillenburg	\$ -	\$ 902.88	\$ 455.30	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,358.18
Ralph Hobratschk	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 182.61	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 182.61
Larry Moore	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
John Ring	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Denise Ruiz	\$ -	\$ 902.88	\$ 254.30	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,157.18
Mike Shaw	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 1,286.27</b>	<b>\$ 3,012.41</b>	<b>\$ 3,612.84</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 358.90</b>	<b>\$ 8,270.42</b>

Friendswood Independent School District  
 Schools FIRST Report  
 For Year Ending August 31, 2007

Schedule of Outside Compensation

<u>Name</u>	<u>Fees Received</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Trish Hanks	\$ -	\$ -
Marta Bourgeois	N/A	N/A
Brandon Burris	N/A	N/A
David Hearn	N/A	N/A
Rebecca Hillenburg	N/A	N/A
Ralph Hobratschk	N/A	N/A
Larry Moore	N/A	N/A
John Ring	N/A	N/A
Denise Ruiz	N/A	N/A
Mike Shaw	N/A	N/A
<b>TOTAL</b>	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ -</u>



Friendswood Independent School District  
 Schools FIRST Report  
 For Year Ending August 31, 2007

Schedule of Gifts Totaling More Than \$250

<u>Name</u>	<u>Gifts Received</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Trish Hanks	\$ -	\$ -
Marta Bourgeois	\$ -	\$ -
Brandon Burris	\$ -	\$ -
David Hearn	\$ -	\$ -
Revecca Hillenburg	\$ -	\$ -
Ralph Hobratschk	\$ -	\$ -
Larry Moore	\$ -	\$ -
John Ring	\$ -	\$ -
Denise Ruiz	\$ -	\$ -
Mike Shaw	\$ -	\$ -
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

Friendswood Independent School District  
 Schools FIRST Report  
 For Year Ending August 31, 2007

Schedule of Business Transactions

<u>Name</u>	<u>Business Trans.</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Trish Hanks	N/A	N/A
Marta Bourgeois	\$ -	\$ -
Brandon Burris	\$ -	\$ -
David Hearn	\$ -	\$ -
Revecca Hillenburg	\$ -	\$ -
Ralph Hobratschk	\$ -	\$ -
Larry Moore	\$ -	\$ -
John Ring	\$ -	\$ -
Denise Ruiz	\$ -	\$ -
Mike Shaw	\$ -	\$ -
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>