

2011 F.I.R.S.T. REPORT



Greenville Independent School District

A Financial Management Report
For the Year Ended August 31, 2010

This page left blank intentionally.

Greenville Independent School District

2011 Fiscal Management Report

Table of Contents

Schools FIRST Introduction and Cover Letter	4
Notice of Public Meeting	6
2009-2010 District Summary Data	8
2009-2010 Schools FIRST Indicators	14
2009-2010 State-Wide Data Summary	48
Required Supplementary Disclosures:	
2008-2009 District Summary Data	55
Superintendent's Contract	61
Reimbursements to Board Members and Superintendent	63
Summary Schedule of Data Submitted Under Financial	
Solvency Provisions of TEC §39.0822	68
Management Report Contact Information	71



This page left blank intentionally.



The Honorable Board of Trustees and
Taxpayers of Greenville ISD:

The 2010 Schools FIRST Rating is being presented for your information. FIRST stands for "Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas." It is the annual rating performed by the Texas Education Agency to test the financial performance of school districts as required by Title 19, Texas Administrative Code, Section 109.

The District is required to hold a public meeting to distribute a financial management report that explains the district's performance under each of the 22 indicators and the resultant district's rating. The 2011 rating was based upon analysis of staff and student data reported for the 2009-2010 school year, and budgetary and actual financial data for the fiscal year ended August 31, 2010.

Greenville ISD received an "**Above Standard Achievement**" rating for 2011, receiving a strong score of 69 out of 80 possible points. A district is assigned one of four ratings: Superior Achievement, Above Standard Achievement, Standard Achievement, and Substandard Achievement.

We feel that receiving the designation of Above Standard Achievement is more significant due to the complexity of accounting associated with the Texas' school finance system. The Schools FIRST accountability rating makes sure that Texas school districts are accountable not only for student learning, but also for achieving these results cost-effectively and efficiently. The information provided by the Schools FIRST system will guide us in our continued efforts to make the most of each taxpayer dollar.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "David C. Carter".

David C. Carter, CPA
Chief Financial Officer

This page left blank intentionally.

Greenville Independent School District
Schools FIRST Rating
Notice of Public Meeting

Published September 27, 2011 and October 11, 2011 in the Greenville Herald Banner

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING TO DISCUSS
2011 SCHOOL FIRST RATING**

The Greenville Independent School District will hold a public meeting at 6:00 pm, October 18, 2010, at the Wesley Martin Operations Center, 4004 Moulton St. Greenville, Texas 75401. **The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the school district's performance under the School FIRST (Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas).** A financial management report will be distributed and public participation in the discussion is invited.

This page left blank intentionally.

2009-2010 DISTRICT DATA





Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 DISTRICT STATUS DETAIL

Name: GREENVILLE ISD(116905)	Publication Level 1: 6/17/2011 9:03:31 AM
Status: Passed	Publication Level 2: 8/31/2011 1:00:45 PM
Rating: Above Standard Achievement	Last Updated: 8/31/2011 1:00:45 PM
District Score: 69	Passing Score: 56

#	Indicator Description	Updated	Score
1	<u>Was The Total Fund Balance Less Reserved Fund Balance Greater Than Zero In The General Fund?</u>	4/25/2011 8:01:00 PM	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>	4/25/2011 8:01:00 PM	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>	4/25/2011 8:01:00 PM	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>	4/29/2011 3:45:15 PM	Yes
5	<u>Was There An Unqualified Opinion in Annual Financial Report?</u>	4/25/2011 8:01:01 PM	Yes
6	<u>Did The Annual Financial Report Not Disclose Any Instance(s) Of Material Weaknesses In Internal Controls?</u>	4/25/2011 8:01:01 PM	Yes

			1 Multiplier Sum
7	<u>Did the Districts Academic Rating Exceed Academically Unacceptable?</u>	4/25/2011 8:01:01 PM	5
8	<u>Was The Three-Year Average Percent Of Total Tax Collections (Including Delinquent) Greater Than 98%?</u>	4/25/2011 8:01:01 PM	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>	5/10/2011 10:04:09 PM	0
10	<u>Were Debt Related Expenditures (Net Of IFA And/Or EDA Allotment) < \$350.00 Per Student? (If The District's Five-Year Percent Change In Students = Or > 7%, Or If Property Taxes Collected Per Penny Of Tax Effort > \$200,000 Per Student)</u>	4/25/2011 8:01:02 PM	4
11	<u>Was There No Disclosure In The Annual Audit Report Of Material Noncompliance?</u>	4/25/2011 8:01:02 PM	5
12	<u>Did The District Have Full Accreditation Status In Relation To Financial Management Practices? (e.g. No Conservator Or Monitor Assigned)</u>	4/25/2011 8:01:02 PM	5
13	<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>	4/25/2011 8:01:03 PM	5
14	<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>	5/10/2011 4:07:54 PM	5
15	<u>Was The Ratio Of Cash And Investments To Deferred</u>	4/25/2011	5

	<u>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>	8:01:03 PM	
16	<u>Was The Administrative Cost Ratio Less Than The Threshold Ratio?</u>	4/25/2011 8:01:03 PM	5
17	<u>Was The Ratio Of Students To Teachers Within the Ranges Shown Below According To District Size?</u>	4/25/2011 8:01:04 PM	5
18	<u>Was The Ratio Of Students To Total Staff Within the Ranges Shown Below According To District Size?</u>	4/25/2011 8:01:04 PM	5
19	<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>	4/25/2011 8:01:04 PM	5
20	<u>Was The Decrease In Undesignated Unreserved Fund Balance < 20% Over Two Fiscal Years?(If 1.5 Times Optimum Fund Balance < Total Fund Balance In General Fund Or If Total Revenues > Operating Expenditures In The General Fund,Then District Receives 5 Points)</u>	4/25/2011 8:01:04 PM	5
21	<u>Was The Aggregate Total Of Cash And Investments In The General Fund More Than \$0?</u>	4/25/2011 8:01:05 PM	5
22	<u>Were Investment Earnings In All Funds (Excluding Debt Service Fund and Capital Projects Fund) More Than \$20 Per Student?</u>	4/25/2011 8:01:05 PM	0
			69 Weighted Sum
			1 Multiplier Sum

DETERMINATION OF RATING

A. Did The District Answer 'No' To Indicators 1, 2, 3 Or 4? **OR** Did The District Answer 'No' To Both 5 and 6? If So, The District's Rating Is **Substandard Achievement**.

B. Determine Rating By Applicable Range For summation of the indicator scores (Indicators 7-22)

Superior Achievement	72-80 and Yes to indicator 7
Above Standard Achievement	64-71 or ≥ 72 and No to indicator 7
Standard Achievement	56-63
Substandard Achievement	< 56 or No to one default indicator

INDICATOR 17 & 18 RATIOS

Indicator 17	Ranges for Ratios		Indicator 18	Ranges for Ratios	
	Low	High		Low	High
District Size - Number of Students Between			District Size - Number of Students Between		
< 500	7	22	< 500	5	14
500-999	10	22	500-999	5.8	14
1000-4999	11.5	22	1000-4999	6.3	14
5000-9999	13	22	5000-9999	6.8	14
≥ 10000	13.5	22	≥ 10000	7.0	14

OPTIONS

Update Unpassed

Update All

Lower Publication Level

Suspend

Suspension

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

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

2009-2010 Schools FIRST Indicators

Indicator Tests 1 to 22



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 1

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
Indicator:	Was The Total Fund Balance Less Reserved Fund Balance Greater Than Zero In The General Fund?
Status	Passed
Last Updated:	4/25/2011 8:01:00 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
(
(
Total Fund Balance	7,440,641
- Reserves	26,889
)	
)	
> Bankrupt Threshold	0

Mathematical Breakdown: 7,413,752 > 0

RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE

Financial distress avoidance is ascertained when the result of the formula is greater than zero.



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 2

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
Indicator:	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)
Status	Passed
Last Updated:	4/25/2011 8:01:00 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
(
(
2010 Total Students	4,915
- 2006 Total Students	5,199
)	
/ 2006 Total Students	5,199
)	
>= Threshold for Five-Year Percent Change in Students	0.1
Or	
(
(
Total Unrestricted Net Asset Balance	7,297,617
+ Accretion of Interest for Capital Appreciation Bonds	1,984,304
)	
> 0	
)	

Mathematical Breakdown: -0.0546 >= 0.1 Or 9,281,921 > 0

RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE

This Indicator will be considered PASSED if EITHER of the following CONDITIONS is TRUE:

1. The District's Five-Year Percent Change in Students was 10% or MORE.

---- OR ----

2. On the 'Statement of Net Assets', in the 'Government Activities Column', was the Total Unrestricted Net Asset Balance (Net of Accretion of Interest on Capital Appreciation Bonds) GREATER THAN ZERO?

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

THE [TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY](#)

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 3

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
Indicator:	Were There No Disclosures In The Annual Financial Report And/Or Other Sources Of Information Concerning Default On Bonded Indebtedness Obligations?
Status	Passed
Last Updated:	4/25/2011 8:01:00 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
Not Default Disclosures	<input type="text" value="false"/> 

RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE

This indicator will be considered PASSED if there were no disclosures in the annual financial report and/or other sources of information concerning default on bonded indebtedness obligations.

The district was able to make all bond payments.

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

THE [TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY](#)

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 4

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
Indicator:	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)?
Status	Passed
Last Updated:	4/29/2011 3:45:15 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
Date Received	2011/01/06 ?
<= Due Date (Fiscal Year End + Deadline in Days After Fiscal Year End)	2011/02/28 ?

RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE

This indicator will be considered PASSED if the audit report was on time or filed within 30 days of the deadline.

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

THE [TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY](#)

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734




Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 5

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
Indicator:	Was There An Unqualified Opinion in Annual Financial Report?
Status	Passed
Last Updated:	4/25/2011 8:01:01 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
Clean Audit	<input type="text" value="true"/> 

RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE

This indicator will be considered PASSED if the district received a "clean audit" (unqualified opinion).

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

THE [TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY](#)

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 6

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
Indicator:	Did The Annual Financial Report Not Disclose Any Instance(s) Of Material Weaknesses In Internal Controls?
Status	Passed
Last Updated:	4/25/2011 8:01:01 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
Not Weak Internal Controls	<input type="text" value="false"/> 

RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE

This indicator will be considered PASSED if the external auditor reported no material weaknesses in the audit report.

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

THE **TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY**

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 7

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
Indicator:	Did the Districts Academic Rating Exceed Academically Unacceptable?
Result/Points	5
Last Updated:	4/25/2011 8:01:01 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
Academic Rating	<input type="text" value="true"/> 

RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE

This indicator will be considered PASSED if the District did not receive Academically Unacceptable rating.

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

THE [TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY](#)

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 8

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
Indicator:	Was The Three-Year Average Percent Of Total Tax Collections (Including Delinquent) Greater Than 98%?
Result/Points	5
Last Updated:	4/25/2011 8:01:01 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
(
(
2010 Tax Collections	17,258,292
+ 2009 Tax Collections	16,618,164
+ 2008 Tax Collections	14,578,270
)	
/	
(
2010 Tax Levy	17,509,918
+ 2009 Tax Levy	16,760,643
+ 2008 Tax Levy	14,990,914
)	
)	
> Acceptable Tax Collection Rate	0.98

Mathematical Breakdown: 0.9836 > 0.98

**RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE
DETERMINATION OF POINTS**

5	4	3	2	1	0
> 98%	> 95% =< 98%	> 92% =< 95%	> 89% =< 92%	> 86% =< 89%	< = 86%

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

THE **TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY**

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 9

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
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 (Data Quality Measure)?
Result/Points	0
Last Updated:	5/10/2011 10:04:09 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
Sum of Differences	3,233,497
/ Denominator	44,531,280
< Acceptable Level of Variance	0.03

Mathematical Breakdown: 0.0726 < 0.03

RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE
DETERMINATION OF POINTS

5	0
< 3%	>= 3%

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

THE TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 10

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
Indicator:	Were Debt Related Expenditures (Net Of IFA And/Or EDA Allotment) < \$350.00 Per Student? (If The District's Five-Year Percent Change In Students = Or > 7%, Or If Property Taxes Collected Per Penny Of Tax Effort > \$200,000 Per Student)
Result/Points	4
Last Updated:	4/25/2011 8:01:02 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
If	
(
(
(
2010 Total Students	4,915
- 2006 Total Students	5,199
)	
/ 2006 Total Students	5,199
)	
)	
< Threshold for 5 Year Student Population Growth	0.07
And	
(
(
Total Tax Collection	17,258,292
/	
(

Total Tax Rate	1.1844	?
* 100		
)		
)		
< Threshold for Revenue Collection Efficiency	200,000	?
)		
Then		
(
(
Function 71 Expenditures	2,565,295	?
- IFA and EDA Allotments	238,643	?
)		
/ 2010 Total Students	4,915	?
)		

Mathematical Breakdown: If $-0.0546 < 0.07$ And $145,713.3739 < 200,000$ Then 473.3778

RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE DETERMINATION OF POINTS

5	4	3	2	1	0
< \$350	$\geq \$350$ < \$600	$\geq \$600$ < \$850	$\geq \$850$ < \$1,100	$\geq \$1,100$ < \$1,350	\geq \$1,350

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

THE [TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY](#)

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734




Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 11

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
Indicator:	Was There No Disclosure In The Annual Audit Report Of Material Noncompliance?
Result/Points	5
Last Updated:	4/25/2011 8:01:02 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
Not Material Non-Compliance	<input type="text" value="false"/> 

RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE

This indicator will be considered PASSED if the Audit Reported No Material Noncompliance.

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

THE [TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY](#)

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734




Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 12

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
Indicator:	Did The District Have Full Accreditation Status In Relation To Financial Management Practices? (e.g. No Conservator Or Monitor Assigned)
Result/Points	5
Last Updated:	4/25/2011 8:01:02 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
Full Accreditation	<input type="text" value="true"/> 

RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE

This indicator will be considered PASSED if the district had No Financial Conservator Or Monitor Assigned.

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us
 THE [TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY](#)
 1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 13

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
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?
Result/Points	5
Last Updated:	4/25/2011 8:01:03 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
(
(
Budgeted Appropriations in the General Fund	33,511,443
+Budgeted Other Uses in the General Fund	0
)	
-	
(
Budgeted Revenues in the General Fund	33,158,085
+Budgeted Other Resources in the General Fund	0
+Fund Balance In General Fund At July 1 or September 1 Depending On Fiscal Year End	5,838,170
)	
)	
< Standard for Annual Budget Surplus/Margin	0

Mathematical Breakdown: -5,484,812 < 0

RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE

This indicator will be considered PASSED if the district adopts a balanced budget.

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

THE [TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY](#)

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 14

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
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? (To Avoid Creating Or Adding To The Fund Balance Deficit Situation)
Result/Points	5
Last Updated:	5/10/2011 4:07:54 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
If	
(
Fund Balance In General Fund At July 1 or September 1 Depending On Fiscal Year End	7,440,641 ?
+ Fund Balance In Capital Projects Fund At July 1 or September 1 Depending On Fiscal Year End	0 ?
)	
< Standard Capital Fund Margin	0 ?
Then	
(
Expenditures Function 81 In General Fund and Capital Projects Fund	0 ?
- Other Resources For Real Property Financing In General Fund and Capital Projects Fund	11,319 ?
-	
(
Fund Balance In General Fund At July 1 or September 1 Depending On Fiscal Year Start	5,838,170 ?
+ Fund Balance In Capital Projects Fund At July 1 or September 1 Depending On Fiscal Year Start	0 ?

)
)
< Standard Construction Margin

Mathematical Breakdown: If 7,440,641 < 0 Then -5,849,489 < 0

RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE

The district adequately budgeted construction projects.

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

THE [TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY](#)

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 15

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
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? (If Deferred Revenues Are Less Than Net Delinquent Taxes Receivable)
Result/Points	5
Last Updated:	4/25/2011 8:01:03 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
If	
(
(
Deferred Revenue in the General Fund	1,175,769
-	
Property Tax Receivable Net of Uncollectible	1,160,122
)	
>	
Standard Deferred Revenue Margin	0
)	
Then	
(
(
Cash in the General Fund	7,101,519
+	
Investments in the General Fund	0
)	
/	
(
Deferred Revenue in the General Fund	1,175,769

- Property Tax Receivable Net of Uncollectible

1,160,122



)
)

Mathematical Breakdown: If 15,647 > 0 Then 453.8582

RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE DETERMINATION OF POINTS

5	4	3	2	1	0
\geq 1.00	$\Rightarrow 0.95 <$ 1.00	$\Rightarrow 0.90 <$ 0.95	$\Rightarrow 0.85 <$ 0.90	$\Rightarrow 0.80 <$ 0.85	$<$ 0.80

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

THE TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 16

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
Indicator:	Was The Administrative Cost Ratio Less Than The Threshold Ratio?
Result/Points	5
Last Updated:	4/25/2011 8:01:03 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
Acceptable Administrative Cost Ratio	0.1401
> District Administrative Cost Ratio	0.08364447

Mathematical Breakdown: 0.1401 > 0.0836

RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE

DETERMINATION OF POINTS

ADA Group	Standard
10,000 and Above	0.1105
5,000 to 9,999	0.1250
1,000 to 4,999	0.1401
500 to 999	0.1561
Less than 500	0.2654
Sparse	0.3614

5

0

Cost Ratio < Threshold

Cost Ratio >= Threshold

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

THE [TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY](#)

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 17

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
Indicator:	Was The Ratio Of Students To Teachers Within the Ranges Shown Below According To District Size?
Result/Points	5
Last Updated:	4/25/2011 8:01:04 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
(
Number of Students	4,915
/ Number of FTE Teachers	373.5133
)	

Mathematical Breakdown: 13.1588

RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE

DETERMINATION OF POINTS

Students	Low	High
< 500	7.0	22
500 - 999	10.0	22
1000 - 4999	11.5	22
5000 - 9999	13.0	22

=> 10,000	13.5	22			
5	4	3	2	1	0
UL <= 100%	> 100% =< 105%	> 105% =< 110%	> 110% =< 115%	> 115% =< 120%	> 120%
LL => 100%	=> 95% < 100%	=> 90% < 95%	=> 85% < 90%	=> 80% < 85%	< 80%

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

THE **TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY**

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 18

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
Indicator:	Was The Ratio Of Students To Total Staff Within the Ranges Shown Below According To District Size?
Result/Points	5
Last Updated:	4/25/2011 8:01:04 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
(
Number of Students	4,915
/	
Number of FTE Staff	704.1113
)	

Mathematical Breakdown: 6.9804

RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE

DETERMINATION OF POINTS

Students	Low	High
< 500	5.0	14
500 - 999	5.8	14
1000 - 4999	6.3	14
5000 - 9999	6.8	14

=> 10,000	7.0	14			
5	4	3	2	1	0
UL <= 100%	> 100% =< 105%	> 105% =< 110%	> 110% =< 115%	> 115% =< 120%	> 120%
LL => 100%	=> 95% < 100%	=> 90% < 95%	=> 85% < 90%	=> 80% < 85%	< 80%

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

THE **TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY**

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 19

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
Indicator:	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?
Result/Points	5
Last Updated:	4/25/2011 8:01:04 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
(
(
Total General Fund Balance At June 30 or August 31, Depending On Fiscal Year End	7,440,641
/Optimum Fund Balance	8,673,727
)	
* 100	
)	

Mathematical Breakdown: 85.7837

RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE

DETERMINATION OF POINTS

	5	4	3	2	1	0
UL < 150%	>= 150%	>152.5%	>155.0%	>157.5%	>	
	=< 152.5%	=< 155.0%	=< 157.5%	=< 160.0%	> 160.0%	

LL >	= > 47.5%	= > 45.0%	= > 42.5%	= > 40.0%	<
50%	= < 50%	< 47.5%	< 45.0%	< 42.5%	40.0%

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

THE **TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY**

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 20

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
Indicator:	Was The Decrease In Undesignated Unreserved Fund Balance < 20% Over Two Fiscal Years?(If 1.5 Times Optimum Fund Balance < Total Fund Balance In General Fund Or If Total Revenues > Operating Expenditures In The General Fund,Then District Receives 5 Points)
Result/Points	5
Last Updated:	4/25/2011 8:01:04 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
If	
(
Total Revenues in the General Fund	34,150,040
- Expenditures in the General Fund in Functions 11-61 and Expenditure Object Codes 6100-6400	32,025,777
> Acceptable Expenditure Revenue Gap	0
)	
Or	
(
Optimum Fund Balance	8,673,727
* Optimum Fund Balance Multiplier	1.5
< Total General Fund Balance in the General Fund	7,440,641
)	
Or	
(
Undesignated, Unreserved Fund Balance In General Fund At June 30 or	5,104,287

August 31, Depending On Fiscal Year End, Two Fiscal Years Prior

* Maximum Allowable 2 Year Change in Fund

< Undesignated, Unreserved Fund Balance In General Fund For The Last Fiscal Year

)

Or

(

(

Undesignated, Unreserved Fund Balance In General Fund For The Last Fiscal Year

-Undesignated, Unreserved Fund Balance In General Fund At June 30 or August 31, Depending On Fiscal Year End, Two Fiscal Years Prior

)

/ Undesignated, Unreserved Fund Balance In General Fund At June 30 or August 31, Depending On Fiscal Year End, Two Fiscal Years Prior

)

Mathematical Breakdown: If 2,124,263 > 0 Or 13,010,590.5 < 7,440,641 Or 4,083,429.6 < 6,913,752 Or 0.3545

RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE
DETERMINATION OF POINTS

5	4	3	2	1	0
< 20%	=> 20% < 21%	=> 21% < 22%	=> 22% < 23%	=> 23% < 24%	=> 24%

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us
THE TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
 1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 21

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
Indicator:	Was The Aggregate Total Of Cash And Investments In The General Fund More Than \$0?
Result/Points	5
Last Updated:	4/25/2011 8:01:05 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
Cash in the General Fund	7,101,519
+ Investments in the General Fund	0
> Acceptable Lower Limit for Cash and Investments	0

Mathematical Breakdown: 7,101,519 > 0

**RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE
DETERMINATION OF POINTS**

5	0
> 0	= < 0

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

THE **TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY**

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2009-2010 INDICATOR TEST 22

Name:	GREENVILLE ISD (116905)
Indicator:	Were Investment Earnings In All Funds (Excluding Debt Service Fund and Capital Projects Fund) More Than \$20 Per Student?
Result/Points	0
Last Updated:	4/25/2011 8:01:05 PM

FORMULA

Field	Value
Investment Earnings In All Funds Except Debt Service Fund and Capital Projects Fund	27,620
/Number of Students	4,915

Mathematical Breakdown: 5.6195

**RESULT DETERMINATION REFERENCE
DETERMINATION OF POINTS**

5	4	3	2	1	0
> \$20	> \$19 <= \$20	> \$18 <= \$19	> \$17 <= \$18	> \$16 <= \$17	= < \$16

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

THE [TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY](#)

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-

9734

2009-2010 STATE-WIDE DATA





Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

**OVERALL STATISTICS
2009-2010 STATUS COUNTS**

Status	Count	% Total	Enrollment	% Total Enrollment
Passed	1,017	98.83 %	4,687,803	99.62 %
Failed	12	1.17 %	17,760	0.38 %
Total	1,029	100.00 %	4,705,563	100.00 %

2009-2010 RATING COUNTS

Ratings	Count	% Total	Enrollment	% Total Enrollment
Superior Achievement	784	76.19 %	3,705,144	78.74 %
Above Standard Achievement	215	20.89 %	951,089	20.21 %
Standard Achievement	18	1.75 %	31,570	0.67 %
Substandard Achievement	12	1.17 %	17,760	0.38 %
Total	1,029	100.00 %	4,705,563	100.00 %

2009-2010 ALL RESULTS BY INDICATOR

Indicator	Result	Count	% of Districts	Enrollment	% Total Enrollment
1	Yes	1023	99.42 %	4695947	99.80 %
	No	6	0.58 %	9616	0.20 %
2	Yes	1025	99.61 %	4700916	99.90 %
	No	4	0.39 %	4647	0.10 %

3	Yes	1029	100.00 %	4705563	100.00 %
	No	0	0.00 %	0	0.00 %
4	Yes	1027	99.81 %	4696155	99.80 %
	No	2	0.19 %	9408	0.20 %
5	Yes	1026	99.71 %	4696948	99.82 %
	No	3	0.29 %	8615	0.18 %
6	Yes	993	96.50 %	4464457	94.88 %
	No	36	3.50 %	241106	5.12 %
7	5	1015	98.64 %	4579585	97.32 %
	0	14	1.36 %	125978	2.68 %
8	5	866	84.16 %	4312735	91.65 %
	4	148	14.38 %	348125	7.40 %
	3	15	1.46 %	44703	0.95 %
9	5	992	96.40 %	4536786	96.41 %
	0	37	3.60 %	168777	3.59 %
10	5	660	64.14 %	4177633	88.78 %
	4	139	13.51 %	201175	4.28 %
	3	74	7.19 %	121910	2.59 %
	2	50	4.86 %	92331	1.96 %
	1	45	4.37 %	62325	1.32 %

	0	61	5.93 %	50189	1.07 %
11	5	998	96.99 %	4270142	90.75 %
	0	31	3.01 %	435421	9.25 %
12	5	1020	99.13 %	4677301	99.40 %
	0	9	0.87 %	28262	0.60 %
13	5	1019	99.03 %	4687262	99.61 %
	0	10	0.97 %	18301	0.39 %
14	5	1027	99.81 %	4704819	99.98 %
	0	2	0.19 %	744	0.02 %
15	5	1027	99.81 %	4704502	99.98 %
	0	2	0.19 %	1061	0.02 %
16	5	990	96.21 %	4670129	99.25 %
	0	39	3.79 %	35434	0.75 %
17	5	950	92.32 %	4577513	97.28 %
	4	41	3.98 %	70737	1.50 %
	3	19	1.85 %	49055	1.04 %
	2	7	0.68 %	5467	0.12 %
	1	4	0.39 %	1719	0.04 %
	0	8	0.78 %	1072	0.02 %
18	5	680	66.08 %	3913325	83.16 %

	4	135	13.12 %	503266	10.70 %
	3	93	9.04 %	205846	4.37 %
	2	47	4.57 %	39491	0.84 %
	1	26	2.53 %	15205	0.32 %
	0	48	4.66 %	28430	0.60 %
19	5	889	86.39 %	4200206	89.26 %
	4	9	0.87 %	76531	1.63 %
	3	9	0.87 %	33105	0.70 %
	2	9	0.87 %	7383	0.16 %
	1	8	0.78 %	17508	0.37 %
	0	105	10.20 %	370830	7.88 %
20	5	971	94.36 %	4570930	97.14 %
	3	1	0.10 %	7809	0.17 %
	1	2	0.19 %	1770	0.04 %
	0	55	5.34 %	125054	2.66 %
21	5	1027	99.81 %	4704550	99.98 %
	0	2	0.19 %	1013	0.02 %
22	5	531	51.60 %	759660	16.14 %
	4	12	1.17 %	68917	1.46 %
	3	16	1.55 %	56600	1.20 %

2	20	1.94 %	48780	1.04 %
1	12	1.17 %	58423	1.24 %
0	438	42.57 %	3713183	78.91 %

2009-2010 ANSWERS BY INDICATOR

Indicator	Yes	No	5	4	3	2	1	0	Total
1	1023	6	x	x	x	x	x	x	1029
2	1025	4	x	x	x	x	x	x	1029
3	1029	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	1029
4	1027	2	x	x	x	x	x	x	1029
5	1026	3	x	x	x	x	x	x	1029
6	993	36	x	x	x	x	x	x	1029
7	x	x	1015	x	x	x	x	14	1029
8	x	x	866	148	15	x	x	x	1029
9	x	x	992	x	x	x	x	37	1029
10	x	x	660	139	74	50	45	61	1029
11	x	x	998	x	x	x	x	31	1029
12	x	x	1020	x	x	x	x	9	1029
13	x	x	1019	x	x	x	x	10	1029
14	x	x	1027	x	x	x	x	2	1029
15	x	x	1027	x	x	x	x	2	1029
16	x	x	990	x	x	x	x	39	1029

17	x	x	950	41	19	7	4	8	1029
18	x	x	680	135	93	47	26	48	1029
19	x	x	889	9	9	9	8	105	1029
20	x	x	971	x	1	x	2	55	1029
21	x	x	1027	x	x	x	x	2	1029
22	x	x	531	12	16	20	12	438	1029

Last Updated: Wednesday, August 31, 2011 12:59:28 PM

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

THE **TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY**

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE · AUSTIN, TEXAS, 78701 · (512) 463-9734

Required Supplemental Disclosures

2008-2009 District Summary Data



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2008-2009 DISTRICT STATUS DETAIL

Name: GREENVILLE ISD(116905)	Publication Level 1: 6/11/2010 12:03:10 PM
Status: Passed	Publication Level 2: 8/30/2010 4:06:59 PM
Rating: Superior Achievement	Last Updated: 8/30/2010 4:06:59 PM
District Score: 77	Passing Score: 56

#	Indicator Description	Updated	Score
1	<u>Was The Total Fund Balance Less Reserved Fund Balance Greater Than Zero In The General Fund?</u>	3/30/2010 3:09:18 PM	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>	3/30/2010 3:09:18 PM	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>	3/30/2010 3:09:18 PM	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>	3/30/2010 3:09:19 PM	Yes
5	<u>Was There An Unqualified Opinion in Annual Financial Report?</u>	3/30/2010 3:09:19 PM	Yes
6	<u>Did The Annual Financial Report Not Disclose Any Instance(s) Of Material Weaknesses In Internal Controls?</u>	3/30/2010 3:09:19 PM	Yes

			1 Multiplier Sum
7	<u>Did the Districts Academic Rating Exceed Academically Unacceptable?</u>	3/30/2010 3:09:19 PM	5
8	<u>Was The Three-Year Average Percent Of Total Tax Collections (Including Delinquent) Greater Than 98%?</u>	3/30/2010 3:09:19 PM	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>	3/30/2010 3:09:20 PM	5
10	<u>Were Debt Related Expenditures (Net Of IFA And/Or EDA Allotment) < \$350.00 Per Student? (If The District's Five-Year Percent Change In Students = Or > 7%, Or If Property Taxes Collected Per Penny Of Tax Effort > \$200,000 Per Student)</u>	3/30/2010 3:09:20 PM	4
11	<u>Was There No Disclosure In The Annual Audit Report Of Material Noncompliance?</u>	3/30/2010 3:09:20 PM	5
12	<u>Did The District Have Full Accreditation Status In Relation To Financial Management Practices? (e.g. No Conservator Or Monitor Assigned)</u>	3/30/2010 3:09:20 PM	5
13	<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>	3/30/2010 3:09:21 PM	5
14	<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>	3/30/2010 3:09:21 PM	5
15	<u>Was The Ratio Of Cash And Investments To Deferred</u>	3/30/2010	5

	<u>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>	3:09:21 PM	
16	<u>Was The Administrative Cost Ratio Less Than The Threshold Ratio?</u>	3/30/2010 3:09:21 PM	5
17	<u>Was The Ratio Of Students To Teachers Within the Ranges Shown Below According To District Size?</u>	3/30/2010 3:09:22 PM	5
18	<u>Was The Ratio Of Students To Total Staff Within the Ranges Shown Below According To District Size?</u>	3/30/2010 3:09:22 PM	5
19	<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>	3/30/2010 3:09:22 PM	5
20	<u>Was The Decrease In Undesignated Unreserved Fund Balance < 20% Over Two Fiscal Years?(If 1.5 Times Optimum Fund Balance < Total Fund Balance In General Fund Or If Total Revenues > Operating Expenditures In The General Fund,Then District Receives 5 Points)</u>	3/30/2010 3:09:22 PM	5
21	<u>Was The Aggregate Total Of Cash And Investments In The General Fund More Than \$0?</u>	3/30/2010 3:09:22 PM	5
22	<u>Were Investment Earnings In All Funds (Excluding Debt Service Fund and Capital Projects Fund) More Than \$20 Per Student?</u>	3/30/2010 3:09:23 PM	3
			77 Weighted Sum
			1 Multiplier Sum

DETERMINATION OF RATING

A. Did The District Answer 'No' To Indicators 1, 2, 3 Or 4? **OR** Did The District Answer 'No' To Both 5 and 6? If So, The District's Rating Is **Substandard Achievement**.

B. Determine Rating By Applicable Range For summation of the indicator scores (Indicators 7-22)

Superior Achievement	72-80 and Yes to indicator 7
Above Standard Achievement	64-71 or ≥ 72 and No to indicator 7
Standard Achievement	56-63
Substandard Achievement	< 56 or No to one default indicator

INDICATOR 17 & 18 RATIOS

Indicator 17	Ranges for Ratios		Indicator 18	Ranges for Ratios	
	Low	High		Low	High
District Size - Number of Students Between			District Size - Number of Students Between		
< 500	7	22	< 500	5	14
500-999	10	22	500-999	5.8	14
1000-4999	11.5	22	1000-4999	6.3	14
5000-9999	13	22	5000-9999	6.8	14
≥ 10000	13.5	22	≥ 10000	7.0	14

OPTIONS

Update Unpassed | Update All | Lower Publication Level | Ssuspend | Suspension

Audit Home Page: [School Financial Audits](#) | Send comments or suggestions to schoolaudits@tea.state.tx.us

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

Required Supplemental Disclosures

Superintendent's Contract

Reporting requirements for the financial management report for Schools FIRST public hearing are found in **Title 19 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 109, Budgeting, Accounting, and Auditing, Subchapter AA, Commissioner's Rules Concerning Financial Accountability Rating System**. This rule describes requirements for the five (5) disclosures explained below that are to be presented as appendices in the Schools FIRST financial management report.

1. Superintendent's Employment Contract

The school district is to provide a copy of the superintendent's employment contract that is effective on the date of the Schools FIRST hearing in calendar year 2010. In lieu of publication in the Schools FIRST financial management report, the school district may choose 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.

<http://www.greenvilleisd.com/cms/lib/TX01001755/Centricity/Domain/78/superintendentcontract.pdf>

Required Supplemental Disclosures

Reimbursements to Board Members and Superintendent

2. Reimbursements Received by the Superintendent and Board Members for Fiscal Year 2010

For the Twelve-month Period Ended August 31, 2010								
Description of Reimbursements	Superintendent	Board Member 1	Board Member 2	Board Member 3	Board Member 4	Board Member 5	Board Member 6	Board Member 7
Meals	\$592.59	\$47.98	\$36.36	\$47.85	\$100.78			
Lodging	49.44							
Transportation	7,211.44	16.50				\$159.72	\$138.00	\$191.16
Motor Fuel								
Other	903.21							
Total	\$8,756.68	\$64.48	\$36.36	\$47.85	\$100.78	\$159.72	\$138.00	\$191.16

Note – The spirit of the rule is to capture all “reimbursements” for fiscal year 2009, 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 (or on-behalf of) to the superintendent and board member not defined above.

3. Outside Compensation and/or Fees Received by the Superintendent for Professional Consulting and/or Other Personal Services in Fiscal Year 2010

For the Twelve-Month Period Ended August 31, 2010	
Name(s) of Entity(ies)	
	\$
Total	\$-0-

Note – Compensation does not include business revenues from the superintendent’s livestock or agricultural-based activities on a ranch or farm. Report gross amount received (do not deduct business expenses from gross revenues). Revenues generated from a family business that have no relationship to school district business are not to be disclosed.

4. Gifts Received by the Executive Officer(s) and Board Members (and First Degree Relatives, if any) in Fiscal Year 2010

For the Twelve-Month Period Ended August 31, 2010								
	Super-intendent	Board Member 1	Board Member 2	Board Member 3	Board Member 4	Board Member 5	Board Member 6	Board Member 7
Summary Amounts	\$-0-	\$-0-	\$-0-	\$-0-	\$-0-	\$-0-	\$-0-	\$-0-

Note – An executive officer is defined as the superintendent, unless the board of trustees or the district administration names additional staff under this classification. Gifts received by first degree relatives, if any, will be reported under the applicable school official.

5. Business Transactions Between School District and Board Members for Fiscal Year 2010

For the Twelve-Month Period Ended August 31, 2010	Board Member 1	Board Member 2	Board Member 3	Board Member 4	Board Member 5	Board Member 6	Board Member 7
Summary Amounts	\$-0-	\$-0-	\$-0-	\$-0-	\$-0-	\$-0-	\$-0-

Note - The summary amounts reported under this disclosure are not to duplicate the items reported in the summary schedule of reimbursements received by board members.

Summary Schedule of Data Submitted
Under Financial Solvency Provisions of TEC §39.0822

Summary Schedule of Data Submitted under the Financial Solvency Provisions of TEC §39.0822

General Fund - First-Quarter Expenditures By Object Code

Report **2010-2011 first-quarter (first three months)** of fiscal year 2010-2011)

GENERAL FUND expenditures by object code using whole numbers.

Payroll- Expenditures for payroll costs	object codes 6110-6149	<u>\$ 6,656,308</u>
Contract Costs- Expenditures for services rendered by firms, individuals, and other organizations	object code series 6200	<u>\$ 689,506</u>
Supplies and Materials- Expenditures for supplies and materials necessary to maintain and/or operate furniture, computers, equipment, vehicles, grounds, and facilities	object code series 6300	<u>\$ 303,374</u>
Other Operating- Expenditures for items other than payroll, professional and contracted services, supplies and materials, debt service, and capital outlay	object code series 6400	<u>\$ 283,776</u>
Debt Service- Expenditures for debt service	object code series 6500	<u>\$ 113,825</u>
Capital Outlay- Expenditures for land, buildings, and equipment	object code series 6600	<u>\$ 657,929</u>

Additional Financial Solvency Questions

- 1) Districts with a September 1- August 31 fiscal year:
 Within the last two years, did the school district
- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1) draw funds from a short-term financing note (term less than 12 months) between the months of September and December, inclusive, and | Yes/No |
| 2) for the prior fiscal year, have a total General Fund balance of less than 2 percent of total expenditures for General Fund function codes 11-61? | <u>No</u> |
| | <u>No</u> |
- Districts with a July 1- June 30 fiscal year:
 Within the last two years, did the school district
- | | |
|---|------------|
| 1) draw funds from a short-term financing note (term less than 12 months) between the months of July and October, inclusive, and | <u>n/a</u> |
| 2) for the prior fiscal year, have a total General Fund balance of less than 2 percent of total expenditures for General Fund function codes 11-61? | <u>n/a</u> |
- 2) Has the school district declared financial exigency within the past two years? No

3) Provide comments or explanations for student-to-staff ratios significantly (more than 15%) below the norm, rapid depletion of General Fund balances, or any significant discrepancies between actual budget figures and projected revenues and expenditures, or any other information that may be helpful in evaluating the school district's financial solvency.

<u>85% of Mean Enroll-to-Teacher</u>		
<u>Mean Enroll-to-Teacher Ratio</u>	<u>Ratio</u>	<u>School District Size</u>
8.39	7.13	Under 100
9.48	8.06	100 to 249
10.73	9.12	250 to 499
11.48	9.76	500 to 999
12.45	10.58	1,000 to 1,599
13.52	11.50	1,600 to 2,999
14.29	12.15	3,000 to 4,999
14.80	12.58	5,000 to 9,999
14.88	12.65	10,000 to 24,999
15.01	12.76	25,000 to 49,999
15.06	12.80	50,000 and Over

No additional comments necessary. The district maintains adequate staffing ratios and has sufficient fund balance as recommended by TEA.

- 4) How many superintendents has your school district had in the last five years? 2
- 5) How many business managers has your school district had in the last five years? 3

This page left blank intentionally.



End of Financial Management Report

**Questions regarding this report can be directed to
David Carter, CPA, Chief Financial Officer, at
903-457-2500.**