

# **Hurst-Euless-Bedford Independent School District**

Independent Accountant's Report on Applying  
Agreed-Upon Procedures Related to House Bill 3  
Efficiency Audit Guidelines  
Data for the Fiscal Year Ended August 31, 2024

# CONTENTS

Page

Independent Accountant's Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures Related to House Bill 3  
Efficiency Audit Guidelines ..... 1

Section I - Executive Summary.....2

Section II - Key Information about the District.....3

Section III - Objectives and Approach .....4

Section IV - District Data on Accountability, Students, Staffing and Finances, with Peer  
Districts and State Comparisons.....8

Section V - Additional Financial, Operational, and Academic Information .....19

**Independent Accountant's Report on  
Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures**

To the Board of Trustees and Citizens  
of Hurst-Euless-Bedford Independent School District

We have performed the procedures enumerated in Section III, as listed in the table of contents, which were agreed to by Hurst-Euless-Bedford Independent School District (the "District"), solely for the purpose of reporting our findings regarding the results of comparing the District to the criteria set forth in the Legislative Budget Board's House Bill 3 Efficiency Audit Guidelines for the year ended August 31, 2024. The District's management is responsible for the results of comparing the District to the criteria set forth in the Legislative Budget Board's House Bill 3 Efficiency Audit Guidelines for the year ended August 31, 2024.

The District has agreed to and acknowledged that the procedures performed are appropriate to meet the intended purpose of evaluating the District's fiscal management, efficiency, and utilization of resources for the year ended August 31, 2024. This report may not be suitable for any other purpose. The procedures performed may not address all the items of interest to a user of this report and may not meet the needs of all users of this report and, as such, users are responsible for determining whether the procedures performed are appropriate for their purposes.

We were engaged by the District to perform this agreed-upon procedures engagement and conducted our engagement in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA). We were not engaged to and did not conduct an examination or review, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion or conclusion, respectively, on the specified procedures above. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion or conclusion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

We are required to be independent of the District and to meet our other ethical responsibilities, in accordance with the relevant ethical requirements related to our agreed-upon procedures engagement.

*Weaver and Tidwell, L.L.P.*

WEAVER AND TIDWELL, L.L.P.

Dallas, Texas  
September 5, 2025

## **SECTION I- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Overview of Procedures Performed**

In conducting our agreed-upon procedures for the District, we gained an understanding of the District's fiscal management, efficiency and utilization of resources, and whether the District has implemented best practices utilized by Texas school districts. This was accomplished by analyzing data from the fiscal year ended August 31, 2024 and prior, maintained by the Texas Education Agency ("TEA") and the District. An overview of the objectives and approach performed during the agreed-upon procedures are provided in Section III of this report. District data on accountability, students, staffing and finances, with peer districts and state comparisons are described in Section IV of this report.

**SECTION II- KEY INFORMATION ABOUT THE DISTRICT**

Hurst-Eules-Bedford Independent School District (the "District") is holding a voter-approved tax rate election (VATRE or "election") on November 4, 2025 to adopt its maintenance and operations (M&O) property tax rate for the 2025-2026 school year (fiscal year 2026). Maintenance and Operations (M&O) taxes are for the operation of public schools. The proposed M&O tax rate for fiscal year 2026 is \$0.7026, which is an increase from fiscal year 2025 which was \$0.6726. The proposed fiscal year 2026 M&O tax rate exceeds the District's Voter Approval tax rate by \$0.03, which by statute requires an election and an efficiency audit (also referred to as agreed-upon procedures or "AUP" engagement). There have been no previous VATREs at the District.

The District engaged Weaver and Tidwell, L.L.P. to conduct the AUP engagement. The AUP engagement's focus is on informing voters about the District's fiscal management, efficiency, utilization of resources, and whether the District has implemented best practices. The information includes data and tools that the State of Texas currently utilizes to measure school district efficiency.

The estimated revenue from the proposed increase in tax rate is approximately \$5.9 million and represents a 2.4% increase in revenues for the general operating fund.

The average home taxable value of a single-family residential property in Tarrant County in fiscal year 2025 is approximately \$255,000. The average tax bill as a result of the M&O rate change is \$1,496, or a \$219 per year decrease compared to fiscal year 2024. Taxes are still reduced year-over-year due to increase in Homestead Exemption and tax rate compression.

If a VATRE is successful, the District will use the additional funds to reduce the District's current deficit. The District currently has a deficit budget for the 2025-2026 school year (fiscal year 2026) of \$20.6 million. The increased funds from tax revenue, as well as additional state revenue, will reduce the deficit to approximately \$8.6 million.

Some key information about the District:

- The District's total operating revenue for all funds, for fiscal year 2024 totaled \$11,404 per student, while its peer district average and State average totaled \$11,754 per student and \$13,037 per student, respectively.
- The District's total operating expenditures for all funds for fiscal year 2024 totaled \$11,193 per student, while its peer district average and State average were \$12,005 per student and \$12,944 per student, respectively.
- The District earned a Superior Rating for the School Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas (FIRST) for fiscal year 2024.
- The Texas Education Agency reviews and tracks the performance of both school districts and individual schools with the Texas A-F Accountability System. The results are posted year-to-year. The District, as a whole, earned a "B" (88 out of 100 points) in 2022 - 2023, the last year accountability ratings were issued. The detail by campus for the 2022 - 2023 accountability rating is shown below:

<b>Rating</b>	<b># of Campus'</b>
A	14
B	14
C	1
Not Rated	0

Campus data as of 2023, was the latest data available. Additional details and audit results are included in Section IV.

## **SECTION III- OBJECTIVES AND APPROACH**

### **Objectives**

The objective of our agreed upon procedures was to assess the District's fiscal management, efficiency and utilization of resources, and whether the District has implemented best practices utilized by Texas school districts.

### **Approach**

In order to achieve the objectives, set forth above, Weaver and Tidwell, L.L.P. performed the following procedures:

1. Selected peer districts, developed a simple average and used the same comparison group throughout the audit.
2. Reported on the overall accountability rating (A-to-F and a corresponding scale score of 1 to 100) and compared to the District's peer districts' average score.
3. Listed the following for the District's campus information:
  - a. Accountability rating count for each campus level within the district.
  - b. Names of the campuses that received an F accountability rating
  - c. Campuses that are required to implement a campus turnaround plan
4. Reported on the District's School FIRST rating. For a rating of less than A, listed the indicators not met.
5. Reported on student characteristics for the District, its peer districts and the State average including:
  - a. Total Students
  - b. Economically Disadvantaged
  - c. English Learners
  - d. Special Education
  - e. Bilingual/ESL Education
  - f. Career and Technical Education
6. Reported on the attendance rate for the District, its peer districts and the State.
7. Reported on the five-year enrollment for the District for the most recent school year and four (4) years prior, the average annual percentage change based on the previous five years and the projected next school year.
8. Reported on the following indicators related to the District's revenue, its peer districts' average and the State average and explained any significant variances.
  - a. Local M&O Tax (Retained) (without debt service and recapture)
  - b. State
  - c. Federal
  - d. Other local and intermediate
  - e. Total revenue

9. Reported on the following indicators related to the District's expenditures, its peer districts' average, and the State average and explained significant variances from the peer districts' average, if any. In addition, explained the reasons for the District's expenditures exceeding revenue, if applicable.
  - a. Instruction
  - b. Instructional resources and media
  - c. Curriculum and staff development
  - d. Instructional leadership
  - e. School leadership
  - f. Guidance counseling services
  - g. Social work services
  - h. Health services
  - i. Transportation
  - j. Food service operation
  - k. Extracurricular
  - l. General administration
  - m. Plant maintenance and operations
  - n. Security and monitoring services
  - o. Data processing services
  - p. Community services
  - q. Total operating expenditures
  
10. Reported on the following indicators for payroll and select District salary expenditures compared to its peer districts' average and the State average and explained any significant variances from the peer districts' average in any category.
  - a. Payroll as a percentage of all funds
  - b. Average teacher salary
  - c. Average administrative salary
  - d. Superintendent salary
  
11. Reported on the General Fund operating fund balance, excluding debt service and capital outlay, for the past five years and per student for the District and its peer districts. Analyzed unassigned fund balance per student and as a percentage of three-month operating expenditures and explained any significant variances.
  
12. Reported the District's allocation of staff, and student-to-teacher and student-to-total staff ratios for the District, its peer districts and the State average. The following staff categories were used:
  - a. Teaching
  - b. Support
  - c. Administrative
  - d. Paraprofessional
  - e. Auxiliary
  - f. Students per total staff
  - g. Students per teaching staff

- 13.** Reported on the District's teacher turnover rate as well as its peer districts and the State's average. Reported on the following programs offered by the District, including the number of students served, percentage of enrolled students served, program budget, program budget as a percentage of the District's budget, total staff for the program, and student-to-staff ratio for the program.

  - a. Economically Disadvantaged
  - b. English Learners
  - c. Special Education
  - d. Bilingual/ESL Education
  - e. Career and Technical Education
  - f. Athletics and Extracurricular Activities
  - g. Alternative Education Program/Disciplinary Alternative Education Program
  - h. Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program
  
- 14.** Described how the District maximizes available resources from state sources and regional education service centers to develop or implement programs or deliver services.
  
- 15.** Report on the District's annual external audit report's independent auditor's opinion as required by Government Auditing Standards.
  
- 16.** Explained the basis of the TEA assigning the District a financial-related monitoring/oversight role during the past three years, if applicable.
  
- 17.** In regard to the District's budget process, provided a response to each of the following questions:

  - a. Does the District's budget planning process include projections for enrollment and staffing?
  - b. Does the District's budget process include monthly and quarterly reviews to determine the status of annual spending?
  - c. Does the District use cost allocation procedures to determine campus budgets and cost centers?
  - d. Does the District analyze educational costs and student needs to determine campus budgets?
  
- 18.** Provided a description of the District's self-funded program, if any, and analyzed whether program revenues are sufficient to cover program costs.
  
- 19.** Reported whether the District administrators are evaluated annually and, if so, explained how the results inform District operations.
  
- 20.** In regard to the District's compensation system, provided a response to the following questions:

  - a. Does the District use salary bonuses or merit pay systems? If yes, explain the performance-based systems and the factors used.
  - b. Do the District's salary ranges include minimum, midpoint, and maximum increments to promote compensation equity based on the employee's education, experience, and other relevant factors?
  - c. Does the District periodically adjust its compensation structure using verifiable salary survey information, benchmarking, and comparable salary data?
  - d. Has the District made any internal equity and/or market adjustments to salaries within the past two years?

- 21.** In regard to planning, provided a response for each of the following questions:
- a. Does the District develop a District Improvement Plan (DIP) annually?
  - b. Do all campuses in the District develop a Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) annually?
  - c. Does the District have an active and current facilities master plan? If yes, does the District consider these factors to inform the plan:
    - i. Does the District use enrollment projections?
    - ii. Does the District analyze facility capacity?
    - iii. Does the District evaluate facility condition?
    - iv. Does the District have an active and current energy management plan?
    - v. Does the District maintain a clearly defined staffing formula for staff in maintenance, custodial, food service, and transportation?
- 22.** In regard to District academic information, we will provide a response for each of the following questions:
- a. Does the District have a teacher mentoring program?
  - b. Are decisions to adopt new programs or discontinue existing programs made based on quantifiable data and research?
  - c. When adopting new programs, does the District define expected results?
  - d. Does the District analyze student test results at the district and/or campus level to design, implement and/or monitor the use of curriculum and instructional programs?
- 23.** Provided a response to the question if the District modifies programs, plans staff development opportunities, or evaluates staff based on analyses of student test results.

**SECTION IV- DISTRICT DATA ON ACCOUNTABILITY, STUDENTS, STAFFING AND FINANCES, WITH PEER DISTRICTS AND STATE COMPARISONS**

**1. Peer Districts**

Weaver and Tidwell, L.L.P. used the Texas Education Agency's (TEA) 2023 Snapshot Peer Search, which identified a total of 67 peer districts of similar size as Hurst-Euless-Bedford Independent School District (10,000 to 24,999 students). We selected 7 out of the 67 peer districts based on similar size, and 3 more using other characteristics listed on the TEA website, such as proximity, student needs, and financial resources. The District did not have input on the peer districts chosen. The peer districts selected are shown below.

**Figure 1**  
**Peer Districts**

District Name	County
MCKINNEY ISD	COLLIN
GRAND PRAIRIE ISD	DALLAS
CARROLLTON-FARMERS BRANCH ISD	DALLAS
NORTHWEST ISD	DENTON
MANSFIELD ISD	TARRANT
KELLER ISD	TARRANT
EAGLE MT-SAGINAW ISD	TARRANT
BIRDVILLE ISD	TARRANT
GRAPEVINE-COLLEYVILLE ISD	TARRANT
CROWLEY ISD	TARRANT

**2. Accountability Rating**

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) annually assigns an A-to-F rating and a corresponding scaled score (1 to 100) to each district and campus based on student assessment results and other accountability measures. To align with Senate Bill 1365, school districts and campuses received an A, B or C rating or were assigned a label of Not Rated: Senate Bill 1365. This Not Rated: Senate Bill 1365 label was applied when the domain or overall scaled score for a district or campus was less than 70.

**Figure 2**  
**Accountability Rating Comparison**

	Hurst-Euless-Bedford ISD		Peer District
	District Rating (A-F)	District Rating (1-100)	Average Score (1-100)
Rating/Score	B	88	79

### 3. Accountability Rating by Campus

The results for the District's 29 campuses that were assigned a rating are shown below. Campus data as of 2023, was the latest data available.

**Figure 3**  
**Accountability Rating by Campus Level**

	Elementary Schools	Middle Schools	High Schools
A	9	5	-
B	11	-	3
C	1	-	-
D	-	-	-
F	-	-	-
Not Rated	-	-	-

Campuses with an "F" Accountability Rating – None noted

Campuses with Required to Implement a Campus Turnaround Plan - None noted

### 4. Financial Rating

The State of Texas' school financial accountability rating system, known as the School Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas (FIRST), ensures that Texas public schools are held accountable for the quality of their financial management practices and that they improve those practices. The system is designed to encourage Texas public schools to better manage their financial resources to provide the maximum allocation possible for direct instructional purposes.

The School Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas (FIRST) holds school districts accountable for the quality of their financial management practices.

The rating is based on five (5) critical indicators as well as minimum number of points for an additional ten (10) indicators. Beginning with 2015-2016 Rating (based on the 2014-2015 financial data), the Texas Education Agency moved from "Pass/Fail" system and began assigning a letter rating.

The ratings and corresponding points are shown below:

Rating	Points
A = Superior	90 - 100
B = Above Standard	80 - 89
C = Meets Standards	60 - 79
F = Substandard Achievement	Less than 60

The District's 2023-2024 rating based on school year 2022 - 2023 data was an "A" (Superior).

**Figure 4**  
**School FIRST Rating**

	District Rating (A-F)
Rating	A

## 5. Student Characteristics

Every student is served differently in public schools based on their unique characteristics. Such data is captured by the Texas Education Agency on an annual basis. Figure 5 provides student counts for five (5) select student characteristics, which are described below:

Economically Disadvantaged - This term has an identical meaning to educationally disadvantaged, which is defined by the Texas Education Code (TEC) §5.001(4) as a student who is "eligible to participate in the national free or reduced-price lunch program".

English Learners - The TEA defines an English Learner as a student who is in the process of acquiring English and has another language as the primary language; it is synonymous with English Language Learner (ELL) and Limited English Proficient (LEP).

Bilingual/ESL Education - TEC §29.055 describes students enrolled in a bilingual education program as those students in a full-time program of dual-language instruction that provides for learning basic skills in the primary language of the students and for carefully structured and sequenced mastery of the English language skills. Students enrolled in an English as a Second Language (ESL) program receive intensive instruction in English from teachers trained in recognizing and dealing with language differences.

Special Education - These are students with a disability as defined by Federal regulations (34 CFR §§ 300.304 through 300.311), State of Texas Laws (Texas Education Code §29.003) or the Commissioner's/State Board of Education Rules (§89.1040).

Career and Technical Education - Students enrolled in State approved Career and Technology Education programs.

**Figure 5**  
**Selected Student Characteristics**

	Total Student Population Count	Percentage of Student Population	Peer District Average Percentage	State Average Percentage
Total Students	23,156	100.0%	N/A	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	14,093	60.9%	50.9%	62.3%
English Learners	5,490	23.7%	20.8%	24.4%
Bilingual/ESL Education	5,263	22.7%	20.6%	24.5%
Special Education	3,239	14.0%	14.2%	13.9%
Career and Technical Education	6,289	27.2%	28.5%	26.9%

There are 5.5 million students served by public schools in the State of Texas. Of those students, 3.4 million or 62.3 percent are economically disadvantaged. The percentage of economically disadvantaged students served by the District compared to its total student population totaled 60.9 percent, which is 10.0 percent greater than the peer districts average and 1.4 percent less than State average. Crowley Independent School District had the highest economically disadvantaged student percentage of 78.3 percent, while Grapevine-Colleyville Independent School District had the lowest percentage of 27.1 percent.

The peer districts average total student count was 24,954. Of the peer districts evaluated, Mansfield Independent School District had the highest total student count of 35,759, while Grapevine-Colleyville Independent School District had the lowest student count of 13,536.

**6. Attendance**

**Figure 6**  
**Attendance Rate**

	<b>District Total</b>	<b>Peer District Average</b>	<b>State Average</b>
Attendance Rate	95.4%	93.7%	93.3%

Source: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information Management System District Attendance, Graduation, and Dropout Rates Reports. Based on school year 2023 - 2024 data.

A school district's State Funding is a complex calculation with many inputs. One of the primary drivers used in the calculation is student attendance. The District's attendance rate is 1.7 percent and 2.1 percent greater than its peer districts average and the State average, respectively.

## 7. Five-Year Enrollment

The attendance rate should be evaluated in conjunction with the number of students enrolled. As shown in Figure 7, the District experienced an average annual decrease over the last five years of 0.6 percent. When the current enrollment data for 2025 is incorporated, the average decrease is 0.5 percent.

**Figure 7**  
**5-Year Enrollment**

	<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>% Change</b>
2024	23,226	1.2%
2023	22,947	0.3%
2022	22,874	-0.4%
2021	22,962	-3.6%
2020	23,816	
Average annual percentage change based on the previous five years		-0.6%
2025 [1]	23,262	0.2%
Average annual percentage change based on the previous five years and the 2025 fiscal year		-0.5%

Note: [1] Based on fiscal year 2025 PEIMS Data from the District.

## 8. District Revenue

**Figure 8**  
**District Tax Revenue**

	<b>District</b>		<b>Peer District Average</b>		<b>State Average</b>	
	<b>Revenue Per Student</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>	<b>Revenue Per Student</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>	<b>Revenue Per Student</b>	<b>Percentage of Total</b>
Local M&O Tax (retained) [1]	\$ 5,299	46.5%	\$ 5,902	50.7%	\$ 4,553	34.9%
State [2]	3,468	30.4%	3,819	32.2%	5,545	42.5%
Federal	1,589	13.9%	1,202	10.0%	2,138	16.4%
Other Local and Intermediate	1,048	9.2%	831	7.1%	801	6.2%
Total Revenue	\$ 11,404	100.0%	\$ 11,754	100.0%	\$ 13,037	100.0%

Note [1]: Excludes Recapture

[2]: Excludes TRS on-behalf

Source: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information Management System District Financial Actual Reports.

The financial data above includes all funds, except for the District's capital projects fund and debt service fund. Approximately \$10.5 million of the Teacher Retirement System (TRS) contributions made by the State of Texas on- behalf of the District were also excluded from the State revenues. In accordance with Governmental Accounting Standards Board, on-behalf contributions must also be recorded as expenditures. However, the source reports used for the analyses did not exclude these on-behalf expenditures. The on-behalf contributions of \$10.5 million equates to \$455 per student.

The District receives less revenue per student compared to its peer district average and the State average.

## 9. District Expenditures

**Figure 9**  
**District Actual Operating Expenditures**

	District		Peer District Average		State Average	
	Expenditure Per Student	Percentage of Total	Expenditure Per Student	Percentage of Total	Expenditure Per Student	Percentage of Total
Instruction	\$ 6,332	56.6%	\$ 6,709	55.9%	\$ 7,101	54.9%
Instruction Resources and Media	127	1.1%	125	1.0%	119	0.9%
Curriculum and Staff Development	318	2.8%	266	2.2%	320	2.5%
Instructional Leadership	159	1.4%	194	1.6%	236	1.8%
School Leadership	552	4.9%	691	5.8%	741	5.7%
Guidance Counseling Services	404	3.6%	528	4.4%	525	4.1%
Social Work Services	84	0.8%	21	0.2%	45	0.3%
Health Services	140	1.3%	137	1.1%	132	1.0%
Transportation	320	2.9%	443	3.7%	395	3.1%
Food Service Operation	646	5.8%	564	4.7%	683	5.3%
Extracurricular	276	2.5%	358	3.0%	400	3.1%
General Administration	306	2.7%	328	2.7%	427	3.3%
Facilities Maintenance and Operations	1,004	9.0%	1,160	9.7%	1,303	10.1%
Security and Monitoring Services	83	0.7%	196	1.6%	209	1.6%
Data Processing Services	421	3.8%	203	1.7%	241	1.9%
Community Services	21	0.1%	82	0.7%	67	0.4%
Total Expenditures	\$ 11,193	100.0%	\$ 12,005	100.0%	\$ 12,944	100.0%

Source: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information Management System District Financial Actual Reports.

Capital outlay, debt service payments and other intergovernmental expenditures are not considered operating expenditures.

Overall, the District spends less per student than the peer district average and the State average. The percentage spent in Instruction is 0.7 percent greater than the peer district average and 1.7 percent greater than the State average. The percentage spent in Food Service Operation is 1.1 percent and 0.5 percent greater than the peer district average and the State average, respectively. The percentage spent in Data Processing Services is 2.1 percent and 1.9 percent greater than the peer district average and the State average, respectively. The remaining areas are all within 1.0 percent or less than the peer district average and State average.

## 10. District Payroll Expenditures Summary

**Figure 10**  
**Payroll Expenditure Summary**

	<b>District</b>	<b>Peer District Average</b>	<b>State Average</b>
Payroll as a Percentage of All Funds	80.4%	79.9%	77.8%
Average Teacher Salary	\$ 67,206	\$ 65,417	\$ 62,463
Average Administrative Salary	111,784	99,308	94,609
Superintendent Salary	297,000	331,363	168,652

Source: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information Management System District Financial Actual Reports. Based on school year 2023 - 2024 data.

The District spends more on payroll costs and more per teacher than the peer district average and the State average.

The average administrative salary is greater than both the peer district average and the State average. The Superintendent's salary is higher than the State average but lower than the peer district average. It is important to note that the data for the State average for the Superintendent is comprised of school districts across the State with enrollments ranging from 21 to 184,000 students.

## 11. Fund Balance

Figure 11

General Fund Balance

	District			Peer District Average		
	General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance Per Student	General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance as a Percentage of Operating Expenditures	General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance as a Percentage of 3 Month Operating Expenditures	General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance Per Student	General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance as a Percentage of Operating Expenditures	General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance as a Percentage of 3 Month Operating Expenditures
2024	\$ 2,568	28.0%	111.9%	\$ 2,767	26.2%	104.9%
2023	2,277	26.1%	104.2%	2,896	29.3%	117.1%
2022	2,149	27.0%	107.9%	2,992	31.2%	124.7%
2021	1,866	22.4%	89.6%	2,941	31.3%	125.2%
2020	1,429	18.8%	75.1%	2,466	27.6%	110.3%

Source: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information Management System District Financial Actual Reports.

The General Fund is the operating fund in a governmental entity. Fund balance represents the current resources/assets available to the government less any current obligations/liabilities. Within fund balance there are five (5) categories: non-spendable, restricted, committed, assigned and unassigned. The categories are described below.

- Non-spendable fund balance cannot be spent because it is either (a) not in a spendable form, such as inventory or (b) legally or contractually required to be maintained intact.
- Restricted fund balance is net resources that are restricted as to use by an external party, such as a federal grantor.
- Committed fund balance is set aside for a specific purpose as resolved by the Board of Trustees.
- Assigned fund balance is fund balance that has been set aside by management for a specific purpose.
- Unassigned fund balance is the remaining amount that is not restricted, committed, or assigned for a specific purpose.

The Texas Education Agency evaluates unassigned fund balance by comparing it to three-months (25 percent) of annual operating expenditures. If the District does not meet goal of three-months, the percentage is shown as less than 100 percent. Amounts that exceed three (3) months are reflected as percentage greater than 100 percent. The District did not meet the three-month average goal in each of the past 5 years. The table below shows the amount by which the District's unassigned fund balance exceeded or did not exceed the three-month goal in a given year.

	<b>General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance (Actual)</b>	<b>General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance 3 Month Goal</b>	<b>Difference between Actual Unassigned Fund Balance and 3 Month Goal in Dollars</b>	<b>Difference between Actual Unassigned Fund Balance and 3 Month Goal in Percentage</b>
2024	\$ 59,463,157	\$ 53,132,854	\$ 6,330,303	11.9%
2023	52,064,060	49,942,967	2,121,093	4.2%
2022	49,034,640	45,455,905	3,578,735	7.9%
2021	42,690,127	47,664,858	(4,974,731)	-10.4%
2020	33,945,877	45,202,464	(11,256,587)	-24.9%

The District's unassigned fund balance as of August 31, 2024 totaled \$59.4 million and General Fund operating expenditures for the year ended August 31, 2024 totaled \$212.5 million. Three months average operating expenditures would equate to \$53.1 million. The District's unassigned fund balance is \$6.3 million (or 11.9 percent) more than this amount. It is important to note that the District has a zero dollar assigned fund balance. The figure below reflects the assigned fund balance for the last five years.

Note that over the past five years, the District has had no assigned fund balance.

	<b>General Fund Assigned Fund Balance (Actual)</b>
2024	\$ -
2023	-
2022	-
2021	-
2020	-

## 12. District Staffing Levels

**Figure 12**  
**Staff Ratio Comparison**

	<b>District</b>	<b>Peer District Average</b>	<b>State Average</b>
Teaching Staff (Percentage of Total Staff)	51.3%	53.6%	48.2%
Support Staff (Percentage of Total Staff)	11.1%	11.3%	11.2%
Administrative Staff (Percentage of Total Staff)	3.9%	4.7%	4.6%
Paraprofessional Staff (Percentage of Total Staff)	9.9%	10.2%	11.4%
Auxiliary Staff (Percentage of Total Staff)	23.8%	20.2%	24.7%
Students Per Total Staff	8.1	7.7	7.1
Students Per Teaching Staff	15.8	14.4	14.7

Source: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information Management System District Staff Information Reports.

The District's total staff for the year ended August 31, 2024 was 2,861 compared to that of the peer district average of 3,234. The District has 0.36 more students per total staff than the peer district average and 1.0 more than the number of students per total staff as the State average. The District has more students per teaching staff ratio than the peer district average and the State average by 1.35 students and 1.08 students, respectively. The percentage of the District's teaching staff is 2.3 percent lower than the peer district average and 3.0 percent higher than the State average. The District is maximizing efficient use of staffing resources to serve students while achieving high accountability ratings.

### 13. Teacher Turnover Rates and Special Programs

**Figure 13**  
**Teacher Turnover Rates**

	<b>District Turnover Rate</b>	<b>Average Peer District Turnover Rate</b>	<b>State Turnover Rate</b>
Teachers	15.9%	20.2%	19.1%

Source: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information Management System District Staff Information Reports.

The District's turnover rate is 4.3 percent lower than the average peer district turnover rate and 3.2 percent lower than the State average. The highest turnover rate within the peer districts was 27.9 percent while the lowest turnover rate was 16.0 percent.

**Figure 14**  
**Special Programs Characteristics**

	<b>Number of Students Served</b>	<b>Percentage of Enrolled Students Served</b>	<b>Program Budget Per Students Served</b>	<b>Program Budget as a Percentage of District Budget</b>	<b>Total Staff For Program</b>	<b>Students Per Total Staff For Program</b>
Total Students	23,156	100.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	14,093	60.9%	452	2.6%	35	403
English Learners	5,490	23.7%	980	2.2%	88	62
Bilingual/ESL Education	5,263	22.7%	1,023	2.2%	88	60
Special Education	3,239	14.0%	7,510	10.0%	483	7
Career and Technical Education	6,289	27.2%	945	2.4%	89	71
Athletics and Extracurricular Activities	20,042	86.6%	260	2.1%	109	184
Alternative Education Program/ Disciplinary Alternative Education Program	639	2.8%	2,223	0.6%	37	17
Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program	2	0.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: Information provided by the district.

**SECTION V- ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL, OPERATIONAL, AND ACADEMIC INFORMATION**

**1. State and Regional Resources**

The District utilizes state and regional resources to maximize its use of quality instructional materials and professional development for educators in order to provide the best outcomes for its students. The District utilizes the service center for general instruction, special services support (Special Education, 504, GT, Bilingual Education, TEKS Resource, etc.), as well as business finance support and technology support.

**2. Reporting**

For the year ended August 31, 2024, Weaver and Tidwell, L.L.P. issued an unmodified opinion on the financial statements. There are three possible opinions: unmodified, modified (e.g., scope limitation or departure from generally accepted accounting principles) or a disclaimer of an opinion. An unmodified opinion is considered a clean opinion.

**3. Oversight**

Not Applicable

**4. Budget Process**

**Figure 15  
Budget Process**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
Does the District's budget planning process include projections for enrollment and staffing?	Yes	
Does the District's budget process include monthly and quarterly reviews to determine the status of annual spending?	Yes	
Does the District use cost allocation procedures to determine campus budgets and cost centers?	Yes	
Does the District analyze educational costs and student needs to determine campus budgets?	Yes	

**5. Self-funded Programs**

The District operates a full day pre-kindergarten program for students that do not qualify for state-based pre-kindergarten and an after-school care program for elementary students. Both of the District's programs are self-sustaining and do not require funds from the District's M&O funds.

**6. Staffing**

All district administrators are evaluated twice annually. Those evaluations include analyzing professional development hours taken and progress towards annual goals.

## 7. Compensation System

<b>Figure 16 Compensation System</b>		
<b>Question</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
Does the District use salary bonuses or merit pay systems?	No	
Do the District's salary ranges include minimum, midpoint, and maximum increments to promote compensation equity based on the employee's education, experience, and other relevant factors?	Yes	
Does the District periodically adjust its compensation structure using verifiable salary survey information, benchmarking, and comparable salary data?	Yes	
Has the District made any internal equity and/or market adjustments to salaries within the past two years?	No	

## 8. Planning

<b>Figure 17 Operational Information</b>		
<b>Question</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
Does the District develop a District Improvement Plan (DIP) annually?	Yes	
Do all campuses in the District develop a Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) annually?	Yes	
Does the District have an active and current facilities master plan? If yes, does the District consider these factors to inform the plan:	Yes	
Does the District use enrollment projections?	Yes	
Does the District analyze facility capacity?	Yes	
Does the District evaluate facility condition?	Yes	
Does the District have an active and current energy management plan?	Yes	
Does the District maintain a clearly defined staffing formula for staff in maintenance, custodial, food service, and transportation?	Yes	

9. Programs

**Figure 18**  
**Academic Information**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
Does the District have a teacher mentoring program?	Yes	
Are decisions to adopt new programs or discontinue existing programs made based on quantifiable data and research?	Yes	
When adopting new programs, does the District define expected results?	Yes	
Does the District analyze student test results at the District and/or campus level to design, implement and/or monitor the use of curriculum and instructional programs?	Yes	
Does the District modify programs, plan staff development opportunities, or evaluate staff based on analyses of student test results?	Yes	