

Goose Creek Consolidated Independent **School District**



FINANCIAL INTEGRITY RATING SYSTEM OF TEXAS



PURPOSE

- Expands the public education accountability system in Texas to include Financial Services.
- Primary goal to achieve quality performance in the management of school district's <u>financial</u> resources
- Developed by TEA in response to SB 875 of the 76th Texas Legislature in 1999



OBJECTIVES

- Assess the quality of financial management in Texas public schools.
- Fairly evaluate the quality of financial management decisions.
- Openly report results to the general public.



School FIRST Transition

- House Bill 5, Section 49, 83rd Texas Legislature amended Section 39.082 Texas Education Code (TEC), Public School System Accountability, to address in part, the future financial solvency of school districts
- Under the statute and adopted rules, TEA will take into consideration a district's School FIRST rating when assigning a final accreditation status.



RATINGS

Determination of rating by the applicable number of points (Indicators 6-15):

> A – Superior 90-100

▶ B – Above Standard 80-89

C – Meets Standard 60-79

F – Substandard Achievement <60</p>

- Note: 2017-2018 Ratings based on school year 2016-2017 data contains 15 indicators
- If the district answer is 'No' to Indicators 1,3,4,5 or 2.A., the school district's rating is F for Substandard Achievement regardless of the points earned.



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

Passed, report received November 27, 2017

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

Passed, Unmodified Opinion received



- 2.B. Did the external independent auditor report that the AFR was free of any instance(s) of material weaknesses in internal controls over financial reporting and compliance for local, state, or federal funds? *Passed, there were no instances of weak internal controls*
- 3. Was the school district in compliance with the payment terms of all debt agreements at fiscal year end? *Passed, no default on debt agreements*



- 4. Did the school district make timely payments to the Teachers Retirement System (TRS), Texas Workforce Commission (TWC), Internal Revenue Service (IRS), and other government agencies? Passed, the district made timely payments to TRS, TWC, IRS and other government agencies
- 5. Was the total unrestricted net position balance (Net of the accretion of interest for capital appreciation bonds and Net pension liability) in the governmental activities column in the Statement of Net Position greater than zero? Passed, total unrestricted Net Position Balance + Net Pension Liability = \$110,948,269 > 0



- 6. Was the number of days of cash on hand and current investments in the general fund for the school district sufficient to cover operating expenditures (excluding facilities acquisition and construction)?

 Yes, 131.8211 days cash on hand > 90 = 10 points
- 7. Was the measure of current assets to current liabilities ratio for the school district sufficient to cover short-term debt? Yes, 3.3928:1 ratio > 3:1 ratio = 10 points



- 8. Was the ratio of long-term liabilities to total assets for the school district sufficient to support long-term solvency? (If the school district's change of students in membership over 5 years was 7 percent or more, then the district passes this indicator). Yes, the ratio of long-term liabilities to total assets of .6881 is within the range of >0.60 <= 0.70 = 8 points (Note: ratio must be <= 0.60 to achieve 10 possible points). However, 10 points awarded due to change of students in membership over 5 years was 7 percent.
- 9. Did the school district's general fund revenues equal or exceed expenditures (excluding facilities acquisition and construction)? Yes, general fund revenues of \$216,650,891 > expenditures of \$201,404,728 = 10 points



- 10. Was the debt service coverage ratio sufficient to meet the required debt service? Yes, the debt service coverage ratio of 1.973 exceeds the ratio of 1.20 = 10 points
- 11. Was the school district's administrative cost ratio equal to or less than the threshold ratio? Yes, District Administrative Cost Ratio is 0.0799 which is <= 0.0855 = 10 points



- 12. Did the school district not have a 15 percent decline in the students to staff ratio over 3 years (total enrollment to total staff)? (If the student enrollment did not decrease, the school district will automatically pass this indicator.) Since student enrollment did not decrease, the district automatically passes this indicator = 10 points
- 13. Did the comparison of Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data to like information in the school district's AFR result in a total variance of less than 3 percent of all expenditures by function?

Yes, 0 < 0.03 = 10 points



- 14. Did the external independent auditor indicate the AFR was free of any instance(s) of material noncompliance for grants, contracts, and laws related to local, state, or federal funds? Yes, the AFR was free of any material noncompliance = 10 points
- 15. Did the school district not receive an adjusted repayment schedule for more than one fiscal year for an over allocation of Foundation School Program (FSP) funds as a result of a financial hardship? Yes, the District did not receive an adjusted repayment schedule = 10 points



HOW DID GOOSE CREEK GISD RATE?

District Score: 100 out of 100 possible points!

Rating: A – Superior





Questions



FINANCIAL INTEGRITY RATING SYSTEM OF TEXAS