

RATING YEAR

2017-2018

DISTRICT NUMBER

district #

Select An Option

Help

Home



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2017-2018 RATINGS BASED ON SCHOOL YEAR 2016-2017 DATA - DISTRICT STATUS DETAIL

Name: LEANDER ISD(246913)	Publication Level 1: 8/6/2018 2:48:24 PM
Status: Passed	Publication Level 2: 8/8/2018 12:11:29 PM
Rating: A = Superior	Last Updated: 8/8/2018 12:11:29 PM
District Score: 100	Passing Score: 60

#	Indicator Description	Updated	Score
1	<u>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?</u>	4/20/2018 9:47:43 AM	Yes
2	Review the AFR for an unmodified opinion and material weaknesses. The school district must pass 2.A to pass this indicator. The school district fails indicator number 2 if it responds "No" to indicator 2.A. or to both indicators 2.A and 2.B.		
2.A	<u>Was there an unmodified opinion in the AFR on the financial statements as a whole? (The American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) defines unmodified opinion. The external independent auditor determines if there was an unmodified opinion.)</u>	4/20/2018 9:47:43 AM	Yes
2.B	<u>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? (The AICPA defines material weakness.)</u>	4/20/2018 9:47:43 AM	Yes
3	<u>Was the school district in compliance with the payment terms of all debt agreements at fiscal year end? (If the school district was in default in a prior fiscal year, an exemption applies in following years if the school district is current on its forbearance or payment plan with the lender and the payments are made on schedule for the fiscal year being rated. Also exempted are technical defaults that are not related to monetary defaults. A technical default is a failure to uphold the terms of a debt covenant, contract, or master promissory note even though payments to the lender, trust, or sinking fund are current. A debt agreement is a legal agreement between a debtor (= person, company, etc. that owes money) and their creditors, which includes a plan for paying back the debt.)</u>	4/20/2018 9:47:43 AM	Yes
4	<u>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?</u>	4/20/2018 9:47:44 AM	Yes
5	<u>Was the total unrestricted net position balance (Net of the accretion of interest for capital appreciation bonds) in the governmental activities column in the Statement of Net Position greater than zero? (If the school district's change of students in membership over 5 years was 7 percent or more, then the school district passes this indicator.)</u>	4/20/2018 9:47:44 AM	Yes

			Multiplier Sum
6	<u>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)? (See ranges below.)</u>	4/20/2018 9:47:44 AM	10
7	<u>Was the measure of current assets to current liabilities ratio for the school district sufficient to cover short-term debt? (See ranges below.)</u>	4/20/2018 9:47:44 AM	10
8	<u>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 school district passes this indicator.) (See ranges below.)</u>	4/20/2018 9:47:45 AM	10
9	<u>Did the school district's general fund revenues equal or exceed expenditures (excluding facilities acquisition and construction)? If not, was the school district's number of days of cash on hand greater than or equal to 60 days?</u>	4/20/2018 9:47:45 AM	10
10	<u>Was the debt service coverage ratio sufficient to meet the required debt service? (See ranges below.)</u>	4/20/2018 9:47:45 AM	10
11	<u>Was the school district's administrative cost ratio equal to or less than the threshold ratio? (See ranges below.)</u>	4/20/2018 9:47:46 AM	10
12	<u>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.)</u>	6/19/2018 11:32:14 AM	10
13	<u>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?</u>	4/20/2018 9:47:46 AM	10
14	<u>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? (The AICPA defines material noncompliance.)</u>	4/20/2018 9:47:47 AM	10
15	<u>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?</u>	4/20/2018 9:47:47 AM	10
			100 Weighted Sum
			1 Multiplier Sum
			100 Score

DETERMINATION OF RATING

A.	Did the district answer 'No' to Indicators 1, 3, 4, 5, or 2.A? If so, the school district's rating is F for Standard Achievement regardless of points earned.
B.	Determine the 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

No Rating = A school district receiving territory that annexes with a school district ordered by the commissioner under TEC 13.054, or consolidation under Subchapter H, Chapter 41. No rating will be issued for the school district receiving territory until the third year after the annexation/consolidation.

Home Page: [Financial Accountability](#) | Send comments or suggestions to FinancialAccountability@tea.texas.gov

THE TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

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

FIRST 5.4.1.0

Back
To
School!

School FIRST 2018 Report

Public Hearing October 25, 2018

- *Based on 2016-17 Results*



Back
TO
School

Agenda

- ❖ Overview of School FIRST
- ❖ Leander ISD's Performance
- ❖ Other Required Disclosures





Overview

Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

- Developed by TEA in 1999
- Measures School Districts Performance in Management of Financial Resources
- Ratings based on 15 indicators* established by the Commissioner of Education

**Previously 20 indicators; 7 indicators for 2014-15 rating year, 15 indicators for 2015-16 and 2016-17 rating years.*

Back
To
School!

Overview

School FIRST in Transition

2013-14 Rating Year (2012-13 Data)		2014-15 Rating Year (2013-14 Data)		2015-16 Rating Year (2014-15 Data)		2016-18 Rating Years (2015-17 Data)	
# of Indicators	20	# of Indicators	7	# of Indicators	15	# of Indicators	15
Ratings	Points	Ratings	Points	Ratings	Points	Ratings	Points
Superior	64 - 70	P - Passed	16 - 30	A - Superior Achievement	70 - 100	A - Superior Achievement	90 - 100
Above Standard	58 - 63	F - Substandard Achievement	0 - 15	B - Above Standard Achievement	50 - 69	B - Above Standard Achievement	80 - 89
Standard	52 - 57			C - Standard Achievement	31 - 49	C - Standard Achievement	60 - 79
Substandard Achievement	< 52			F - Substandard Achievement	0 - 30	F - Substandard Achievement	0 - 59

Past

Present



Back
To
School!

Overview

School FIRST Indicator Categories

- **Critical Indicators**
(Indicators 1 – 5, Yes/No); Failure to meet requirements of any of these indicators results in an overall F (substandard) rating
- **Solvency Indicators**
(Indicators 6 – 12, 0 to 10 points)
- **Financial Competence Indicators**
(Indicators 13 – 15, 0 to 10 points)



Back
To
School!

LISD Performance

Critical Indicators

#	Indicator Description	Yes/No
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?	Yes
2	2.A. Was there an unmodified opinion in the AFR on the financial statements as a whole? 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?	Yes Yes
3	Was the school district in compliance with the payment terms of all debt agreements at fiscal year end?	Yes
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?	Yes
5	Was the total unrestricted net asset balance (Net of the accretion of interest for capital appreciation bonds) in the governmental activities column in the Statement of Net Assets greater than zero? (If the school district's change of students in membership over 5 years was 10 percent or more, then the school district passes this indicator.)	Yes



Back
To
School!

LISD Performance

Solvency Indicators

#	Indicator Description	Points (0-10)
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)?	10
7	Was the measure of current assets to current liabilities ratio for the school district sufficient to cover short-term debt?	10
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 10 percent or more, then the school district passes this indicator.)	10
9	Did the school district's general fund revenues equal or exceed expenditures (excluding facilities acquisition and construction)? If not, was the school district's number of days of cash on hand greater than or equal to 60 days?	10



Back
To
School!

LISD Performance

Solvency Indicators

#	Indicator Description	Points (0-10)
10	Was the debt service coverage ratio sufficient to meet the required debt service?	10
11	Was the school district's administrative cost ratio equal to or less than the threshold ratio?	10
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.)	10



Back
To
School!

LISD Performance

Financial Competence Indicators

#	Indicator Description	Points (0-10)
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?	10
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?	10
15	Did the school district not receive an adjusted repayment schedule for more than one fiscal year for an overallocation of Foundation School Program (FSP) funds as a result of a financial hardship?	10





Required Disclosures

Board Member and Superintendent Disclosures (Fiscal Year 2016-17)

Board Member	Gifts > \$250 aggregate value	Business Transactions with District
Trish Bode	None	None
Don Hisle	None	None
Pamela Waggoner	None	None
Grace S. Barber-Jordan, M.Ed.	None	None
Russell Bundy	None	None
Aaron Johnson	None	None
Will Streit	None	None
Jim MacKay	N/A	N/A
Superintendent	Gifts > \$250 aggregate value	Outside Compensation/Fees
Dr. Dan Troxell	None	None

Superintendent's Contract – A copy of the Superintendent's current contract has been available on the LISD website in accordance with 19 TAC §109.1001(o)(3)(B)(i).

Back
To
School!

Required Disclosures

**Reimbursement Received by the Superintendent and Board Members
For the Twelve-Month Period
Ended August 31, 2017**

Description of Reimbursements	Superintendent- Dan Troxell	Board Member Don Hisle	Board Member Pamela Waggoner	Board Member Grace S. Barber- Jordan, M.Ed.	Board Member Jim Mackay	Board Member Aaron Johnson	Board Member Will Streit	Board Member Trish Bode	Board Member Russell Bundy
Meals	\$533.59	\$273.99	\$138.00	\$167.60	\$212.52	\$34.56	\$24.00	\$0.00	\$56.00
Lodging	\$1,857.35	\$1,773.07	\$753.90	\$1,416.57	\$1,005.20	\$1,195.68	\$1,397.93	\$1,557.06	\$662.67
Transportation	\$1,062.29	\$1,240.08	\$378.80	\$506.34	\$559.65	\$407.32	\$825.09	\$21.42	\$0.00
Motor Fuel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Other	\$2,430.17	\$1,805.00	\$915.00	\$1,240.00	\$1,260.00	\$1,240.00	\$1,240.00	\$505.00	\$325.00
Total	\$5,883.40	\$5,092.14	\$2,185.70	\$3,330.51	\$3,037.37	\$2,877.56	\$3,487.02	\$2,083.48	\$1,043.67

Items to be reported per category include:

Meals-Meals consumed out of town, and in -district meals at area restaurants

Lodging-Hotel charges

Transportation-Airfare, car rental (can include fuel on rental, taxis, mileage reimbursements, leased cars, parking & tolls)

Motor Fuel-Gasoline

Other-Registration Fees, telephone/cell phone, internet service, fax machine, and other reimbursements not defined above.



Back
To
School!

Leander ISD's Overall School FIRST Rating

2017-18 Rating Year: A - Superior Achievement (100 points on 100 point scale)

2016-17 Rating Year: A - Superior Achievement (100 points on 100 point scale)

2015-16 Rating Year: A - Superior Achievement (100 points on 100 point scale)

2014-15 Rating Year: Passed (30 points on 30 point scale)

2013-14 Rating Year: Superior (70 points on 70 point scale)*

* Under the previous rating system, LISD had achieved a Superior rating in all 12 years of FIRST Reporting.



Back
To
School!

Thank You!

