



# JOAQUIN ISD 2017-18 School FIRST Rating FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REPORT



**School FIRST** (Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas), is a financial accountability system for Texas school districts specified in 19 Texas Administrative Code Section 109.1001 which was originally created by the 77<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature in 2001. The system ensures Texas public schools are held accountable for the quality of their financial management practices and that they improve those practices. It is designed to encourage public schools to manage their financial resources to provide maximum allocations for direct instructional purposes. The rating assigned is considered by the Texas Education Agency when assigning a school district's accreditation status.

The system is based on indicators and a point system. For the 2015-16 report and beyond, the system changed to *a letter grade of “A= Superior Achievement”, “B = Above Standard Achievement”, “C = Standard Achievement”, and “F = Substandard Achievement” with 15 total Indicators.*

The FIRST system uses financial data submitted in the “Annual Audited Financial Report (AFR)” and staff and student data submitted through the “Public Education Information System (PEIMS)”. This **2017-18 FIRST** rating is derived from actual financial and student/staff data from the 2016-17 fiscal year (data from two school years prior).

The **2017-18 FIRST** rating is a maximum possible score of 100 points from 15 total indicators with a “Yes” or “No” assigned to indicators one through five. . If a district scores a “No” on any of the indicators #1, #2.A. or #3-5 it automatically receives an “F”. Ten or less points are assigned to indicators six through eight and ten and eleven. For indicators nine and twelve through fifteen, 10 points are assigned as all-“10” or none “-0-“. So in one school year a district may lose 10 points by not meeting the criteria in just one of those indicators

***JOAQUIN ISD scored an 88 for 2017-18 FIRST with a “B= Above Standard” rating. This was 2 points below an “A-Superior”. Last year’s score was a 94 based on 2015-16 data. For the 2018-19 FIRST report the 2017-18 financial data is currently being audited and student/staff data has already been finalized. We are estimating a 92 score for next year with a possible “A” but could be a “B” again because our audit is not complete--estimating gaining four points on #10 and all other indicators the same points.***

***Only two times since School First inception sixteen years ago has the district not received the highest possible rating--- the 2013-14 School FIRST where we received “Above-Standard Achievement” and this 2017-18 year with a “B-Above Standard”. In 2014-15 the system was in a transition year and we highest possible rating of just “P-for Pass”.***

The actual **2017-18 FIRST** report issued by TEA follows. Explanations and comments about Joaquin ISD's data are added to the TEA data for clarification. Prior year's 2016-17 report based on 2015-16 data is also included for comparison purposes.

***Pages eight and nine of this report include some required items of disclosure related to Superintendents and Board members.***

**Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas**

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

<b>Name: JOAQUIN ISD(210902)</b>		<b>Publication Level 1:</b> 8/6/2018 2:48:24 PM			
<b>Status: Passed</b>		<b>Publication Level 2:</b> None			
<b>Rating:</b> B = Above Standard		<b>Last Updated:</b> 8/6/2018 2:48:24 PM			
<b>District Score:</b> 88		<b>Passing Score:</b> 60			
#	Indicator Description	17-18 Score	2016-17 Data	16-17 Score	2015-16 Data
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>	Yes	Submitted 11/21/2017	Yes	Submitted 12/12/2016
2	Review the AFR for an unmodified opinion and material weakness. 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>	Yes	“Clean Audit” Unmodified Opinion	Yes	“Clean Audit” Unmodified Opinion
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>	Yes	No Material Weakness in Internal Controls	Yes	No Material Weakness in Internal Controls

3	<p><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></p>	Yes	<p>No Default Paid All Bond Payments when due</p>	Yes	<p>No Default Paid All Bond Payments when due</p>												
4	<p><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></p>	Yes	<p>All payments made timely</p>	Yes	<p>All payments made timely</p>												
5	<p><u>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.)</u></p>	Yes	<p>\$2,983.252 Unrestricted Net Assets 5yr change in Students = 7.51% decrease</p>		<p>\$3,205.536 Unrestricted Net Assets 5yr change in Students = 6.92% decrease</p>												
6	<p><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></p>	10	<p>\$2,742,142 Cash and Investments / \$6,483,224 Total Expenditures X 365days= 154.38 days</p>	10	<p>\$2,762,070 Cash and Investments / \$6,375,995 Total Expenditures X 365days= 158.08 days</p>												
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>8</td> <td>6</td> <td>4</td> <td>2</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>&gt;=90</td> <td>&lt;90 &gt;=75</td> <td>&lt;74 &gt;=60</td> <td>&lt;60 &gt;=45</td> <td>&lt;45 &gt;=30</td> <td>&lt;30</td> </tr> </table>						10	8	6	4	2	0	>=90	<90 >=75	<74 >=60	<60 >=45	<45 >=30	<30
10	8	6	4	2	0												
>=90	<90 >=75	<74 >=60	<60 >=45	<45 >=30	<30												
<p><i>Estimated at 112.84 days next year</i></p>																	

7 Was the measure of current assets to current liabilities ratio for the school district sufficient to cover short-term debt? (See ranges below.)

10	8	6	4	2	0
$\geq 3.00$	$< 3.00$ $\geq 2.50$	$< 2.50$ $\geq 2.00$	$< 2.00$ $\geq 1.50$	$< 1.50$ $\geq 1.00$	$< 1.00$

**Estimated at 3.51 for 10 points next year**

10 **\$3,377,985** 10 **\$3,425,960**  
 Current Assets/  
**\$1,095,693**  
 Current Liabilities  
 = **3.0839**

10 **\$3,425,960**  
 Current Assets/  
**\$1,075,345**  
 Current Liabilities  
 = **3.1859**

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.) (See ranges below.) (per TEA this Change" in students is only an Increase to pass)

10	8	6	4	2	0
$\leq 0.60$	$> 0.60$ $\leq 0.70$	$> 0.70$ $\leq 0.80$	$> 0.80$ $\leq 0.90$	$> 0.90$ $\leq 1.00$	$> 1.00$

**Estimated 6 points next year**

6 **\$12,605,755** 8 **\$11,602,853**  
 Long Term liabilities/  
**\$16,055,470**  
 Total Assets  
 = **0.7851**  
 5yr change in Students  
 = **7.51%**  
 decrease

8 **\$11,602,853**  
 Long Term liabilities/  
**\$16,785,067**  
 Total Assets  
 = **0.6913**  
 5yr change in Students  
 = **6.92%**  
 decrease

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 **\$6,561,877** 10 **\$6,534,377**  
 Gen Fund Rev  
**\$6,483,224**  
 Gen Fund Exp  
 = **Yes**  
 Number of Days Cash on Hand =  
**154.3803**  
 Greater than 60 days

10 **\$6,534,377**  
 Gen Fund Rev  
**\$6,375,995**  
 Gen Fund Exp  
 = **Yes**  
 Number of Days Cash on Hand =  
**158.117**  
 Greater than 60 days

10

Was the debt service coverage ratio sufficient to meet the required debt service? (See ranges below.)

10	8	6	4	2	0
$\geq 1.20$	$< 1.20$ $\geq 1.15$	$< 1.15$ $\geq 1.10$	$< 1.10$ $\geq 1.05$	$< 1.05$ $\geq 1.00$	$< 1.00$

**Statement included in last years report:**

For 2016-17 \$(150,000) was transferred to the debt service fund to cover the difference in tax collections and debt payments. For the 2017-18 FIRST report the debt coverage ratio is estimated at only 1.063 so we will only get 4 points for this indicator in next year's FIRST rating. For 15-16--this year's FIRST rating-- the revenues exceeded expenditures and there was no shortage in the debt service fund (the year before our TRE).

**Estimated at 1.1479 next year for 8 points**

4

\$ (66,567)  
Deficiency  
Revenues  
over  
Expenditures  
in General &  
Debt Funds.  
\$965,562  
Debt  
payments.  
\$122,256  
Debt Service  
Fund  
Balance.  
Coverage  
Ratio  
=1.0631

8

\$ 57,567  
Excess  
Revenues  
over  
Expenditures  
in General &  
Debt Funds.  
\$1,187,175  
Debt  
payments.  
\$122,271  
Debt Service  
Fund  
Balance.  
Coverage  
Ratio  
=1.1514

11

Was the school district's administrative cost ratio equal to or less than the threshold ratio? (See ranges below.)

ADA Size	10	8	6	4	2	0
500 to 999	$\leq 0.1311$	$> 0.1311$ $\leq 0.1561$	$> 0.1561$ $\leq 0.1811$	$> 0.1811$ $\leq 0.2061$	$> 0.2061$ $\leq 0.2311$	$> 0.2311$

**Estimated at .14356 for next year—same 8 pts**

8

Ratio =  
.152  
Threshold  
 $\leq .1311$  for  
10 points  
 $\leq .1561$   
For 8 pts

8

Ratio =  
.1397  
Threshold  
 $\leq .1311$  for  
10 points  
 $\leq .1561$   
For 8 pts

12	<p><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></p>	<p>10</p> <p>2016-17 Total Enrollment = 691 Staff FTE = 109.0162 Ratio = 6.338</p> <p>2014-15 Total Enrollment = 721 Staff FTE = 118.9165 Ratio = 6.063</p> <p>3 year increase in ratio of 4.54%</p>	<p>10</p> <p>2015-16 Total Enrollment = 701 Staff FTE = 109.1023 Ratio = 6.42</p> <p>2013-14 Total Enrollment = 752 Staff FTE = 120.6255 Ratio = 6.23</p> <p>3 year increase in ratio of 3.04%</p>
13	<p><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></p>	<p>10</p> <p>.0000026% &lt;3%</p>	<p>10</p> <p>.0000002% &lt;3%</p>
14	<p><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></p>	<p>10</p> <p>No material instances of non-compliance</p>	<p>10</p> <p>No material instances of non-compliance</p>

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?

94 Weighted Sum  
1 Multiplier Sum

10	No adjusted repayment schedule	10	No adjusted repayment schedule
88	88 Score \ 100	94	94 Score \ 100

### DETERMINATION OF RATING FOR 2017-18

**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 Substandard 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

JOAQUIN ISD 2017-18 FIRST REPORT  
REQUIRED DISCLOSURES

Title 19 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 109, Budgeting, Accounting, and Auditing Subchapter AA, Commissioner's Rules Concerning Financial Accountability Rating System, Section 109.1001(o). Effective 8/1/2018.

**1. Superintendent's Current Employment Contract**

A copy of the superintendent's employment contract that is effective on the date of the Schools FIRST hearing is to be provided. 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.

*The Joaquin ISD Superintendent's contract can be accessed from the school district website at [www.joaquinisd.net](http://www.joaquinisd.net) by clicking on "Public Accountability" then "Superintendent's Contract"*

**2. Reimbursements Received by the Superintendent and Board Members for the Twelve-Month period ended August 31, 2017**

Description of Reimbursements	Phil Worsham	Thomas Harvey	Ronnie Belrose	Chrisco Bragg	Jeff Cater	Brandon Neal	Tam Hearnberger	Bill Mason
Meals	\$ 126.93							
Lodging	\$ 1,930.02							
Transportation	\$							
Motor Fuel	\$ 0.00							
Other-Registrations, Dues, Liab Ins	\$ 1,298.92	\$ 185.00				\$ 25.00	\$ 25.00	
Total	\$ 3,355.87	\$ 185.00	\$ -0-	\$ -0-	\$ -0-	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.00	\$ -0-

**Note** - All "reimbursements" expenses, regardless of the manner of payment, including direct pay, credit card, cash, and purchase order. Items to be reported per category include:

**Meals** – Meals consumed out of town, and in-district meals at area restaurants (outside of board meetings, excludes catered board meeting meals).

**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 for the Twelve-Month period ended August 31, 2017**

*No outside compensation and/or fees for professional consulting and/or personal services were received by the Superintendent.*

**Note** – Compensation does not include business revenues from a family business (farming, ranching, etc.) that has no relations to school district business.

**4. Gifts Received by the Executive Officers and Board Members (and First Degree Relatives, if any) (gifts that have an economic value of \$250 or more in the aggregate in the fiscal year) for the Twelve-Month period ended August 31, 2017**

*No gifts were received by the Executive Officers and Board Members.*

**Note** – An executive officer is defined as the superintendent, unless the board of trustees or the district administration names additional staff under this classification for local officials.

**5. Business Transactions Between School District and Board Members for the Twelve-Month period ended August 31, 2017**

	Tam Hearnberger  (Husband paid for Security Work)	Chrisco Bragg  (Plumbing Contractor)	<i>No other board members had business transactions with the school district.</i>
<b>Total Amounts</b>	<b>\$430.00</b>	<b>\$ -0-</b>	