GOODRICH INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

2010 SCHOOL FIRST RATING FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REPORT

The Goodrich Independent School District is pleased to announce its "Superior Achievement" rating on its 2010 School FIRST Rating. The 2010 rating is derived from student and staff data, budgetary and actual financial data reported in the 2008-2009 school year.

School FIRST (Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas), is a financial accountability system for Texas School Districts developed by the Texas Education Agency mandated by Senate Bill 875 of the 76th Texas Legislature in 1999. The primary goal of School FIRST is to achieve quality performance in the management of the school district's financial resources. The system is designed to encourage Texas public schools to manage their financial resources better in order to provide the maximum allocation possible for direct instructional purposes. The system will also disclose the quality of local management and decision-making processes that impact the allocation of financial resources in Texas public schools. An evaluation of the long-term effectiveness of the system should disclose a measurable improvement in the quality of Texas public schools' financial decision-making processes.

Under the current system, the School FIRST accountability rating system assigns one of four financial accountability ratings to Texas school districts, with the highest being "Superior Achievement," followed by "Above-Standard Achievement," "Standard Achievement," and "Substandard Achievement."

Substantial changes to the School FIRST system went into effect with the FIRST rating released in August 2008. The indicators and scoring system have changed from the system created in 1999.

The FIRST rating system was formerly comprised of 21 district-level indicators with either yes or no answers for 21 possible points. Now the scoring system is based on 22 indicators with points assigned to each indicator with a total maximum possible score of 80. The FIRST indicators uses financial data submitted in the "Annual Audited Financial Reports" and through the "Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS)".

The **2010 School FIRST** report is based on data for the 2008-2009 school year. Of a possible score of **80** points, **GOODRICH ISD** scored **79**.

The final page of this report includes required documentation that was distributed at the public hearing held on September 16, 2010, relating to the reimbursements received by the superintendent and board members.





Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2008-2009 DISTRICT STATUS DETAIL

Name: GOODRICH ISD(187903)	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: 79	Passing Score: 56

#	Indicator Description	Updated	Score
1	Was The Total Fund Balance Less Reserved Fund Balance Greater Than Zero In The General Fund?	3/30/2010 3:49:33 PM	Yes
2	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)	3/30/2010 3:49:33 PM	Yes
3	Were There No Disclosures In The Annual Financial Report And/Or Other Sources Of Information Concerning Default On Bonded Indebtedness Obligations?	3/30/2010 3:49:33 PM	Yes
4	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)?	3/30/2010 3:49:33 PM	Yes
5	Was There An Unqualified Opinion in Annual Financial Report?	3/30/2010 3:49:34 PM	Yes

District Status Detail Page 2 of 4

Did the Districts Academic Rating Exceed Academically Unacceptable? Was The Three-Year Average Percent Of Total Tax Collections (Including Delinquent) Greater Than 98%? 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)?	3/30/2010 3:49:34 PM 3/30/2010 3:49:34 PM 3/30/2010 3:49:35 PM	1 Multiplier Sum 5
Unacceptable? Was The Three-Year Average Percent Of Total Tax Collections (Including Delinquent) Greater Than 98%? Did The Comparison Of PEIMS Data To Like Information In Annual Financial Report Result In An Aggregate Variance Of Less Than 3 Percent Of	3:49:34 PM 3/30/2010 3:49:34 PM 3/30/2010	5
Collections (Including Delinquent) Greater Than 98%? Did The Comparison Of PEIMS Data To Like Information In Annual Financial Report Result In An Aggregate Variance Of Less Than 3 Percent Of	3:49:34 PM 3/30/2010	
Information In Annual Financial Report Result In An Aggregate Variance Of Less Than 3 Percent Of	(C) UE	_
	3.13.33.11	5
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)	3/30/2010 3:49:35 PM	4
Was There No Disclosure In The Annual Audit Report Of Material Noncompliance?	3/30/2010 3:49:35 PM	5
Did The District Have Full Accreditation Status In Relation To Financial Management Practices? (e.g. No Conservator Or Monitor Assigned)	3/30/2010 3:49:35 PM	5
Was The Aggregate Of Budgeted Expenditures And Other Uses Less Than The Aggregate Of Total Revenues, Other Resources and Fund Balance In General Fund?	3/30/2010 3:49:35 PM	5
If The District's Aggregate Fund Balance In The General Fund And Capital Projects Fund Was Less Than Zero, Were Construction Projects Adequately Financed?	3/30/2010 3:49:36 PM	5
D R C W O R G If G	vid The District Have Full Accreditation Status In elation To Financial Management Practices? (e.g. No onservator Or Monitor Assigned) //as The Aggregate Of Budgeted Expenditures And other Uses Less Than The Aggregate Of Total evenues, Other Resources and Fund Balance In eneral Fund? The District's Aggregate Fund Balance In The eneral Fund And Capital Projects Fund Was Less Than	id The District Have Full Accreditation Status In elation To Financial Management Practices? (e.g. No onservator Or Monitor Assigned) // Ass The Aggregate Of Budgeted Expenditures And other Uses Less Than The Aggregate Of Total evenues, Other Resources and Fund Balance In eneral Fund? The District's Aggregate Fund Balance In The eneral Fund And Capital Projects Fund Was Less Than ero, Were Construction Projects Adequately Financed? To Avoid Creating Or Adding To The Fund Balance

15	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)	3/30/2010 3:49:36 PM	5
16	Was The Administrative Cost Ratio Less Than The Threshold Ratio?	3/30/2010 3:49:36 PM	5
17	Was The Ratio Of Students To Teachers Within the Ranges Shown Below According To District Size?	3/30/2010 3:49:36 PM	5
18	Was The Ratio Of Students To Total Staff Within the Ranges Shown Below According To District Size?	3/30/2010 3:49:37 PM	5
19	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?	3/30/2010 3:49:37 PM	5
20	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)	3/30/2010 3:49:37 PM	5
21	Was The Aggregate Total Of Cash And Investments In The General Fund More Than \$0?	3/30/2010 3:49:37 PM	5
22	Were Investment Earnings In All Funds (Excluding Debt Service Fund and Capital Projects Fund) More Than \$20 Per Student?	3/30/2010 3:49:37 PM	5
			79 Weighted Sum
			1 Multiplier Sum
			79 Score

District Status Detail Page 4 of 4

DETERMINATION OF RATING

1	۵.	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	Ratios	Ratios		Indicator 18	Ranges for Ratios	
District Size - Number of Students Between	Low	High		District Size - Number of Students Between	Low	High
< 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 Reason.

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

School FIRST Annual Financial Management Report

New reporting requirements are effective for the financial management report that will be distributed at the School FIRST public hearing in September 16, 2010.

Title 19 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 109, Budgeting, Accounting, and Auditing Subchapter AA,

Commissioner's Rules Concerning Financial Accountability Rating System, Section 109.1005

TEA would like to acknowledge TASBO, TASB, and the Coordinating Task Force for their assistance in developing this template.

The template has been established to help the districts in gathering their data and presenting it at their School FIRST hearing, it may not be all inclusive.

Superintendent's Current Employment Contract

A copy of the superintendent's current employment contract at the time of the School FIRST hearing is to be provided. In lieu of publication in the annual School FIRST financial management report, the school district may chose 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.

Reimbursements Received by the Superintendent and Board Members

For the Twelve-Month Period Ended August 31, 2009

		Board						
Description of Reimbursements	Superintendent	Member 1	Member 2	Member 3	Member 4	Member 5	Member 6	Member 7
Meals	589.00	227.00	137.00	137.00	118.00	144.00	0.00	0.00
Lodging	958.00	469.00	469.00	469.00	469.00	469.00	0.00	0.00
Transportation	3,779.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Motor Fuel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other	1,391.00	295.00	295.00	295.00	295.00	295.00	45.00	0.00
Total	6,717.00	991.00	901.00	901.00	882.00	908.00	45.00	0.00

All "reimbursements" expenses, regardless of the manner of payment, including direct pay,

credit card, cash, and purchase order are to be reported. 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.

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, 2009 Name(s) of Entity(ies) NONE

Amount Received

\$0.00

Total

Compensation does not include business revenues generated from a family business (farming, ranching, etc.) that has no relation to school district business.

Gifts Received by Executive Officers and Board Members (and First Degree Relatives, if any) (gifts that had an economic value of \$250 or more in the aggregate in the fiscal year)

For the Twelve-Month Period Ended August 31, 2009

Board Board Board Board Board Board Board Member 4 Member 5 Member 6 Member 7 Member 1 Member 2 Member 3 Superintendent 0 0 Total 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 for local officials.

Business Transactions Between School District and Board Members

For the Twelve-Month Period

Amounts

Ended August 31, 2009

Board Board Board Board Board Board **Board** Member 2 Member 3 Member 4 Member 5 Member 6 Member 7 Member 1 0 0 0

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