



**SCHERTZ-CIBOLO-UNIVERSAL CITY ISD**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**November 28, 2023**

# What Is Schools FIRST?

- Schools FIRST is the Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas.
- This is the twenty-first year the financial health of every school district in Texas has been evaluated.
- Schools FIRST ensures that Texas public schools are held accountable for the quality of their financial management practices and that they improve these 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.
- School districts are required to hold a public meeting to publicize the district's financial report and rating.

# Schools FIRST Ratings

- Possible ratings are Superior (A), Above Standard (B), Meets Standard (C) and Substandard Achievement (F).
- Schertz-Cibolo-Universal City ISD received a Superior Rating from TEA, achieving 90 of 100 points in the indicator system.
- Ratings are based upon financial data from the 2021-2022 School Fiscal Year.
- 20 indicators were used by TEA to determine the district's Schools FIRST Rating.

# 2021-22 Texas Rating Summary

| ISD Rating                     | Count        | % Total       |
|--------------------------------|--------------|---------------|
| Superior = A                   | 919          | 90.3%         |
| Above Standard = B             | 50           | 4.9%          |
| Meets Standard = C             | 41           | 4.0%          |
| Substandard<br>Achievement = F | 8            | 0.8%          |
| <b>TOTALS</b>                  | <b>1,018</b> | <b>100.0%</b> |

| Charter Ratings                | Count      | % Total       |
|--------------------------------|------------|---------------|
| Superior = A                   | 124        | 71.3%         |
| Above Standard = B             | 31         | 17.8%         |
| Meets Standard = C             | 12         | 6.9%          |
| Substandard<br>Achievement = F | 7          | 4.0%          |
| <b>TOTALS</b>                  | <b>174</b> | <b>100.0%</b> |

# 20 Rating Indicators

1. Was the complete Annual Financial Report (AFR) and data submitted to the TEA within 30 days of the January 28th deadline?

**YES – Financial report was filed with TEA on January 19, 2023.**

2. 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.)

**YES- The District received an unmodified opinion or “clean” audit.**

3. Was the district in compliance with the payment terms of all debt agreements at fiscal year end?

**YES – Financial obligations, bills, and payments were made in a timely manner.**

4. Did the district make timely payments to the Teachers Retirement System (TRS), Texas Workforce Commission (TWC), Internal Revenue Service (IRS), and other government agencies?

**YES – Payments were made in a timely manner.**

5. N/A

6. Was the average change in (assigned and unassigned) fund balances over 3 years less than a 25 percent decrease or did the current year's assigned and unassigned fund balances exceed 75 days of operational expenditures?

**Passed - SCUC 3-year average fund balance change = 13.3% increase.**

7. 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 – SCUC earned the maximum 10 points.**

*This indicator measures how many days after the end of the fiscal year the district could have dispersed funds for operating expenditures.*

8. Was the measure of current assets to current liabilities ratio for the district sufficient to cover short-term debt?

**YES – District ratio is 3.20, which earned the District the maximum 10 points.**

*This indicator measures whether the district has sufficient short-term assets at the end of the fiscal year to pay off short-term liabilities.*

9. Did the district's general fund revenues equal or exceed expenditures (excluding facilities and construction)? If not, was the district's number of days of cash on hand greater than or equal to 60 days?

**YES – The District's general fund revenues exceeded expenditures (excluding facilities and construction) by \$6,463,051. SCUC received all 10 points for this indicator.**

*This indicator simply asks if a district earned more than it spent.*

10. This indicator was not used; all districts received the maximum 10 points.

11. Was the ratio of long-term liabilities to total assets for the district sufficient to support long-term solvency?

**YES – The District’s ratio of long-term liabilities to total assets is 0.91, which only earns the District 2 points for this indicator.**

12. What is the correlation between future debt requirements and the district's assessed property value?

**The District property value ratio equates to 6.01, which earns the District 8 of 10 points.**

*This indicator asks about the school district’s ability to make debt principal and interest payments.*

13. Was the district’s administrative cost ratio equal to or less than the threshold ratio?

**YES – The District’s administrative cost ratio is 6.1%, earning the District the maximum 10 points for this indicator.**

*This indicator measures the percentage of school district’s budget spent on administration.*



14. This indicator was not used; all districts received the maximum 10 points.

15. This indicator was not used; all districts received the maximum 5 points.

16. Did the comparison of Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data to like information in the district's AFR result in a total variance of less than 3 percent of all expenditures by function?

**YES - PEIMS data compared to like information in the district's AFR resulted in less than 3% variance.**

*This indicator measures the quality of district's data reported to PEIMS and in the annual audit. If the difference in numbers reported in any fund type is 3 percent or more, your district "fails" this measure.*

17. Did the external independent auditor report indicate 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)

**YES -- No material weaknesses were noted in the AFR.**

18. 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.)

**YES -- No material noncompliance was noted in the AFR, and SCUC earned the maximum 10 points.**

19. Did the school district post the required financial information on its website in accordance with Government Code, Local Government Code, Texas Education Code, Texas Administrative Code and other statutes, laws and rules that were in effect at the school district's fiscal year.

**YES -- SCUC posted the financial information as required, and earned the maximum 5 points.**

20. Did the school district's administration and school board members discuss any changes and/or impact to local, state, and federal funding at a board meeting within 120 days before the district adopted its budget?

**YES -- SCUC Board of Trustees discussed district budget workshops.**

## PRIOR YEAR RESULTS\*

Rating A = Superior (90 points)

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. Indicator not used; all districts received a "Yes"
6. Passed
7. 10
8. 10
9. 10
10. Indicator not used; all districts received max of 10 pts
11. 2
12. 8
13. 10
14. 10
15. Indicator not used; all districts received max of 5 pts
16. Yes
17. Yes
18. 10
19. 5
20. Yes

\* TEA requires prior year results be presented for comparison

**DISCLOSURE #1**

**SUPERINTENDENT'S  
CONTRACT**

The Superintendent's contact is located  
at <https://www.scuc.txed.net/Page/101>

## DISCLOSURE #2

### Reimbursements Received by the Superintendent and Board Members for Fiscal Year 2021-22

| For the 12 month Period Ended August 31, 2022 |                     |                    |                  |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |
|---|---------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Description of Reimbursements                 | Dr. Clark Ealy      | Gary Inmon         | Amy Driesbach    | Gerald Perkins     | Dan Swart          | Robert Westbrook   | Edward Finley      | Leticia Sever      | Belinda Evans      | Amy Thomas         |
| Meals   | \$ 1,157.00         | \$ 6.59            | \$ -             | \$ 184.27          | \$ 174.27          | \$ 174.27          | \$ 174.27          | \$ 174.32          | \$ 174.28          | \$ 174.32          |
| Lodging                                       | \$ 4,547.86         | \$ 969.48          | \$ -             | \$ 1,307.75        | \$ 590.69          | \$ 1,011.91        | \$ 816.31          | \$ 2,376.56        | \$ 570.21          | \$ 590.69          |
| Transportation                                | \$ 2,508.06         | \$ 326.36          | \$ -             | \$ 476.04          | \$ 127.77          | \$ 804.32          | \$ 392.96          | \$ 1,051.91        | \$ 106.24          | \$ 106.24          |
| Motor Fuel                                    | \$ -                | \$ -               | \$ -             | \$ -               | \$ -               | \$ -               | \$ -               | \$ -               | \$ -               | \$ -               |
| Other   | \$ 1,705.00         | \$ -               | \$ 205.00        | \$ 25.00           | \$ 315.00          | \$ 25.00           | \$ 25.00           | \$ 25.00           | \$ 315.00          | \$ 315.00          |
| Registration                                  | \$ 1,395.00         | \$ -               | \$ -             | \$ 835.00          | \$ 835.00          | \$ 525.00          | \$ 674.00          | \$ 375.00          | \$ 835.00          | \$ 835.00          |
| <b>Total</b>                                  | <b>\$ 11,312.92</b> | <b>\$ 1,302.43</b> | <b>\$ 205.00</b> | <b>\$ 2,828.06</b> | <b>\$ 2,042.73</b> | <b>\$ 2,540.50</b> | <b>\$ 2,082.54</b> | <b>\$ 4,002.79</b> | <b>\$ 2,000.73</b> | <b>\$ 2,021.25</b> |

|              |                     |
|--------------|---------------------|
| <b>Total</b> | <b>\$ 30,338.95</b> |
|--------------|---------------------|

\* The spirit of the rule is to capture all “reimbursements” or payments made on behalf of Board Members or the Superintendent for fiscal year ended 2022, regardless of the manner of payment, including direct pay, credit card, cash, and purchase order.

**DISCLOSURE #3**

**Outside Compensation and/or Fees Received by the Superintendent for Professional Consulting and/or Other personal Services in Fiscal Year 2021-22**

*NONE TO REPORT*

**DISCLOSURE #4**

**Gifts Received by the Executive Officer(s) and Board Members (and First Degree Relative, if any) in Fiscal Year 2021-22**

*NONE TO REPORT*

**DISCLOSURE #5**

**Business Transactions Between School District and Board Members for Fiscal Year 2021-22**

*NONE TO REPORT*