

Financial Integrity Rating System Financial Management Report

Process:	Status Details:
1. Notice of this annual financial management report was published on website & went out to newspapers on 9/13/2010.	Name: Melissa ISD (043-908)
2. A public copy of this report is available at sign-in table.	Data Year: 2009-2010 Fiscal Year
3. The public will be afforded the opportunity to comment on the report at this public hearing in accordance with the following guidelines:	District Rating: Superior Achievement
A. Sign-up at entrance to comment during Open Forum.	District Score: 75
B. Individual presentations may not exceed 5 minutes.	Passing Score: 56

Indicator Description	Result
1. Was the total fund balance less reserved fund balance greater than zero in the general fund?	Yes
2. Was the total unrestricted net asset balance in the governmental activities column in the statement of net assets greater than zero?	Yes
3. Were there no disclosures in the annual financial report and/or other sources of information concerning default on bonded indebtedness obligations?	Yes
4. Was the annual financial report filed within one month after the November 27th or January 28th deadline depending upon the district's fiscal year end date?	Yes
5. Was there an unqualified opinion in the annual financial report?	Yes
6. Did the annual financial report not disclose any instances of material weaknesses in internal controls?	Yes
7. Did the District's academic rating exceed academically unacceptable?	5
8. Was the three year average percent of total tax collections (including delinquent) greater than 98%?	5
9. Did the comparisons of PEIMS data to like information in the annual financial report result in an aggregate variance of less than 3% of expenditures per fund type (data quality measure)?	5
10. Were debt related expenditures < \$350 per student (If the district's five-year percent change in students is = to or > 7% or if property taxes collected per penny of tax effort > \$200,000, then this indicator is answered yes.	5
11. Was there no disclosure in the annual audit report of material noncompliance?	5
12. Did the district have full accreditation status in relation to financial management practices (no monitor assigned)?	5

13. Was the aggregate of budgeted expenditures and other uses less than the aggregate of total revenues, other resources, and fund balance in the general fund?	5
14. If the district's aggregate of fund balance in the general fund and capital projects fund was less than zero, were construction projects adequately financed to avoid creating or adding to the fund balance deficit?	5
15. Was the ratio of cash and investments to deferred revenues in the general fund = or > 1:1?	5
16. Was the administrative cost ratio less than the threshold ratio?	5
17. Was the ratio of students to teachers within the ranges according to district size?	5
18. Was the ratio of students to total staff within the ranges according to district size?	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?	5
20. Was the decrease in undesignated unreserved fund balance < 20% over two fiscal years?	5
21. Was the aggregate total of cash and investments in the general fund more than \$0?	5
22. Were investment earnings in all funds more than \$20 per student?	0

Rating Determination Guide	
Rating	Applicable Range for the Number of Indicators Answered "No"
Superior Achievement	72-80 and Yes to indicator 7
Above Standard Achievement	65-74 or >=75 and No to indicator 7
Standard Achievement	55-64
Substandard Achievement	<55 or No to one default indicator

*Default Indicators: 1,2,3 or 4 OR 5 & 6 combined