INFORMATIVE REPORT NO.

Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas Financial Management Report

Richland Collegiate High School (RCHS)'s 2015-2016 Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas (FIRST) Financial Management Report based on the 2015 fiscal year data includes the status ratings and summary schedule for compensation and/or reimbursements to the RCHS Superintendent and Board of Trustees members.

Status Rating for Fiscal Year Ending August 31, 2015

RCHS achieved a letter grade of A and a performance rating of Superior (A – Superior), the highest rating under the current FIRST guidelines.

Report requirements:

Indicator Description	Score
1. Was the complete annual financial and compliance report (AFR)	
and the charter school financial data submitted to TEA on or before	
the November 27 or January 28 deadline depending on the charter	
school's fiscal year end date of June 30 or August 31, respectively?	Yes
2 A. Was there an unmodified opinion in the AFR on the financial	
statements as a whole?	Yes
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
3. Was the charter school in compliance with the payment terms of	
all debt agreements at fiscal year end?	Yes
4. Did the charter school make timely payments to the Teachers	
Retirement System (TRS), Texas Workforce Commission (TWC),	
Internal Revenue Service (IRS), and other government agencies?	
5. Was the total net asset balance in the statement of financial	
position for the charter school greater than zero?	Yes
6. Was the ratio of days of cash on hand and current investments	
for the charter school sufficient to cover operating expenses? The	
calculation will use expenses, excluding depreciation.	10
7. Was the measure of current assets to current liabilities ratio for	
the charter school sufficient to cover short-term debt?	10
8. Was the ratio of long-term liabilities to total assets for the	
charter school sufficient to support long-term solvency?	10

9. Did the charter school's revenues equal or exceed expenses, excluding depreciation? If not, was the charter school's number of days of cash on hand greater than or equal to 40 days? 10. Was the debt service coverage ratio sufficient to meet the required debt service? 11. Was the charter school's administrative cost ratio equal to or below the threshold ratio as specified by TEA? 12. Did the charter school not have a 15 percent decline in the students to staff ratio over 3 years (total enrollment to total staff)? 13. Did the comparison of Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data to like information in the charter school's AFR result in a total variance of less than 3 percent of all expenses by function? 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? 15. Did the charter school 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? 10. Total Score		
days of cash on hand greater than or equal to 40 days? 10 10. Was the debt service coverage ratio sufficient to meet the required debt service? 11. Was the charter school's administrative cost ratio equal to or below the threshold ratio as specified by TEA? 12. Did the charter school not have a 15 percent decline in the students to staff ratio over 3 years (total enrollment to total staff)? 13. Did the comparison of Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data to like information in the charter school's AFR result in a total variance of less than 3 percent of all expenses by function? 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? 15. Did the charter school 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? 10		
10. Was the debt service? 11. Was the charter school's administrative cost ratio equal to or below the threshold ratio as specified by TEA? 12. Did the charter school not have a 15 percent decline in the students to staff ratio over 3 years (total enrollment to total staff)? 13. Did the comparison of Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data to like information in the charter school's AFR result in a total variance of less than 3 percent of all expenses by function? 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? 15. Did the charter school 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? 10	excluding depreciation? If not, was the charter school's number of	
required debt service? 11. Was the charter school's administrative cost ratio equal to or below the threshold ratio as specified by TEA? 12. Did the charter school not have a 15 percent decline in the students to staff ratio over 3 years (total enrollment to total staff)? 13. Did the comparison of Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data to like information in the charter school's AFR result in a total variance of less than 3 percent of all expenses by function? 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? 15. Did the charter school 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? 10	days of cash on hand greater than or equal to 40 days?	10
11. Was the charter school's administrative cost ratio equal to or below the threshold ratio as specified by TEA? 12. Did the charter school not have a 15 percent decline in the students to staff ratio over 3 years (total enrollment to total staff)? 13. Did the comparison of Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data to like information in the charter school's AFR result in a total variance of less than 3 percent of all expenses by function? 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? 15. Did the charter school 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? 10	10. Was the debt service coverage ratio sufficient to meet the	
below the threshold ratio as specified by TEA? 12. Did the charter school not have a 15 percent decline in the students to staff ratio over 3 years (total enrollment to total staff)? 13. Did the comparison of Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data to like information in the charter school's AFR result in a total variance of less than 3 percent of all expenses by function? 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? 15. Did the charter school 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? 10	required debt service?	10
12. Did the charter school not have a 15 percent decline in the students to staff ratio over 3 years (total enrollment to total staff)? 13. Did the comparison of Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data to like information in the charter school's AFR result in a total variance of less than 3 percent of all expenses by function? 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? 15. Did the charter school 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? 10	11. Was the charter school's administrative cost ratio equal to or	
students to staff ratio over 3 years (total enrollment to total staff)? 13. Did the comparison of Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data to like information in the charter school's AFR result in a total variance of less than 3 percent of all expenses 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? 15. Did the charter school 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? 10	below the threshold ratio as specified by TEA?	10
13. Did the comparison of Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data to like information in the charter school's AFR result in a total variance of less than 3 percent of all expenses by function? 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? 15. Did the charter school 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? 10	12. Did the charter school not have a 15 percent decline in the	
Management System (PEIMS) data to like information in the charter school's AFR result in a total variance of less than 3 percent of all expenses 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 charter school 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? 10	students to staff ratio over 3 years (total enrollment to total staff)?	10
charter school's AFR result in a total variance of less than 3 percent of all expenses 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 charter school 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? 10	13. Did the comparison of Public Education Information	
of all expenses by function? 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? 15. Did the charter school 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? 10	Management System (PEIMS) data to like information in the	
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? 15. Did the charter school 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? 10	charter school's AFR result in a total variance of less than 3 percent	
of any instance(s) of material noncompliance for grants, contracts, and laws related to local, state, or federal funds? 15. Did the charter school 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? 10	of all expenses by function?	10
and laws related to local, state, or federal funds? 15. Did the charter school 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? 10	14. Did the external independent auditor indicate the AFR was free	
15. Did the charter school 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?	of any instance(s) of material noncompliance for grants, contracts,	
schedule for more than one fiscal year for an over-allocation of Foundation School Program (FSP) funds as a result of a financial hardship?	and laws related to local, state, or federal funds?	10
Foundation School Program (FSP) funds as a result of a financial hardship?	15. Did the charter school not receive an adjusted repayment	
hardship?	schedule for more than one fiscal year for an over-allocation of	
	Foundation School Program (FSP) funds as a result of a financial	
Total Score 100	hardship?	10
Total Score	Total Score	100

<u>Previous four years Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas Information</u>

Fiscal Year	Rating
2013-2014	Pass
2012-2013	Above Standard Achievement
2011-2012	Above Standard Achievement
2010-2011	Above Standard Achievement

RCHS received its highest possible rating for the four previous fiscal years under the former rating guidelines.

<u>Summary of total salaries and benefits received by the Superintendent or</u> Board members

Name or Title	Compensation
Charletta Rogers Compton	\$0
Bob Ferguson	\$0
Diana Flores	\$0

Wesley Jameson	\$0
Bill Metzger	\$0
Jerry Prater	\$0
JL Sonny Williams	\$0
Donna Walker, Superintendent	\$66,809.90

<u>Summary of total reimbursements and compensations received by the Superintendent or Board members</u>

Reimbursements received by the Superintendent and Board members for the 12 month period ended August 31, 2015. Description of reimbursements: meals, lodging, transportation, fuel, other items excluding supplies and materials purchased for the school

Name or Title	Reimbursements
Charletta Rogers Compton	\$0
Bob Ferguson	\$0
Diana Flores	\$0
Wesley Jameson	\$0
Bill Metzger	\$0
Jerry Prater	\$0
JL Sonny Williams	\$0
Donna Walker, Superintendent	\$0

Outside compensation and/or fees received by the Superintendent for professional consulting and/or other personal services for the 12 month period ended August 31, 2015.

Donna Walker, Superintendent	\$0
------------------------------	-----

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 12 month period ended August 31, 2015.

Charletta Rogers Compton	\$0
Bob Ferguson	\$0
Diana Flores	\$0
Wesley Jameson	\$0
Bill Metzger	\$0
Jerry Prater	\$0
JL Sonny Williams	\$0

Donna Walker, Superintendent	\$0

Business transactions between school district and Board members for the 12 month period ended August 31, 2015.

Charletta Rogers Compton	\$0
Bob Ferguson	\$0
Diana Flores	\$0
Wesley Jameson	\$0
Bill Metzger	\$0
Jerry Prater	\$0
JL Sonny Williams	\$0
Donna Walker, Superintendent	\$0

Background

The Texas Education Agency and the Texas Administrative Code, Chapter 19.109.1002(e) require charter schools to report to the Board of Trustees the school's most recent FIRST status which includes a schedule summary of total reimbursements and compensation received by the Superintendent or Board members.

The 2015-2016 ratings are based on annual financial reports provided to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) by charter schools from the 2015 fiscal year. The financial accountability system requires TEA to review the audited financial reports from all districts and charters.

The FIRST rating is based on 15 financial indicators, such as administrative cost expenditures; accuracy of school's financial information submitted to TEA, and any financial vulnerabilities or material weaknesses in internal controls as determined by an external auditor.

Based on the submitted information a charter is assigned one of four possible letter grades (A, B, C or F) as well as a coinciding financial management rating - "Superior, Above Standard Achievement, Meet Standard or Substandard Achievement".