

YEAR **2001-2002** Select An Option Help Home Log Out



Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

2001-2002 DISTRICT STATUS DETAIL

Name: GRANBURY ISD(111901)	Publication Level 1: 10/3/2003 9:39:05 AM
Status: Passed	Publication Level 2: 8/9/2004 3:03:04 PM
Rating: Superior Achievement	Last Updated: 8/9/2004 3:03:04 PM
Indicators Answered YES: 21	Indicators Answered NO: 0

#	Indicator Description	Updated	Result
1	<u>Was The Total Fund Balance Less Reserved Fund Balance Greater Than Zero In The General Fund?</u>	9/19/2003 6:24:33 PM	Yes
2	<u>Were There No Disclosures In The Annual Financial Report And/Or Other Sources Of Information Concerning Default On Bonded Indebtedness Obligations?</u>	9/19/2003 6:24:33 PM	Yes
3	<u>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)?</u>	9/19/2003 6:24:33 PM	Yes
4	<u>Was There An Unqualified Opinion in Annual Financial Report?</u>	9/19/2003 6:24:33 PM	Yes
5	<u>Did The Annual Financial Report Not Disclose Any Instance (s) Of Material Weaknesses In Internal Controls?</u>	9/19/2003 6:24:34 PM	Yes
6	<u>Was The Percent Of Total Tax Collections (Including Delinquent) Greater Than 96%?</u>	9/19/2003 6:24:34 PM	Yes
7	<u>Did The Comparisons Of PEIMS Data To Like Information In Annual Financial Report Result In An Aggregate</u>	9/19/2003 6:24:35 PM	Yes

	<u>Variance Of Less Than 4 Percent Of Expenditures Per Fund Type (Data Quality Measure)?</u>		
8	<u>Were Debt Related Expenditures (Net Of IFA And/Or EDA Allotment) < \$770.00 Per Student? (If The District's Five-Year Percent Change In Students = Or > 2%, Or If Property Taxes Collected Per Penny Of Tax Effort > \$100,000, Then Answer This Indicator Yes)</u>	9/19/2003 6:24:36 PM	Yes
9	<u>Was There No Disclosure In The Annual Audit Report Of Material Noncompliance?</u>	9/19/2003 6:24:36 PM	Yes
10	<u>Did The District Have Full Accreditation Status In Relation To Financial Management Practices? (e.g. No Master Or Monitor Assigned)</u>	9/19/2003 6:24:36 PM	Yes
11	<u>Was The Percent Of Operating Expenditures Expended For Instruction More Than 54%?</u>	9/19/2003 6:24:37 PM	Yes
12	<u>Was The Aggregate Of Budgeted Expenditures And Other Uses Less Than The Aggregate Of Total Revenues, Other Resources and Fund Balance In General Fund?</u>	9/19/2003 6:24:38 PM	Yes
13	<u>If The District's Aggregate 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 Situation)</u>	9/19/2003 6:24:39 PM	Yes
14	<u>Was The Ratio Of Cash And Investments To Deferred Revenues (Excluding Amount Equal To Net Delinquent Taxes Receivables) In The General Fund = Or > 1:1? (If Deferred Revenues < Net Delinquent Taxes Receivable, Then Answer This Indicator Yes)</u>	9/19/2003 6:24:39 PM	Yes
15	<u>Was The Administrative Cost Ratio Less Than The Standard In State Law?</u>	9/19/2003 6:24:39 PM	Yes
16	<u>Was The Ratio Of Students To Teachers Within the Ranges Shown Below According To District Size?</u>	9/19/2003 6:24:40 PM	Yes
17	<u>Was The Ratio Of Students To Total Staff Within the Ranges Shown Below According To District Size?</u>	9/19/2003 6:24:41 PM	Yes

18	<u>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?</u>	9/19/2003 6: 24: 41 PM	Yes
19	<u>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 Answer This Indicator Yes)</u>	9/19/2003 6: 24: 42 PM	Yes
20	<u>Was The Aggregate Total Of Cash And Investments In The General Fund More Than \$0?</u>	9/19/2003 6: 24: 42 PM	Yes
21	<u>Were Investment Earnings In All Funds More Than \$15 Per Student?</u>	9/19/2003 6: 24: 43 PM	Yes

DETERMINATION OF RATING

A.	Did The District Answer ' No ' To Indicators 1, 2, Or 3? OR Did The District Answer ' No ' To Both 4 and 5? If So, The District's Rating Is Substandard Achievement .	
B.	By Applicable Range For The Number Of Indicators Answered ' No '	
	Superior Achievement	0-2
	Above Standard Achievement	3-4
	Standard Achievement	5-6
	Substandard Achievement	7+ OR ' No ' To Critical Indicator(s)

INDICATOR 16 & 17 RATIOS

Indicator 16	Ranges for Ratios		Indicator 17	Ranges for Ratios	
	Low	High		Low	High
District Size - Number of Students Between			District Size - Number of Students Between		
< 500	7	22	< 500	4	14
500-999	10	22	500-999	5.5	14

1000-4999	11.5	22	1000-4999	6	14
5000-9999	13	22	5000-9999	6.5	14
=> 10000	13.5	22	=> 10000	6.6	14

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