# JIM NED CISD Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

School Year Kating Year Kating		(	;		,					Į.			l l	-	Indicators	tors			i i		!			
n		Score	%	Yes	2	1 2	က	4	5 6	~ <b>~</b>	တ ထ	10	<del>/</del>	7		<del>~-</del>	13 14	1 15	16	17	<u>~</u>	<del>1</del> 0	20	
jo.	Superior Achievement	02/69	%66	9	0	<b>≻</b>	>	<b>≻</b>	>	ις.	5 5	5	5	ß		Ŋ	.5	. 2	4	5	2	2	S	
Ö	Superior Achievement	70/70	100%	9	0	<b>≻</b>	>	>	<b>≻</b> <b>≻</b>	3	5 5	5	5	S		5	.2	5	5	5	2	2	22	
jo.	Superior Achievement	02/59	%86	9	0	<b>≻</b>	>-	<b>&gt;</b>	<i>&gt;</i> -	5	0 5	2	3	Ŋ		9		ις.	5	5	ß	ιΩ	Ŋ	
					,		}							-	Indicators	tors								
School Year Rating		Score	%	Yes	g	1 2	က	4	5 6	7	တ တ	10	7	12		<del>*</del>	13 14	1 15	16	17	<del>2</del>	19	20	21 22
jor /	Superior Achievement	74/80	93%	9	0	<b>≻</b>	>	>- >-	>	22	5	ιÇ	0	ζ.		5	5	5	5	5	4	5	22	r)
ior A	Superior Achievement	74/80	93%	9	0	> >	>-	<b>≻</b>	>	5	5	ιC	0	5		5	5	ιΩ	4	5	4	S	rC	5
					'		:							=	Indicators	tors								
School Year Rating		Score		Yes	8	1 2	က	4 5	9	~	ත හ	10	4	12	13 1	14 15	5 16	3 17	7	19	20	21	22	23 24
ior A	Superior Achievement	79/85	93%	9	0	<i></i>	>	<b>≻</b>	>	3	5 5	4	0	2	3	3 5	5	ß	2	5	Ŋ	Ŋ	Ŋ	Ŋ
ior A	Superior Achievement	85/85	100%	9	0	<b>≻</b>	>-	>- >-	>	5	5 5	5	t)	2	8	3 5	5	5	5	5	2	Ŋ	Ŋ	Ŋ
					•									-	Indicators	tors								
School Year Rating				Yes	2	τ	7	3 4	5		2 9	00	0	10	7	12	2 13	3 14	. 15	16	17	$\frac{\omega}{\infty}$	19	20 21
ior /	Superior Achievement Superior Achievement Superior Achievement Superior Achievement Superior Achievement			<b>5 7 2 8 9 9 9</b>	<b>+0</b> 0 ← 0	<b>&gt; &gt;</b> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >>	<b>&gt;&gt;</b> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >>	<b>&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</b>	<b>&gt;&gt;</b> >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>		<b>&gt;&gt;</b> >>>	<b>&gt;&gt;</b> >> >> >>	<b>Z</b> > Z Z Z	<b>&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</b>	<b>&gt;&gt;</b> >> >> >	<b>&gt;&gt;</b> >>>	<b>&gt;&gt;</b> >>>	<b>&gt;</b> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >	<b>&gt;&gt;</b> >> >>	<b>&gt;&gt; &gt; &gt; &gt;</b>	<b>&gt;-&gt;</b> >-> >-	<b>&gt;&gt;</b> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >>	<b>&gt;&gt;</b> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >> >>	<b>&gt;&gt;</b> >>>

District Status Detail Page 1 of 4

**User: Hunter Cooley User Role: District** 

RATING YEAR 2013-2014 Help Home



# **Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas**

# **2013-2014 RATINGS BASED ON SCHOOL YEAR 2012-2013 DATA - DISTRICT STATUS DETAIL**

Name: JIM NED CONS ISD(221911)		Publication Level	<b>Publication Level 1:</b> 6/18/2014 8:04:42 AM			
Sta	tus: Passed	Publication Level	<b>2:</b> None			
Rat	ing: Superior Achievement	Last Updated: 6/	18/2014 8:04:4	2 AM		
Dis	trict Score: 69	Passing Score: 52	2			
#	Indicator Description		Updated	Score		
1	Was The Total Fund Balance Less No Restricted Fund Balance Greater Tha General Fund?		4/28/2014 4:18:56 PM	Yes		
2	Was the Total Unrestricted Net Asset Accretion of Interest on Capital Appr the Governmental Activities Column of Net Assets Greater than Zero? (If Year % Change in Students was 10%	reciation Bonds) In in the Statement the District's 5	4/28/2014 4:18:57 PM	Yes		
3	Were There No Disclosures In The All Report And/Or Other Sources Of Info Concerning Default On Bonded Indel Obligations?	ormation	4/28/2014 4:18:57 PM	Yes		
4	Was The Annual Financial Report File Month After November 27th or Janua Depending Upon The District's Fiscal (June 30th or August 31st)?	ary 28th Deadline	4/28/2014 4:18:57 PM	Yes		
5	Was There An Unqualified Opinion in Report?	Annual Financial	4/28/2014 4:18:58 PM	Yes		
6	Did The Annual Financial Report Not	Disclose Any	4/28/2014	Yes		

District Status Detail Page 2 of 4

	Instance(s) Of Material Weaknesses In Internal Controls?	4:18:58 PM	
			1 Multiplier Sum
7	Was The Three-Year Average Percent Of Total Tax Collections (Including Delinquent) Greater Than 98%?	4/28/2014 4:18:58 PM	5
8	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)?	4/28/2014 4:18:59 PM	5
9	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)	5/15/2014 12:07:20 PM	5
10	Was There No Disclosure In The Annual Audit Report Of Material Noncompliance?	4/28/2014 4:19:00 PM	5
11	Did The District Have Full Accreditation Status In Relation To Financial Management Practices? (e.g. No Conservator Or Monitor Assigned)	4/28/2014 4:19:00 PM	5
12	Was The Aggregate Of Budgeted Expenditures And Other Uses Less Than The Aggregate Of Total Revenues, Other Resources and Fund Balance In General Fund?	4/28/2014 4:19:00 PM	5
13	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)	4/28/2014 4:19:01 PM	5
14	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)	4/28/2014 4:19:01 PM	5
15	Was The Administrative Cost Ratio Less Than The	4/28/2014	5

District Status Detail Page 3 of 4

	Threshold Ratio?	4:19:02 PM	
16	Was The Ratio Of Students To Teachers Within the Ranges Shown Below According To District Size?	4/28/2014 4:19:02 PM	4
17	Was The Ratio Of Students To Total Staff Within the Ranges Shown Below According To District Size?	4/28/2014 4:19:03 PM	5
18	Was The Decrease In Undesignated Unreserved Fund Balance < 20% Over Two Fiscal Years?(If Total Revenues > Operating Expenditures In The General Fund, Then District Receives 5 Points)	4/28/2014 4:19:03 PM	5
19	Was The Aggregate Total Of Cash And Investments In The General Fund More Than \$0?	4/28/2014 4:19:03 PM	5
20	Were Investment Earnings In All Funds (Excluding Debt Service Fund and Capital Projects Fund) Meet or Exceed the 3-Month Treasury Bill Rate?	5/14/2014 12:36:19 PM	5
			69 Weighted Sum
			1 Multiplier Sum
			69 Score

# **DETERMINATION OF RATING**

	Did The District Answer ' <b>No</b> ' To Indicators 1, 2, 3 Or 4? <b>OR</b> Did T Answer ' <b>No</b> ' To Both 5 and 6? If So, The District's Rating Is <b>Subst Achievement</b> .	andard
В.	Determine Rating By Applicable Range For summation of the indicat (Indicators 7-20)	or scores
	Superior Achievement	64-70
	Above Standard Achievement	58-63
	Standard Achievement	52-57
	Substandard Achievement	<52

District Status Detail Page 4 of 4

# **INDICATOR 16 & 17 RATIOS**

Indicator 16	Ranges Ratios	for	Indicator 17	Ranges Ratios	s for
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

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