### PAISD Facts for 2019-2020

- PAISD has 8,337 students
- There are 1,280 employees at PAISD
- The total 2019-2020 budget is \$120,595,331
- The total PAISD appraised value is \$9,104,313,879
- The total PAISD taxable value is \$6,548,388,432

### **PAISD**

Port Arthur Independent School District is an Equal Opportunity Employer in full compliance with the Title VI, Civil Rights Act, 1964; Title IX, Education Amendment, 1972; Section 504, Rehabilitation Act, 1973. It is the policy of the Port Arthur Independent School District not to discriminate based on race, color, age, gender, handicap, religion, or national origin in educational or vocational programs, activities or employment. For further information, please contact Mark Porterie, Ed.D. at (409) 989-6238.



### **School Finance Report Card**

### **Rating: Above Standard**

B

### As rated by Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas

A division of the Texas Education Agency
Issue Date: Fall 2019 (for the 2017-2018 School Year)

Score 88 Above Standard 80-89

### Dr. Mark Porterie, Superintendent

Ms. Phyllis Geans, CPA, Assistant Superintendent for Business and Finance

### **Board of Trustees:**

Mr. Brandon Bartie, President
Mr. Donald Frank, Sr., Vice President
Mr. Robert Reid, Secretary
Ms. Debra Ambroise, Trustee
Ms. Dianne Brown, Trustee
Ms. Lloyd Marie Johnson, Trustee
Mr. Kenneth W. Lofton, Sr., Trustee

## Other Disclosures September 2017 - August 2018

Outside Compensation and/or Fees Received by the Superintendent for Professional Consulting and/or Other Personal Services

For the Twelve-Month Period Ended August 31, 2016

Amount Received Name(s) of Entity(ies) Note - Compensation does not include business revenues generated from a family business (farming, ranching, etc.) that has no relation to school district business

# Giffs Received by Executive Officers and Board Members (and First Degree Relatives, if any) (giffs that had an economic value of \$250 or more in the aggregate in the fiscal year)

For the Twelve-Month Period Ended August 31, 2016

Description of	Mark
Reimb Supt.	Porterie
Total	0\$

Brandon
Ambroise Bartie
0\$ 0:

Note – An executive officer is defined as the superintendent, unless the board of trustees or the district administration names additional staff under this classification for local officials.

## Business Transactions Between School District and Board Members

For the Twelve-Month Period Ended August 31, 2016

			,	:	,		,	,
Description of	Debra	Brandon	Dianne	Donald	loseph	Kenneth	Lloyd	Kobert
Reimb Board	Ambroise	Bartie	Brown	Frank Sr.	Guillory	Lofton	Johnson	Reid
Amounts	0\$	0\$	0\$	0\$	0\$	0\$	0\$	80

Note – The summary amounts reported under this disclosure are not to duplicate the items disclosed in the summary schedule of reimbursements received by board members.

### Reimbursments Received by the Superintendent and Board Members - August 2018 September 2017

Description of	Mark
Reimb Supt.	Porterie
Meals	\$46
Lodging	\$1,432
Transportation	\$645
Motor Fuel	\$109
Other	\$1,610
Total	\$3,842

Description of	Debra	Brandon	Dianne	Donald	Joseph	Kenneth	Loyd	Robert
Reimb Board	Ambroise	Bartie	Brown	Frank Sr.	Guillory	Lofton	Johnson	Reid
Meals	\$276	9658	\$276	\$156	80	\$156	8156	\$276
Lodging	\$1,627	\$3,064	\$1,541	\$894	80	\$894	\$628	\$1,893
Transportation	\$612	\$261	\$137	\$71	80	\$71	\$71	\$612
Motor Fuel	80	840	865	\$25	80	\$26	\$26	80
Other	\$2,798	\$3,145	\$2,045	\$3,121	\$2,911	\$1,966	8550	\$1,966
Total	\$5,313	\$7,106	\$4,064	\$4,267	\$2,911	\$3,112	\$1,430	\$4,747

### **Port Arthur Independent School Board of Trustees**



Left to right:

Mr. Robert Reid Mr. Kenneth Lofton, Sr.

Ms. Dianne Brown

Dr. Mark Porterie Ms. Debra Ambroise

Mr. Brandon Bartie

Ms. Lloyd Marie Johnson

Mr. Donald R. Frank, Sr.

MEMO from the Office of the Superintendent

TO: Stakeholders

DATE: October 24, 2019

SUBJECT: Financial Report Card

The financial report card is provided to you in an effort to keep you abreast of the financial health of your school district. An Above Standard rating was awarded to Port Arthur ISD by the Texas Education Agency's F.I.R.S.T (Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas). The district is proud to receive a score of 86 out of 100 possible points.

I hope this report card gives you added comfort in knowing that PAISD tax dollars are being managed cost-efficiently and effectively to provide the highest quality education possible to the children of the district.

No.	Indicator Description	2016-2017 Result	2017-2018 Result	SCORE	COMPARISON
1	Was the complete annual financial report (AFR) and data submitted to the TEA within 30 days of the November 27 or January 28 deadline depending on the school district's fiscal year end date of June 30 or August 31, respectively?	Yes - The Annual Financial Report was filed with TEA's audit area on January 28. PAISD's deadline was 2/28.	Yes - The Annual Financial Report was filed with TEA's audit area on January 28. PAISD's deadline was 2/28.	Yes	No change.
	Review the AFR for an unmodified opinion and material weaknesses. The school district must pass 2.A to pass this indicator. The school district fails indicator number 2 if it responds "No" to indicator 2.A or to both indicators 2.A and 2.B.				
2.A	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 - PAISD received an Unqualified Opinion.	Yes - PAISD received an Unqualified Opinion.	Yes	No change.
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? (The AICPA defines material weaknesses.)	Yes - PAISD was free of any instance(s) of material weaknesses in internal controls.	Yes - PAISD was free of any instance(s) of material weaknesses in internal controls.	Yes	No change.
3	Was the school district in compliance with the payment terms of all debt agreements at fiscal year end? (If the school district was in default in a prior fiscal year, an exemption applies in following years if the school district is current on its forbearance or payment plan with the lender and the payments are made on schedule for the fiscal year being rated. Also exempted are technical defaults that are not related to monetary defaults. A technical default is a failure to uphold the terms of a debt covenant, contract, or master promissory note even though payments to the lender, trust, or sinking fund are current. A debt agreement is a legal agreement between a debtor (=person, company, etc. that owes money) and their creditors, which includes a plan for paying back the debt.)	Yes- The District was able to make all bond payments.	Yes- The District was able to make all bond payments.	Yes	No change.
4	Did the school district make timely payments to the Teachers Retirement System (TRS), Texas Workforce Commission (TWC), Internal Revenue Service (IRS), and other government agencies?	Yes - PAISD made timely payments to Government Agencies	Yes - PAISD made timely payments to Government Agencies	Yes	No change.

No.	Indicator Description	2016-2017 Result	2017-2018 Result	SCORE	COMPARISON
6	Was the number of days of cash on hand and current investments in the general fund of the school district sufficient to cover operating expenditures (excluding facilities acquisition and construction)?	PAISD Number of days cash on hand = 74.33 days Ratio - <74>=60	PAISD Number of days cash on hand = 85.98 days Ratio - < 90 > = 75	8	Increase in number of days cash on hand of 11.65 days.
7	Was the measure of current assets to current liabilities ratio for the school district sufficient to cover short-term debt?	Ratio - >=3.00; PAISD -5.325.	Ratio - >=3.00; PAISD -3.1358.	10	Decrease in ratio of 1.997
8	Was the ratio of long-term liabilities to total assets for the school district sufficient to support long-term solvency? (If the school district's change of students in membership over 5 years was 10 percent or more, then the school district passes the indicator.)	Ratio - >0.90 <= 1.00; PAISD - 0.9175.	Ratio - >0.90 <= 1.00; PAISD - 0.9156.	2	Decrease in ratio of 0.0019
9	Did the school district's general fund revenues equal or exceed expenditures (excluding facilities acquisition and construction)? If not, was the school district's number of days of cash on hand greater than or equal to 60 days?	Ratio - >= 0 or >= 60; PAISD - 0.0759 or 74.3302	Ratio - >= 0 or >= 60; PAISD - 0.0219 or 85.9803	10	Decrease in ratio of 0.054 and increase in number of days of 11.65.
10	Was the debt service coverage ratio sufficient to meet the required debt service?	Ratio - >= 1.2 PAISD - 3.9412	Ratio - >= 1.2 PAISD - 1.2278	10	Decrease in ratio of 2.7134
11	Was the school district's administrative cost ratio equal to or less than the threshold ratio?	Cost Ratio - >.1000; PAISD1204	Cost Ratio - >.1000; PAISD1109	8	Decrease in ratio of 0.0095
12	Did the school district not have a 15 percent decline in the staff ratio over 3 years (total enrollment to total staff)? (If the student enrollment did not decrease, the school district will automatically pass this function?	PAISD did not have 15 percent decline in the students to staff ration	PAISD did not have 15 percent decline in the students to staff ration	10	No change.
13	Did the comparison of Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data to like information in the school district's AFR result in a total variance of less than 3 percent of all expenditures by function?	Acceptable Level of Variance < (rounding) is 0.03%. District variance was 0%	Acceptable Level of Variance < (rounding) is 0.03%. District variance was .0023%	10	Increase in percentage of 00023
14	Did the external independent auditor report that 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.	Yes - No material noncompliance.	10	No change.
15	Did the school district not receive and adjusted repayment schedule for more that one fiscal year for an over allocation of Foundation School Program (FSP) funds as a result of a financial hardship?	True - No Adjusted Repayment Schedule	True - No Adjusted Repayment Schedule	10	No change.
				88	

**Determination of Rating** 

A. Did the district answer "NO" to indicators 1, 3, 4, 5, or 2.B? If so, the school district's rating if F for Substandard Achievement regardless of points earned.

B. Determine Rating by applicable range for summation of the indicator scores (Indicators 6 - 15).

A = Superior 90-100

B = Above Standard

C = Meets Standard

60-79

D = Substandard Achievement <60