

STEPHANIE DURAN CPA, RTSBA | 832.693.1214 | stephanie@duranassocs.com

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT'S REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

To the Board of Trustees and Citizens of La Vernia Independent School District

We have performed the agreed-upon procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by La Vernia Independent School District (the "District"), solely for the purpose of reporting our findings regarding the results of the procedures as compared to the criteria set forth in the Legislative Budget Board's ("LBB") House Bill 3 Efficiency Audit Guidelines in relation to the District's peer districts.

This agreed-upon procedures engagement was performed in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of the District. Consequently, we make no representations regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

We were not engaged to and did not conduct an examination or review, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion or conclusion. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion or conclusion. Our report includes specific findings based on the procedures performed. Had we been engaged to perform additional procedures; other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of District management and the Board and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Duran & Associates, LLC Spring, Texas July 31, 2025







LA VERNIA INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES RELATED TO THE DISTRICT'S VOTER-APPROVED TAX RATE ELECTION

Data for the Year Ended June 30, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|--------|
| | |
| Independent Accountant's Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures | 1 |
| Section I – Executive Summary | 3 |
| Section II – Key Information about the District | 5 |
| Section III – Objectives and Approach | 7 |
| Section IV District Data on Accountability, Students, Staffing and Financ with Peer Districts and State Comparisons | es, 11 |
| Section V – Additional Financial, Operational, and Academic Information | 25 |

SECTION I - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview of Procedures Performed

In conducting the agreed-upon procedures for the District, we gained an understanding of the District's fiscal management, efficiency and utilization of resources, and whether the District has implemented best practices utilized by Texas school districts. This was accomplished by analyzing data from the year ended June 30, 2024 and prior, maintained by the Texas Education Agency ("TEA") and the District. An overview of the objectives and approach performed during the agreed-upon procedures are provided in Section III of this report.

District data on accountability, students, staffing and finances, with peer districts and state comparisons are described in Section IV of this report.



SECTION II - KEY INFORMATION ABOUT THE DISTRICT

La Vernia Independent School District ("the District"), is holding an election to increase the District's maintenance and operations property tax rate in fiscal year 2026. Maintenance and Operations (M&O) taxes are for the operation of public schools. The District has not held a tax ratification election in recent years.

The M&O tax rate for fiscal years 2023 and 2024 were \$0.8546 and \$0.6692, respectively. An efficiency audit was deemed necessary to determine if the District can achieve cost efficiencies before deciding on next steps to close the budget gap. The results of this report are to consider if efficiencies can be achieved and if a Voter Approved Tax Rate Election (VATRE) is warranted.

With the proposed M&O tax rate increase the District estimates the incremental tax revenue generated to be approximately \$1.5 million. The District will look to achieve further cost efficiencies and review program cost savings that would allow the District to reduce any potential budget deficit for fiscal year 2026.

If a VATRE is successful for fiscal year 2026, the District intends to use the additional tax revenue to maintain staffing based on staffing guidelines and competitive teacher and staff compensation and also continue to provide the same level of instructional opportunities for students. The District will also use funds to address deteriorating facilities and related deferred maintenance.

The District engaged Duran & Associates, LLC to conduct agreed-upon procedures, following the guidelines of an efficiency audit established by the Legislative Budget Board. The purpose of the procedures is to inform voters about the District's fiscal management, efficiency, utilization of resources, and whether the District has implemented best practices. The information includes data and tools that the State of Texas currently utilizes to measure school district efficiency.

SECTION II - KEY INFORMATION ABOUT THE DISTRICT (continued

- The District's total operating revenue for all funds for fiscal year 2024 totaled \$10,379 per student, while its peer districts average and State average were \$11,925 per student and \$13,037 per student, respectively.
- The District's total local operating revenues for fiscal year 2024 totaled \$2,949 per student, while its peer districts average and State average were \$3,637 per student and \$4,553 per student, respectively.
- The District's total operating expenditures for all funds for fiscal year 2024 totaled \$10,577 per student, while its peer districts average and State average were \$11,733 per student and \$12,944 per student, respectively.
- Results for the School Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas (FIRST) for 2024, based on 2022-2023 school year, reflect a Superior Rating.
- The Texas Education Agency reviews and tracks the performance of both school districts and individual schools with the Texas A-F Accountability System. The results are posted year-toyear. The District earned an "B" (86 out of 100 points) in 2022 - 2023. The detail by campus for the 2022- 2023 accountability rating is shown below: (Scores are different from previous year due to updated standards)

| Grade | # of Campuses |
|--------------------|---------------|
| A | - |
| В | 4 |
| С | - |
| D | - |
| Not Rated: SB 1365 | - |

Additional details and the results of our procedures are included in Section IV.

SECTION III - OBJECTIVES AND APPROACH

Objectives

The objective of our efficiency audit was to assess the District's fiscal management, efficiency and utilization of resources, and whether the District has implemented best practices utilized by Texas school districts.

Approach

In order to achieve the objectives, set forth above, Duran & Associates LLC performed the following procedures:

- 1. Selected 5 peer districts, developed a simple average and used the same comparison group throughout the audit.
- 2. Reported on the overall accountability rating (A-to-F and a corresponding scale score of 1 to 100).
- 3. Compared the District's peer districts' average score and listed the following District's campus information:
 - a. Accountability rating count for each campus level within the district.
 - b. Names of the campuses that received an F accountability rating
 - c. Campuses that are required to implement a campus turnaround plan
- 4. Reported on the District's School FIRST rating. For a rating of less than A, listed the indicators not met.
- 5. Reported on student characteristics for the District, its peer districts and the State average including:
 - a. Total Students
 - b. Economically Disadvantaged
 - c. English Learners
 - d. Special Education
 - e. Bilingual/ESL Education
 - f. Career and Technical Education
- 6. Reported on the attendance rate for the District, its peer districts and the State.
- 7. Reported on the five-year enrollment for the District for the most recent school year and four (4) years prior, the average annual percentage change based on the previous five years and the projected next school year.
- 8. Reported on the following indicators related to the District's revenue, its peer districts' average and the State average and explained any significant variances.
 - a. Local M&O Tax (Retained) (without debt service and recapture)
 - b. State
 - c. Federal
 - d. Other local and intermediate
 - e. Total revenue
- 9. Reported on the following indicators related to the District's expenditures, its peer districts' average, and the State average and explained significant variances from the peer districts' average in any. In addition, explained the reasons for the District's expenditures exceeding revenue, if applicable.
 - a. Instruction
 - b. Instructional resources and media
 - c. Curriculum and staff development
 - d. Instructional leadership
 - e. School leadership
 - f. Guidance counseling services
 - g. Social work services
 - h. Health services
 - i. Transportation

- j. Food service operation
- k. Extracurricular
- I. General administration
- m. Plant maintenance and operations
- n. Security and monitoring services
- o. Data processing services
- p. Community services
- q. Total operating expenditures

SECTION III - OBJECTIVES AND APPROACH (continued)

- 10. Reported on the following indicators for payroll and select District salary expenditures compared to its peer districts' average and the State average and explained any significant variances from the peer districts' average in any category.
 - a. Payroll as a percentage of all funds
 - b. Average teacher salary
 - c. Average administrative salary
 - d. Superintendent salary
- 11. Reported on the General Fund operating fund balance, excluding debt service and capital outlay, for the past five years and per student for the District and its peer districts. Analyzed unassigned balance per student and as a percentage of three-month operating expenditures and explained any significant variances.
- 12. Reported the District's allocation of staff, and student-to-teacher and student-to-total staff ratios for the District, its peer districts and the State average. The following staff categories were used:
 - a. Teaching
 - b. Support
 - c. Administrative
 - d. Paraprofessional
 - e. Auxiliary
 - f. Students per total staff
 - g. Students per teaching staff
- 13. Reported on the District's teacher turnover rate as well as its peer districts and the State's average. Reported on the following programs offered by the District, including the number of students served, percentage of enrolled students served, program budget, program budget as a percentage of the District's budget, total staff for the program, and student-to-staff ratio for the program.
 - a. Special Education
 - b. Bilingual Education
 - c. Migrant Programs
 - d. Gifted and Talented Programs
 - e. Career and Technical Education
 - f. Athletics and Extracurricular Activities
 - g. Alternative Education Program/Disciplinary Alternative Education Program
 - h. Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program
- 14. Described how the District maximizes available resources from state sources and regional education service centers to develop or implement programs or deliver services.
- 15. Report on the District's annual external audit report's independent auditor's opinion as required by *Government Auditing Standards*.
- 16. Explained the basis of the TEA assigning the District a financial-related monitoring/oversight role during the past three years, if applicable.
- 17. In regard to the District's budget process, provided a response to each of the following questions:
 - a. Does the District's budget planning process include projections for enrollment and staffing?
 - b. Does the District's budget process include monthly and quarterly reviews to determine the status of annual spending?
 - c. Does the District use cost allocation procedures to determine campus budgets and cost centers?
 - d. Does the District analyze educational costs and student needs to determine campus budgets?
- 18. Provided a description of the District's self-funded program, if any, and analyzed whether program revenues are sufficient to cover program costs.
- 19. Reported whether the District administrators are evaluated annually and, if so, explained how the results inform District operations.

SECTION III - OBJECTIVES AND APPROACH (continued)

- 20. In regard to the District's compensation system, provided a response to the following questions:
 - a. Does the District use salary bonuses or merit pay systems? If yes, explain the performance-based systems and the factors used.
 - b. Do the District's salary ranges include minimum, midpoint, and maximum increments to promote compensation equity based on the employee's education, experience, and other relevant factors?
 - c. Does the District periodically adjust its compensation structure using verifiable salary survey information, benchmarking, and comparable salary data?
 - d. Has the District made any internal equity and/or market adjustments to salaries within the past two years?
- 21. In regard to planning, provided a response for each of the following questions:
 - a. Does the District develop a District Improvement Plan (DIP) annually?
 - b. Do all campuses in the District develop a Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) annually?
 - c. Does the District have an active and current facilities master plan? If yes, does the District consider these factors to inform the plan:
 - i. Does the District use enrollment projections?
 - ii. Does the District analyze facility capacity?
 - iii. Does the District evaluate facility condition?
 - d. Does the District have an active and current energy management plan?
 - e. Does the District maintain a clearly defined staffing formula for staff in maintenance, custodial, food service, and transportation?
- 22. In regard to District academic information, we will provide a response for each of the following questions:
 - a. Does the District have a teacher mentoring program?
 - b. Are decisions to adopt new programs or discontinue existing programs made based on quantifiable data and research?
 - c. When adopting new programs, does the District define expected results?
 - d. Does the District analyze student test results at the district and/or campus level to design, implement and/or monitor the use of curriculum and instructional programs?
- 23. Provided a response to the question if the District modifies programs, plans staff development opportunities, or evaluates staff based on analyses of student test results.

SECTION IV - DISTRICT DATA ON ACCOUNTABILITY, STUDENTS, STAFFING AND FINANCES, WITH PEER DISTRICTS AND STATE COMPARISONS

1. Peer Districts

The Texas Education Agency's (TEA) Snapshot Peer Search identified a total of 6 peer districts based on size (3,000 – 4,999). Using other similar characteristics for tax rate, district type, and Texas Smart Schools, the five (5) peer districts shown below were selected.

| DISTRICT NAME | COUNTY |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Community ISD | Collin County |
| Dumas ISD | Moore County |
| Floresville ISD | Wilson County |
| Lampasas ISD | Lampasas County |
| Lindale ISD | Smith County |

SECTION IV - DISTRICT DATA ON ACCOUNTABILITY, STUDENTS, STAFFING AND FINANCES, WITH PEER DISTRICTS AND STATE COMPARISONS (continued)

2. Accountability Rating

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) annually assigns an A-to-F rating and a corresponding scaled score (1 to 100) to each district and campus based on student assessment results and other accountability measures.

| FIGURE 2 | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------------------|
| ACCOUNTABILITY RATING | COMPARISON | | |
| 2022 - 2023 | | | |
| | DISTRICT RATING | DISTRICT SCORE | PEER DISTRICT AVERAGE SCORE |
| | | | |
| | (A-F) | (1-100) | (1-100) |
| Rating/Score | В | 86 | 82 |

There were no campuses with an F rating. The results for the District's 4 campuses are shown below.

FIGURE 3
ACCOUNTABILITY RATING BY CAMPUS LEVEL
2022 - 2023

| | ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS | MIDDLE SCHOOLS | HIGH SCHOOLS |
|---|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|
| ^ | _ | _ | |
| A | 2 | | 1 |
| В | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| С | - | - | - |

Campuses with F Accountability Rating

None

Campuses Required to Implement a Campus Turnaround Plan

None

SECTION IV - DISTRICT DATA ON ACCOUNTABILITY, STUDENTS, STAFFING AND FINANCES, WITH PEER DISTRICTS AND STATE COMPARISONS (continued)

3. Financial Rating

The State of Texas' school financial accountability rating system, known as the School Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas (FIRST), ensures that Texas public schools are held accountable for the quality of their financial management practices and that they improve those practices. The system is designed to encourage Texas public schools to better manage their financial resources to provide the maximum allocation possible for direct instructional purposes.

The FIRST rating is based on five (5) critical indicators as well as minimum number of points for an additional ten (10) indicators. Beginning with 2016-2017 Rating (based on the 2015-2016 financial data), the Texas Education Agency moved from a "Pass/Fail" system and began assigning a letter rating. The ratings and corresponding points are shown below:

| Rating | <u>Points</u> |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| A = Superior | 90 – 100 |
| B = Above Standard | 80 - 89 |
| C = Meets Standards | 60 – 79 |
| F = Substandard Achievement | Less than 60 |

The District's 2023 - 2024 rating based on school year 2022 - 2023 data was an "A" (Superior).

| FIGURE 4 | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| SCHOOL FIRST RATING | i |
| 2024 Rating (Based on | School Year 2022-2023 Data) |
| | DISTRICT RATING (A-F) |
| Rating | Δ |

SECTION IV - DISTRICT DATA ON ACCOUNTABILITY, STUDENTS, STAFFING AND FINANCES, WITH PEER DISTRICTS AND STATE COMPARISONS (continued)

4. Student Characteristics, Attendance, and 5-Year Enrollment

Student Characteristics

Every student is served differently in public schools based on their unique characteristics. Such data is captured by the Texas Education Agency on an annual basis. Figure 5 provides student counts for five (5) select student characteristics, which are described below:

Economically Disadvantaged – This term has an identical meaning to educationally disadvantaged, which is defined by the Texas Education Code (TEC) §5.001(4) as a student who is "eligible to participate in the national free or reduced-price lunch program".

English Learners – The Texas Education Agency defines an English Learner as a student who is in the process of acquiring English and has another language as the primary language; it is synonymous with English Language Learner (ELL) and Limited English Proficient (LEP).

Special Education – These are students with a disability as defined by Federal regulations (34 CFR§§ 300.304 through 300.311), State of Texas Laws (Texas Education Code §29.003) or the Commissioner's/State Board of Education Rules (§89.1040).

Bilingual/ESL Education – The Texas Education Code §29.055 describes students enrolled in a bilingual education program as those students in a full-time program of dual-language instruction that provides for learning basic skills in the primary language of the students and for carefully structured and sequenced mastery of the English language skills. Students enrolled in an English as a Second Language (ESL) program receive intensive instruction in English from teachers trained in recognizing and dealing with language differences.

Career and Technical Education - Students enrolled in State approved Career and Technology Education programs.

| FIGURE 5 |
|----------------------------------|
| SELECTED STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS |
| 2022 - 2024 |

| | TOTAL STUDENT POPULATION COUNT | PERCENTAGE OF STUDENT POPULATION | PEER DISTRICTS AVERAGE PERCENTAGE | STATE AVERAGE PERCENTAGE |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| Total Students | 3454 | 100.0% | N/A | N/A |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 982 | 28.4% | 57.8% | 62.3% |
| English Learners | 123 | 3.6% | 17.2% | 24.4% |
| Special Education | 523 | 15.1% | 15.5% | 13.9% |
| Bilingual/ESL Education | 137 | 4.0% | 17.5% | 24.5% |
| Career and Technical Education | 1117 | 32.3% | 27.4% | 26.9% |

SOURCE: Texas Education Agency, Texas Academic Performance Reports.

SECTION IV - DISTRICT DATA ON ACCOUNTABILITY, STUDENTS, STAFFING AND FINANCES, WITH PEER DISTRICTS AND STATE COMPARISONS (continued)

4. Student Characteristics, Attendance, and 5-Year Enrollment (continued)

There are 5.5 million students served by public schools in the State of Texas. Of those students, 3.4 million or 62.3 percent are economically disadvantaged. The percentage of economically disadvantaged students served by the District compared to its total student population totaled 28.4 percent, which is 29.4 percent and 33.9 percent lower than the peer districts average and State average, respectively.

Attendance

| FIGURE 6 | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| ATTENDANCE RATE | | | |
| 2024 based on 2022-2023 Distri | ct Attendance | | |
| | DISTRICT TOTAL | PEER DISTRICTS AVERAGE | STATE AVERAGE |
| Attendance Rate | 95.6% | 94.0% | 93.3% |

SOURCE: Texas Education Agency, Texas Academic Performance Reports.

A school district's State Funding is a complex calculation with many inputs. One of the primary drivers used in the calculation is student attendance. The District's attendance rate is 1.6 percent greater than its peer districts average and 2.3 percent greater than the State average.

SECTION IV - DISTRICT DATA ON ACCOUNTABILITY, STUDENTS, STAFFING AND FINANCES, WITH PEER DISTRICTS AND STATE COMPARISONS (continued)

4. Student Characteristics, Attendance, and 5-Year Enrollment (continued)

Five-Year Enrollment

The attendance rate should be evaluated in conjunction with the number of students enrolled. As shown in Figure 7, the District has experienced an average annual increase over the last five years of 13.37 percent.

| FIGURE 7 |
|-------------------|
| 5-YEAR ENROLLMENT |
| 2020 - 2024 |

| | ENROLLMENT | % CHANGE |
|---|------------|----------|
| 2024 | 3454 | -1.3 % |
| 2023 | 3500 | 4.3 % |
| 2022 | 3356 | 4.5 % |
| 2021 | 3211 | -4.5 % |
| 2020 | 3362 | -0.8 % |
| Average annual percentage change based on the previous five years | .45% | |
| Estimated 2025 Enrollment | 3548 | 2.7% |

SECTION IV - DISTRICT DATA ON ACCOUNTABILITY, STUDENTS, STAFFING AND FINANCES, WITH PEER DISTRICTS AND STATE COMPARISONS (continued)

5. District Revenue

FIGURE 8
DISTRICT TAX REVENUE
2023-2024

| | DISTRICT | | | PEER DISTRICT AVERAGE | | | STATE AVERAGE | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|--------|--------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------|-------------------|------------------------|--------|
| | REVENUE PER STUDENT | | | | PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL | | ENUE PER UDENT | PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL | |
| Local M&O Tax (Retained) (1) | \$ | 2,949 | 28.4 % | \$ | 3,637 | 30.5 % | \$ | 4,553 | 34.9 % |
| State (2) | | 6,011 | 57.9 % | | 6,417 | 53.7 % | | 5,545 | 42.5 % |
| Federal | | 636 | 6.1 % | | 1,270 | 10.7 % | | 2,138 | 16.4 % |
| Other Local and Intermediate | | 783 | 7.6 % | | 601 | 5.1 % | | 801 | 6.1% |
| Total Revenue | \$ | 10,379 | 100.0% | \$ | 11,925 | 100.0% | \$ | 13,037 | 100.0% |

Note: (1) Excludes recapture

(2) Excludes TRS on-behalf revenue

SOURCE: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information Management System District Financial Actual Reports.

The financial data above includes all funds, except for the District's capital projects fund and debt service fund revenues. Approximately \$3.1 million of the Teacher Retirement System (TRS) contributions were made by the State of Texas on-behalf of the District. In accordance with Governmental Accounting Standards Board, on-behalf contributions must be recorded as both revenue and expenditures. However, the source reports used for the analyses excluded on-behalf revenue but included the on-behalf expenditures. The on-behalf contributions of \$3.1 million equates to \$555 per student.

The District's receives less revenue per student than its peer district average and less than the State average.

SECTION IV - DISTRICT DATA ON ACCOUNTABILITY, STUDENTS, STAFFING AND FINANCES, WITH PEER DISTRICTS AND STATE COMPARISONS (continued)

6. District Expenditures

FIGURE 9
DISTRICT ACTUAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES
2023-2024

| | DIST | RICT | PEER DISTRICT AVERAGE | | | STATE AVERAGE | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|----|----------------------|------------------------|--|
| | NDITURES STUDENT | PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL | NDITURES STUDENT | PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL | | ENDITURES STUDENT | PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL | |
| Instruction | \$ 6,239 | 59.0% | \$ 6,450 | 55.1% | \$ | 7,101 | 54.5% | |
| Instructional Resources and Media | 126 | 1.2% | 101 | 0.9% | | 119 | 0.9% | |
| Curriculum and Staff Development | 84 | 0.8% | 193 | 1.6% | | 320 | 2.5% | |
| Instructional Leadership | 164 | 1.6% | 170 | 1.4% | | 236 | 1.8% | |
| School Leadership | 419 | 4.0% | 583 | 5.0% | | 741 | 5.7% | |
| Guidance Counseling Services | 241 | 2.3% | 420 | 3.6% | | 525 | 4.0% | |
| Social Work Services | - | 0.0% | 27 | 0.2% | | 45 | 0.4% | |
| Health Services | 92 | 0.9% | 115 | 1.0% | | 132 | 1.0% | |
| Transportation | 433 | 4.1% | 569 | 4.8% | | 395 | 3.1% | |
| Food Service Operation | 547 | 5.2% | 580 | 5.0% | | 683 | 5.3% | |
| Extracurricular | 371 | 3.5% | 483 | 4.1% | | 400 | 3.1% | |
| General Administration | 453 | 4.3% | 430 | 3.7% | | 427 | 3.3% | |
| Plant Maintenance and Operations | 1,021 | 9.7% | 1,217 | 10.4% | | 1,303 | 10.1% | |
| Security and Monitoring Services | 161 | 1.5% | 158 | 1.4% | | 209 | 1.6% | |
| Data Processing Services | 199 | 1.9% | 228 | 1.9% | | 241 | 1.9% | |
| Community Services | 27 | 0.3% | 9 | 0.8% | | 67 | 0.5% | |
| Total Operating Expenditures | \$ 10,577 | 100.0% | \$ 11,733 | 100.0% | \$ | 12,944 | 100.0% | |

Note: (1) Includes TRS on-behalf expenditures.

SOURCE: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information Management System District Financial Actual Reports.

Capital outlay, debt service payments and other intergovernmental expenditures are not considered operating expenditures.

Overall, the District spends less per student than its peer districts average and less than the State average.

SECTION IV - DISTRICT DATA ON ACCOUNTABILITY, STUDENTS, STAFFING AND FINANCES, WITH PEER DISTRICTS AND STATE COMPARISONS (continued)

7. District Payroll Expenditures Summary

FIGURE 10
PAYROLL EXPENDITURE SUMMARY
2023-2024

| | DISTRICT | | R DISTRICT VERAGE | STATE AVERAGE | |
|--------------------------------------|----------|---------|--------------------------|---------------|---------|
| Payroll as a Percentage of All Funds | | 75.9% | 79.8% | | 77.8% |
| Average Teacher Salary | \$ | 65,271 | \$ 58,907 | \$ | 62,463 |
| Average Administrative Salary | \$ | 84,085 | \$ 88,066 | \$ | 92,101 |
| Superintendent Salary | \$ | 183,751 | \$ 231,605 | \$ | 171,022 |

SOURCE: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information Management System District Financial Actual Reports.

The District spends less on payroll costs than its peer districts average and less than the State average. Also, the District, on average, spends more per teacher than its peer districts average, and more than the State average.

The average administrative salary is lower than the peer average and lower than the state average. The Superintendent's salary is less than its peer district average and higher than the state average. It is important to note that the data for the State average for the Superintendent is comprised of school districts across the State with enrollments ranging from less than 100 to over 100,000 students.

SECTION IV - DISTRICT DATA ON ACCOUNTABILITY, STUDENTS, STAFFING AND FINANCES, WITH PEER DISTRICTS AND STATE COMPARISONS (continued)

8. Fund Balance

FIGURE 11 GENERAL FUND BALANCE

2020 - 2024

| | DISTRICT | | | | PEER DISTRICT AVERAGE (1) | | | | |
|------|------------|--|--|---|---------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| YEAR | UNAS BA | NERAL FUND SIGNED FUND LLANCE PER STUDENT | GENERAL FUND UNASSIGNED FUND BALANCE AS A PERCENTAGE OF OPERATING EXPENDITURES | GENERAL FUND UNASSIGNED FUND BALANCE AS A PERCENTAGE OF 3- MONTH OPERATING EXPENDITURES | UNAS: BAI | ERAL FUND SIGNED FUND LANCE PER TUDENT | GENERAL FUND UNASSIGNED FUND BALANCE AS A PERCENTAGE OF OPERATING EXPENDITURES | GENERAL FUND UNASSIGNED FUND BALANCE AS A PERCENTAGE OF 3- MONTH OPERATING EXPENDITURES | |
| 2024 | \$ | 2,777 | 29.8% | 119.4% | \$ | 2,853 | 28.0% | 111.9% | |
| 2023 | | 2,761 | 32.7% | 130.6% | | 2,987 | 31.4% | 125.4% | |
| 2022 | | 2,473 | 29.5% | 117.8% | | 3,137 | 34.9% | 139.4% | |
| 2021 | | 2,184 | 25.5% | 101.8% | | 2,993 | 32.8% | 131.3% | |
| 2020 | | 1,925 | 23.2% | 92.8% | | 3,155 | 36.2% | 144.9% | |

Note: (1) Includes Peer District with a policy requiring a minimum assigned fund balance equal to 90-days of operating expenses, which reduces the amount of Unassigned Fund Balance.

SOURCE: Texas Education Agency, Public Education Information Management System District Financial Actual Reports.

The General Fund is the operating fund in a governmental entity. Fund balance represents the current resources/assets available to the government less any current obligations/liabilities. Within fund balance there are five (5) categories: non-spendable, restricted, committed, assigned and unassigned. The categories are described below:

- Non-spendable fund balance cannot be spent because it is either (a) not in a spendable form, such as inventory or (b) legally or contractually required to be maintained intact.
- Restricted fund balance is net resources that are restricted to use by an external party, such as a federal grantor.
- Committed fund balance is set aside for a specific purpose as resolved by the Board of Trustees.
- Assigned fund balance is fund balance that has been set aside by management for a specific purpose.
- Unassigned fund balance is the remaining amount that is not restricted, committed, or assigned for a specific purpose.

SECTION IV - DISTRICT DATA ON ACCOUNTABILITY, STUDENTS, STAFFING AND FINANCES, WITH PEER DISTRICTS AND STATE COMPARISONS (continued)

9. District Staffing Levels

FIGURE 12 STAFF RATIO COMPARISON 2023 - 2024

| | DISTRICT | STATE AVERAGE | |
|--|----------|---------------|-------|
| | | | |
| Teaching Staff (Percentage of Total Staff) | 49.2% | 47.6% | 48.3% |
| Support Staff (Percentage of Total Staff) | 8.3% | 8.6% | 11.1% |
| Administrative Staff (Percentage of Total Staff) | 3.2% | 3.4% | 3.3% |
| Paraprofessional Staff (Percentage of Total Staff) | 13.1% | 14.3% | 11.4% |
| Auxiliary Staff (Percentage of Total Staff) | 24.4% | 24.7% | 24.7% |
| Students Per Total Staff | 8.4 | 7.0 | 7.1 |
| Students Per Teaching Staff | 17.1 | 14.7 | 14.7 |

SOURCE: Texas Education Agency, Texas Academic Performance Reports.

The District's students per total staff ratio is 1.4 more than its peer districts and 1.3 more than the State average. The District's students per teaching staff ratio is more than its peer districts average and more than the State average. The District is maximizing efficient use of staffing resources to serve students while achieving high accountability ratings as peer districts.

SECTION IV - DISTRICT DATA ON ACCOUNTABILITY, STUDENTS, STAFFING AND FINANCES, WITH PEER DISTRICTS AND STATE COMPARISONS (continued)

10. Teacher Turnover Rates

FIGURE 13 TEACHER TURNOVER RATES 2023-2024

| | DISTRICT | AVERAGE PEER DISTRICT | STATE |
|----------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| | TURNOVER RATE | TURNOVER RATE | TURNOVER RATE |
| Teachers | 17.2% | 16.7% | 19.1% |

SOURCE: Texas Education Agency, Texas Academic Performance Reports.

The District's turnover rate is higher than the peer districts average and less than the State average. The highest turnover rate within the peer districts was 23.7% while the lowest turnover rate was 12.1%.

SECTION IV - DISTRICT DATA ON ACCOUNTABILITY, STUDENTS, STAFFING AND FINANCES, WITH PEER DISTRICTS AND STATE COMPARISONS (continued)

11. Special Programs

FIGURE 14
SPECIAL PROGRAMS CHARACTERISTICS
2023-2024

| | NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED | PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLED STUDENT SERVED | PROGRAM BUDGET PER STUDENTS SERVED | PROGRAM BUDGET AS A PERCENTAGE OF DISTRICT BUDGET | TOTAL STAFF FOR PROGRAM | STUDENTS PER TOTAL STAFF FOR PROGRAM |
|--|---------------------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Total Students | 3454 | 100.0% | \$ 5804 | 59.8% | 202.2 | 17 |
| Special Education | 523 | 15.1% | 7,797 | 12.2% | 26.2 | 20 |
| Bilingual/ESL Education | 137 | 4% | 792 | 0.3% | 0.4 | 10 |
| Gifted and Talented | 285 | 8.3% | 207 | 0.2% | 0 | 0 |
| Career and Technical Education (1) | 1117 | 32.3% | 1,246 | 4.2% | 13.2 | 85 |
| Athletics and Extracurricular Activities (1) | 416 | 12% | 1,793 | 2.2% | 26 | 0 |
| Alternative Education Program/Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (1) | 49 | 1.4% | 497 | 0.05% | 1 | 1 |

Note:

(1) Amounts provided by La Verna ISD

SECTION V - ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL, OPERATIONAL, AND ACADEMIC INFORMATION

1. State and Regional Resources

The District continuously explores all options for funding, including state and federal sources and local grant sources. The District seeks out and researches potential grants that may be beneficial for the District. The District provides assistance in obtaining external funding for educational programs of distinction which prepare students for academic achievement and graduation. Sources of grants vary widely from State or Federal sources to local options. All funding, state, local or federal, is tied directly to the District Strategic Plan and student performance.

2. Reporting

For the year ended June 30, 2024, Armstrong, Vaughan & Associates, P.C. expressed an unmodified opinion on the financial statements. There are three possible opinions: unmodified, modified (e.g. scope limitation or departure from generally accepted accounting principles: or a disclaimer of an opinion. An unmodified opinion is considered a clean opinion.

3. Oversight

Not Applicable

4. Budget Process

| FIGURE 15 BUDGET PROCESS | | |
|--|--------|----------------|
| QUESTION | YES/NO | NOT APPLICABLE |
| Does the District's budget planning process include projections for enrollment and staffing? | Yes | |
| Does the District's budget process include monthly and quarterly reviews to determine the status of annual spending? | Yes | |
| Does the District use cost allocation procedures to determine campus budgets and cost centers? | | NA |
| Does the District analyze educational costs and student needs to determine campus budgets? | Yes | |

5. Self-funded Programs

The District has no self-funded programs.

SECTION V - ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL, OPERATIONAL, AND ACADEMIC INFORMATION (continued)

6. Staffing

All District administrators are evaluated annually. Evaluations help to ensure that highly qualified and effective administrators lead campuses and departments to successfully develop and implement the District's Strategic Plan and focus on student achievement.

7. Compensation System

| FIGURE 16 COMPENSATION SYSTEM | | |
|---|--------|-------------------|
| QUESTION | YES/NO | NOT APPLICABLE |
| Does the District use salary bonuses or merit pay systems? | No | |
| Do the District's salary ranges include minimum, midpoint, and maximum increments to promote compensation equity based on the employee's education, experience, and other relevant factors? | Yes | |
| Does the District periodically adjust its compensation structure using verifiable salary survey information, benchmarking, and comparable salary data? | Yes | |
| Has the District made any internal equity and/or market adjustments to salaries within the past two years? | Yes | |

SECTION V - ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL, OPERATIONAL, AND ACADEMIC INFORMATION (continued)

8. Planning

| FIGURE 17 OPERATIONAL INFORMATION | | |
|---|--------|----------------|
| QUESTION | YES/NO | NOT APPLICABLE |
| Does the District develop a District Improvement Plan (DIP) annually? | Yes | |
| Do all campuses in the District develop a Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) annually? | Yes | |
| Does the District have an active and current facilities master plan? If yes, does the District consider these factors to inform the plan: | No | |
| Does the District use enrollment projections? Does the District analyze facility capacity? Does the District evaluate facility condition? | | |
| Does the District have an active and current energy management plan? | Yes | |
| Does the District maintain a clearly defined staffing formula for staff in maintenance, custodial, food service, and transportation? | No | |

SECTION V - ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL, OPERATIONAL, AND ACADEMIC INFORMATION (continued)

9. Programs

| FIGURE 18 | | |
|--|--------|----------------|
| ACADEMIC INFORMATION | | |
| QUESTION | YES/NO | NOT APPLICABLE |
| Does the District have a teacher mentoring program? | Yes | |
| Are decisions to adopt new programs or discontinue existing programs made based on quantifiable data and research? | Yes | |
| When adopting new programs, does the District define expected results? | Yes | |
| Does the District analyze student test results at the District and/or campus level to design, implement and/or monitor the use of curriculum and instructional programs? | Yes | |
| Does the District modify programs, plan staff development opportunities, or evaluate staff based on analyses of student test results? | Yes | |