



MOAKCASEY
PROVEN LEADERS ADVANCING TEXAS SCHOOLS



2024

EFFICIENCY AUDIT

Seguin ISD Independent School District

EFFICIENCY AUDIT FOR SEGUIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

September 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
SUMMARY OF RESULTS	3
Methodology.....	7
Assumptions.....	10
DISTRICT DATA ON ACCOUNTABILITY, STUDENTS, STAFFING AND FINANCES, WITH PEER AND STATE COMPARISONS.....	11
Peer Districts	11
Figure 1. Peer Districts.....	11
Accountability Rating.....	11
Figure 2. Accountability Rating Comparison	11
Figure 3. Accountability Rating by Campus Level.....	12
Financial Rating.....	13
Figure 4. FIRST Rating	13
Student Information	14
Figure 5. Selected Student Characteristics.....	15
Figure 6. Attendance Rate	15
Figure 7. 5-Year Enrollment.....	16
Financial Information – Revenue, Expenditures, Payroll and Fund Balance	17
Figure 8. District Tax Revenue	17
Figure 9. Actual Operating Expenditures.....	18
Figure 10. Payroll Expenditure Summary	19
Figure 11. General Fund Balance.....	20
Staffing Information	21
Figure 12. Staff Ratio Comparisons	21
Figure 13. Teacher Turnover Rate	21
Special Programs.....	22
Figure 14. Special Program Characteristics	22
ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL, OPERATIONAL, AND ACADEMIC INFORMATION	23

District Financial Information	23
Figure 15. Budget Process	24
District Operational Information	25
Figure 16. Compensation System	25
Figure 17. Operational Information.....	26
District Academic Information	26
Figure 18. Academic Information	27
APPENDIX A – Data Sources	28
APPENDIX B – Target and Peer Group Data	31
<i>Table 1. Accountability Data</i>	31
<i>Table 2. Student Data</i>	32
<i>Table 3. Staff Data – Average Base Pay</i>	33
<i>Table 4. Staff Data – Other Staff FTEs and Teacher Turnover</i>	34
<i>Table 5. Financial Data –District Revenue</i>	35
<i>Table 6. Financial Data – All Funds Operating Expenditures</i>	36
<i>Table 7. Financial Data – All Funds Operating Expenditures (cont.)</i>	37

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

MoakCasey, LLC was contracted to conduct an efficiency audit for Seguin Independent School District (“the District”). The purpose of an efficiency audit is to investigate the District’s operations to examine fiscal management, efficiency, and utilization of resources.

The District’s efficiency audit report follows the [guidelines](#) prescribed by the Legislative Budget Board. These guidelines identify the scope and areas of investigation.

Because the District is proposing a maintenance and operations (M&O) tax rate for fiscal year 2025 that exceeds their voter-approval tax rate, House Bill 3 (86th Legislature) generally requires a school district’s board of trustees to conduct an efficiency audit before seeking voter approval to adopt the M&O tax rate. Statute does provide for a two-year exemption from this requirement if all or part of the District is located in an area declared a disaster area by the governor under Chapter 418, Government Code.

The efficiency audit incorporates Texas Education Agency (TEA) Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) standard data for school years 2018-19 through 2023-24, TEA PEIMS financial data for 2022-23, Texas Academic Performance Reports (TAPR) data 2022-23, 2023 TEA FIRST Ratings, and 2022 TEA Accountability Ratings.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

District Comment: Seguin ISD maximizes funding by ensuring efficient budget management and investing in critical areas like classroom resources, high quality staff and professional development. By carefully managing and allocating funds, we ensure resources are used effectively to improve educational outcomes.

On November 5, 2024, Seguin Independent School District (“the District”) is holding an election to increase the District’s maintenance and operations (M&O) property tax rate in tax year 2024 or school year 2024-25. M&O taxes are used for the operation of public schools.

Without an election, the District’s M&O tax rate would be \$0.6778. The District is proposing to increase the M&O tax rate by \$0.02 through a voter approval tax rate election (VATRE) to \$0.6978. The District expects to generate approximately \$2.3 million in M&O tax revenue in the first school year, which represents about 2.9 percent of the district’s current adopted operating budget for the 2024-25 school year. Additional resources will be used for salary needs across the district.

	2024 Tax Year (Without VATRE)		2024 Tax Year (With VATRE)	
Average Taxable Value for Single-Family Residence	\$	162,305	\$	162,305
M&O Tax Rate	\$	0.6778	\$	0.6978
M&O Levy	\$	1,100	\$	1,133
Difference			\$	32

If the VATRE is successful, the average single-family residential property would expect an increase of \$32 compared to if the VATRE does not pass. The District has also proposed an interest and sinking (I&S) tax rate of \$0.4050 to service its debt. These proposed tax rates are in addition to the tax rates adopted by the city, county, and special taxing districts.

The District's 2023-24 M&O tax rate of \$0.7316 was \$0.0201 higher than the average of their peers, and \$0.00017 lower than the state average. If the VATRE is successful, the district tax rate will be \$0.0119 lower than their peers. The state average 2024-25 M&O tax rate is not yet available.

District Name	2023-24 M & O Tax Rate		Proposed 2024-25 M & O Tax Rate*	
SEGUIN ISD	\$	0.7316	\$	0.6978
COPPERAS COVE ISD	\$	0.7575	\$	0.7575
CORSICANA ISD	\$	0.6692	\$	0.6669
EALES ISD	\$	0.7680	\$	0.7655
GREENVILLE ISD	\$	0.6792	\$	0.6769
JACKSONVILLE ISD	\$	0.6692	\$	0.6669
LA PORTE ISD	\$	0.6920	\$	0.6920
MIDWAY ISD	\$	0.6992	\$	0.6969
WEATHERFORD ISD	\$	0.7575	\$	0.7552
STATE AVERAGE	\$	0.7333	Not Available	

**Districts holding VATRE November 2024*

The District engaged MoakCasey, LLC in June 2024 to conduct the efficiency audit. Efficiency audits focus on informing 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.

Below is key information about the District:

- The District's total operating revenue for the most recent school year totaled \$12,297 per student, while its peer districts average and State average were \$12,263 per student and \$12,739 per student, respectively.
- The District's total operating expenditures for the most recent year totaled \$12,603 per student, while its peer districts average was \$12,032 per student. The State's total average operating expenditure totaled \$12,352 per student.
- The District has earned a Superior Rating for the School Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas (FIRST) for the 2023-24 school year.
- The Texas Education Agency reviews and tracks the performance of both school districts and individual schools with the Texas A-F Accountability System. The District was not rated in the reviewed school year for the Texas Accountability rating system; however the district received an overall score of 67.

District Name	Rating	Overall Score
SEGUIN ISD	Not Rated: Senate Bill 1365	67
COPPERAS COVE ISD	B	87
CORSICANA ISD	B	81
EANES ISD	A	97
GREENVILLE ISD	C	76
JACKSONVILLE ISD	B	86
LA PORTE ISD	B	87
MIDWAY ISD	A	96
WEATHERFORD ISD	B	86

Source: TEA 2022 Accountability Ratings

The district has 14 campuses with the following campus ratings:

Grade	Number of Campuses
A	1
B	6
C	3
D	0
F	0
Not Rated	2
Not Rated (SB 1365)	2

Source: TEA 2022 Accountability Ratings

Additional details and audit results are included in Section IV.

Methodology

To complete the efficiency audit, MoakCasey, LLC performed the following procedures:

1. Selected 8 peer districts, developed a simple average for peer districts, and used the same peer district group throughout the audit.
2. Reported on the overall accountability rating (A-to-F and the corresponding scale score of 1 to 100).
3. Compared the District's peer districts' average accountability rating and listed the following District's campus information:
 - a. Accountability rating counts 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 the following data:
 - 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 2022-23 attendance rate for the District, its peer districts, and the state average.
7. Reported on the five-year enrollment for the District, including the most recent school year and four years prior, the average annual percentage change based on the previous five years, and the projected enrollment for the 2024-25 school year.
8. Reported on the following indicators related to the District's revenue, its peer district's average, and the state average, and explained any significant variances using 2022-23 data.
 - 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, if any, using 2022-23 data.
 - 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
 - l. General administration
 - m. Plant maintenance and operations
 - n. Security and monitoring services
 - o. Data processing services
 - p. Community services
 - q. Total operating expenditures
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, using 2022-23 and 2023-24 data.
- 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, using 2022-23 and 2023-24 data. 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 for the 2023-24 school year. 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 for the 2022-23 school year.
14. 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, using data from the 2022-23 and 2023-24 school years.

- 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
15. Described how the District maximizes available resources from state sources and regional education service centers to develop or implement programs or deliver services.
16. Report on the District's annual external audit report's independent auditor's opinion as required by *Government Auditing Standards*.
17. Explained the basis of the TEA assigning the District a financial-related monitoring/oversight role during the past three years, if applicable.
18. In regards 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?
19. Provided a description of the District's self-funded program, if any, and analyzed whether program revenues are sufficient to cover program costs.
20. Reported whether the District administrators are evaluated annually and, if so, explained how the results inform District operations.
21. In regards 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?
22. In regards 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?

23. In regards to District academic information, provided 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?
- e. Does the District modify programs, plan staff development opportunities, or evaluate staff based on analyses of student test results.

Assumptions

To conduct an accurate and effective efficiency audit, data from the state is assumed to be correct and complete. All data is accessed from publicly available records and is submitted to the state by the referenced districts.

DISTRICT DATA ON ACCOUNTABILITY, STUDENTS, STAFFING AND FINANCES, WITH PEER AND STATE COMPARISONS

Peer Districts

MoakCasey, LLC analyzes multiple school district variables from statewide data sources to select and provide peer districts for the Seguin Independent School District ("the District"). The peer districts were selected based on how they compared to the District in terms of enrollment, 5-year growth, average daily attendant (ADA) to weighted average daily attendance (WADA) ratio, Tier II M&O tax rate, geographic proximity, and National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) type. The district selected 8 peer districts, as shown below.

Figure 1. Peer Districts

050910	COPPERAS COVE ISD
175903	CORSICANA ISD
227909	EANES ISD
116905	GREENVILLE ISD
037904	JACKSONVILLE ISD
101916	LA PORTE ISD
161903	MIDWAY ISD
184903	WEATHERFORD ISD

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.

The District did not receive a rating for the 2021-22 school year. See Table 1 in Appendix B for overall score ratings for each of the peer districts.

Figure 2. Accountability Rating Comparison

	District Rating (A-F)	District Score (1-100)	Peer Districts Average Score (1-100)
Rating/Score	Not Rated: Senate Bill 1365	67	87

Source: TEA 2022 Accountability Ratings

The District has 14 campuses. Of the campuses in the District, 1 received an A rating and 6 received a B rating, 3 received a C rating, while 4 were not rated. There were no campuses that received an F accountability rating. There were no campuses that were required to implement a campus turnaround plan.

Figure 3. Accountability Rating by Campus Level

	Elementary/ Secondary	Elementary	Middle School	High School
A	0	0	0	1
B	0	6	0	0
C	0	2	0	1
D	0	0	0	0
F	0	0	0	0
Not Rated	1	0	0	1
Not Rated: SB 1365	0	0	2	0

Source: TEA 2022 Accountability Ratings

Campuses that received an F accountability rating:

None

Campuses that are required to implement a campus turnaround plan:

None

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 School Financial Integrity Rating System of Texas (FIRST) holds school districts accountable for the quality of their financial management practices. The rating is based on five critical indicators as well as minimum number of points for an additional ten indicators. Beginning with 2015-2016 Rating (based on the 2014-2015 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:

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

The District has earned a Superior rating of "A" from the FIRST for the 2022-23 school year. The District has also received a Superior rating every year since 2015-16. **Based on the preliminary scores the district will receive an "A" rating for 2023-24.**

Figure 4. FIRST Rating	District Rating (A-F)
Rating	A

Source: TEA FIRST Ratings (2022-23)

Student Information

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 select student characteristics, which are described below:

Economically Disadvantaged – This term, while not explicitly defined in statute, can be used interchangeably with educationally disadvantaged, according to the Texas Education Agency (TEA). Educationally disadvantaged 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 – TEC §29.052 refers to Emergency Bilingual students as those who are in the process of acquiring English and have a primary language other than English as Limited English Proficient (LEP). TEA guidance states that the term English Learners can be used interchangeably with Emergent Bilingual.
- Special Education – Federal and state law both offer definitions of special education students. Federal regulations define a “child with a disability” under 34 CFR, §300.8(a). State statute defines special education eligibility under TEC §29.003 or the Texas Administrative Code §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 enrolled in the program 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 (CTE) programs. Specific eligibility criteria for CTE are included in section 5 of the Student Attendance Accounting Handbook.

The District classified 75.7 percent of their total student population as economically disadvantaged. The District’s peer district average shows that 53.2 percent of students were characterized as economically disadvantaged. The District’s economically disadvantaged student population was higher than the peer and state average of 62.2 percent.

Emergent Bilingual/English Learner students at the District equal 13.7 percent of the student population, which is lower than the peer district average of 14.5 percent and the state average percentage of 24.3.

Special Education students at the District equal 18.2 percent of the student population, higher than the peer district average of 16.2 percent and the state average of 14.0 percent.

Bilingual/ESL Education students at the District equal 14.9 percent of the student population, which is higher than the peer district average of 13.1 percent, but lower than the state average percentage of 19.9.

Career and Technical Education students in the District equal 19.8 percent of the student population, which is lower than their peers and state averages, 18.8 and 26.5 percents respectively.

Figure 5. Selected Student Characteristics

	Total Student Population Count	Percentage of Student Population	Peer Districts Average Percentage	State Average Percentage*
Total Students	7,314	100.0%	100%	100%
Economically Disadvantaged	5,534	75.7%	53.2%	62.2%
Emergent Bilingual/English Learners	1,002	13.7%	14.5%	24.3%
Special Education	1,329	18.2%	16.2%	14.0%
Bilingual/ESL Education	1,093	14.9%	13.1%	19.9%
Career & Technology Education**	1,431	19.8%	28.8%	26.5%

Source: PEIMS Standard Reports (2023-24)

*State average includes charter students

**Career & Technology is membership from TAPR (2022-23)

The District had an attendance rate of 90.0 percent in the 2021-22 school year, lower than their peers and the state average.

Figure 6. Attendance Rate

	District Total	Peer Districts' Average	State Average
Attendance Rate	90.0	92.5	92.2

Source: TAPR Report (2022-23)

Figure 7 displays the District's enrollment for the last five years. The District's average annual percentage change is an increase of 0.3 percent. Since 2019-20, the District's enrollment has increased by 88 students. Based off the 2024 enrollment projection, the District is expected to have a slight increase in enrollment.

Figure 7. 5-Year Enrollment

2023-24	7,314
2022-23	7,239
2021-22	7,064
2020-21	6,899
2019-20	7,226
Average Annual percentage change	0.3%
2024 Projection	7,339

Source: PEIMS Standard Reports (2018-19 through 2023-24)
 2024-25 enrollment is district provided

Financial Information – Revenue, Expenditures, Payroll and Fund Balance

Figure 8 below presents the district tax revenue for the 2022-23 school year for the District, the peer district average, and the state average.

The District receives \$12,297 in total revenue per student, which is slightly higher than their peers but lower than the state average.

Figure 8. District Tax Revenue

	DISTRICT		PEER DISTRICTS AVERAGE		STATE AVERAGE*	
	Per Student	% of Total	Per Student	% of Total	Per Student	% of Total
Local Net M&O Tax Revenue	\$5,812	47.3%	\$6,108	49.8%	\$5,612	44.1%
State Revenue	\$2,977	24.2%	\$3,308	27.0%	\$3,835	30.1%
Federal Revenue	\$3,095	25.2%	\$1,913	15.6%	\$2,559	20.1%
Other Local / Intermediate Revenue	\$412	3.4%	\$935	7.6%	\$733	5.8%
TOTAL REVENUE	\$12,297	100%	\$12,263	100%	\$12,739	100.0%

Source: TEA PEIMS Actual Financial Reports 2022-23

* State Average does not include charter districts.

Figure 9 outlines expenditures per student. The District spends \$12,603 in total operating expenditures per student, which is higher than the peer district average of \$12,032 and state average of \$12,352. The District's largest expenditures per student are in instruction, maintenance and operations, and school leadership.

Figure 9. Actual Operating Expenditures

	DISTRICT		PEER DISTRICTS AVERAGE		STATE AVERAGE*	
	Per Student	% of Total	Per Student	% of Total	Per Student	% of Total
Instruction	\$6,629	52.6%	\$6,610	54.9%	\$6,872	55.6%
Instructional Resources & Media	\$150	1.2%	\$102	0.9%	\$128	1.0%
Curriculum & Staff Development	\$217	1.7%	\$259	2.1%	\$301	2.4%
Instructional Leadership	\$404	3.2%	\$273	2.3%	\$218	1.8%
School Leadership	\$823	6.5%	\$590	4.9%	\$679	5.5%
Guidance Counseling	\$523	4.2%	\$503	4.2%	\$505	4.1%
Social Work	\$200	1.6%	\$28	0.2%	\$47	0.4%
Health	\$146	1.2%	\$122	1.0%	\$137	1.1%
Transportation	\$427	3.4%	\$396	3.3%	\$385	3.1%
Food Service Operation	\$784	6.2%	\$630	5.2%	\$631	5.1%
Extracurricular	\$375	3.0%	\$421	3.5%	\$400	3.2%
General Administration	\$409	3.2%	\$388	3.2%	\$383	3.1%
Plant Maintenance & Operations	\$1,034	8.2%	\$1,234	10.3%	\$1,198	9.7%
Security & Monitoring	\$130	1.0%	\$173	1.4%	\$168	1.4%
Data Processing	\$327	2.6%	\$258	2.1%	\$235	1.9%
Community	\$25	0.2%	\$43	0.4%	\$64	0.5%
TOTAL Operating Expenditures	\$12,603	100.0%	\$12,032	100.0%	\$12,352	100.0%

Source: TEA PEIMS Financial Reports 2022-23

* State average does not include charter districts.

Figure 10 presents the payroll expenditure summary for the District, the peer district average, and the state average.

The average base teacher salary at the District is higher than both their peer district average and the state average, by \$2,644 and \$599 respectively. The average administrative base salary and superintendent salary at the District is lower than the peer district average. Data for the state average of superintendent base salary is comprised of school districts that have enrollments ranging from 24 students to 194,607 students in the 2021-22 school year.

Figure 10. Payroll Expenditure Summary

	District	Peer Districts Average	State Average
Payroll as a Percentage of All Operating Expenditures	78.4%	80.5%	78.8%
Average Teacher Base Salary	\$63,062	\$60,418	\$62,463
Average Administrative Base Salary	\$95,407	\$96,349	\$94,609
Superintendent Base Salary	\$165,277	\$272,849	\$171,022

Source: PEIMS Standard Report (2023-24) and PEIMS Actual Financial Reports (2022-23)

* Only State average for payroll expenditures does not include charter districts. Staffing salary does include charter districts.

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 categories: non-spendable, restricted, committed, assigned and unassigned. The categories are defined by Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statement No. 54: Fund Balance Reporting and Governmental Fund Type Definitions:

- **Non-spendable** fund balance includes funds that cannot be spent because they are not in spendable form, or legally required by contract for a specific future use.
- **Restricted** fund balance includes amounts that can only be spent for specific purposes stipulated by enabling legislation, creditors, grantors, contributors, or other governmental laws and regulations.
- **Committed** fund balance includes amounts that can be used only for the specific purposes determined by constraints imposed by the district's board of trustees.
- **Assigned** fund balance is fund balance is intended to be used by the government for specific purposes but do not meet the criteria to be classified as restricted or committed.

- **Unassigned** fund balance is the residual classification for the government's general fund and includes all spendable amounts not contained in the other classifications above.

The Texas Education Agency evaluates unassigned fund balance by comparing it to three-months (25%) of annual operating expenditures or 75 days of operational expenditures. If the District does not meet goal of three-months, the percentage is shown as less than 100%. Amounts that exceed three months are reflected as percentage greater than 100%.

The District's unassigned fund balance for the 2022-23 school year totaled \$34.5 million compared to its three-month operating expenditures of \$17.6 million. The District fund balance met the 25% goal each of the past five years.

Figure 11. General Fund Balance

	Unassigned Fund Balance per Student	Unassigned Fund Balance as Percentage of 3-month Operating Expenditures	Unassigned Fund Balance Amount	3-Months of Operating Expenditures	Shortfall in 3-month Goal
2022-23	\$4,765	196.3%	\$34,495,713	\$17,575,263	\$0
2021-22	\$5,073	237.2%	\$35,839,125	\$15,110,595	\$0
2020-21	\$4,475	191.5%	\$30,872,224	\$16,122,320	\$0
2019-20	\$4,124	189.4%	\$29,802,591	\$15,731,241	\$0
2018-19	\$4,273	210.8%	\$30,877,094	\$14,650,015	\$0

Source: PEIMS Standard Reports (2023-24); PEIMS Actual Financial Reports (2022-23)

Staffing Information

Figure 12 presents the staff ratios for the District, peer district average, and state average. The Districts teaching staff was 40.8 percent of the staff, however for their peers was 46.7 percent and the state average was 48.2 percent.

The District had 0.16 more students per total staff than their peers, and 2.43 more students per teacher than their peers.

Figure 12. Staff Ratio Comparisons

	District	Peer Districts Average	State Average*
<u>% of Total Staff</u>			
Teaching Staff	40.8%	46.7%	48.2%
Support Staff	14.1%	11.2%	11.2%
Administrative Staff	4.3%	4.3%	4.6%
Paraprofessional Staff	12.1%	13.1%	11.4%
Auxiliary Staff	28.6%	24.7%	24.7%
Students per Total Staff	6.79	6.62	7.11
Students per Teaching Staff	16.63	14.19	14.75

Source: PEIMS Standard Reports (2023-24)

*State average includes charter students.

The District has a teacher turnover rate of 31.6 percent, which is higher than their peer district average of 26.2 percent. The district teacher turnover rate is also higher than the state average of 21.4 percent.

Figure 13. Teacher Turnover Rate

	District	Peer Districts Average	State Average
Teachers	31.6	26.2	21.4

Source: TAPR (2022-23)

Special Programs

Figure 14. Special Program Characteristics

	Number of Students Served	Percentage of Enrolled Students Served	Program Budget per Student Served	Program Budget as a Percentage of District Budget	Total Staff for Program	Students Per Total Staff for Program
Special Education	1,329	18.2%	\$5,342	10.1%	123.6	10.8
Bilingual Education	591	8.1%	\$975	0.9%	5.0	118.2
Migrant Programs	17	0.2%	\$0	0.0%		0.0
Gifted and Talented	593	8.1%	\$478	0.5%	3.0	197.7
Career and Technical	1,431	19.6%	\$1,156	3.1%	21.7	65.9
Athletics and Extracurricular	6,822	93.3%	\$330	3.2%	6.5	1,049.5
Alternative Education/Disciplinary						
Alternative Education	27	0.4%	\$21,803	0.8%	8.5	0.0
Juvenile Justice Alternative Education	0	0.0%	\$0	1.3%	13.6	0.0

Source: School District Data

ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL, OPERATIONAL, AND ACADEMIC INFORMATION

District Financial Information

State and Regional Resources

The District makes strategic use of state resources and regional education service centers to enhance our educational programs and services. The District uses funds to support key areas such as teacher salaries, infrastructure improvements, and instructional materials. By carefully managing and allocating funds, the District ensures resources are used effectively to improve educational outcomes. The District collaborates with ESC Region 20 to gain access to specialized services and programs. The ESC offers professional development, instructional support, and administrative services. By participating in ESC sponsored workshops and training sessions, the District enhances the skills of its educators and administrators.

The District actively pursues grant opportunities provided by federal sources to supplement state sources as well. Staff make use of data provided by state assessments and regional education centers to inform decision-making. By analyzing student performance data and educational research, staff tailor programs to address specific needs and improve student outcomes. Through collaborations with neighboring districts and regional partners, the District shares resources, such as professional development opportunities and educational materials.

Reporting

For the year ended June 30, 2023, Belt Harris Pechacek, LLLP, provided an unmodified report on the financial statements in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP). 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.

The District's financial statements have been reviewed by Belt Harris Pechacek, LLLP, a firm of licensed certified public accountants. The goal of the independent audit was to provide reasonable assurance that the financial statements of the District for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2023, are free of material misstatement. The independent auditor concluded, based upon the audit, that there was a reasonable basis for rendering an unmodified opinion that the District's financial statements for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2023, are fairly presented in conformity with GAAP.

Oversight

The Texas Education Agency has not assigned the District a financial-related monitoring/oversight role in the last three years.

Budget Process

Figure 15. Budget Process	Y/N/NA
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?	Yes
Does the district analyze educational costs and student needs to determine campus budgets?	Yes

The District uses demographic studies as a crucial tool for planning and budgeting by analyzing the characteristics of their student population and the community they serve. If a demographic study indicates an expected increase in student population, staff can budget for new facilities, expansions, or additional resources to accommodate the growth.

Both monthly and quarterly reviews are used to determine the status of annual spending within our district's budget to ensure the District stays on track with its budget and makes necessary adjustments. Monthly reviews involve examining detailed expenditure reports to compare actual spending against the budget. By reviewing expenditures monthly, the district can manage its cash flow more effectively, ensuring that there is sufficient liquidity to meet operational needs and financial obligations.

The District uses cost allocation procedures to determine campus budgets depending on campus student needs. By analyzing both prior year students and demographic studies we budget according to projections and then adjust each six weeks as necessary.

Staff analyze educational costs and student needs with demographic studies, by analyzing academic performance, program participation, requirements by TEA and historical spending. Staff reviews past spending patterns to identify trends and inform future budgeting decisions along with campus input.

Self-funded Programs

The District does not have any self-funded programs.

District Operational Information

Staffing – District provided information

Figure 16. Compensation System	Y/N/NA
Does the district use salary bonuses or merit pay systems? If yes, explain the performance-based systems and the factors used.	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

District administrators are evaluated annually. Evaluation criteria include performance metrics, leadership, goals and goal achievements. Both self-assessment and supervisory reviews are used.

The District's salary range is intended to ensure fairness and equity as well as to recruit and retain staff. The District compares salaries to those of neighboring and like school districts to be sure we are competitive for both the position and years of experience. Each position is evaluated based on factors such as job responsibilities, required qualifications, and experience. This evaluation helps in setting appropriate salary ranges that reflect the value of the position. While the District aims to offer competitive salaries, it must balance this with overall budgetary considerations and financial sustainability.

The district's Compensation plan is reviewed and presented to the Board of Trustees annually. By conducting research including comparisons to other districts, salary studies from the Texas Association of School Boards (TASBP) and input from school administrators, staff adjust the compensation structure annually.

Planning

Figure 17. Operational Information	Y/N/NA
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:	Yes
Does the district use enrollment projections?	Yes
Does the district analyze facility capacity?	Yes
Does the district evaluate facility condition?	Yes
Does the district have an active and current energy management plan?	No
Does the district maintain a clearly defined staffing formula for staff in maintenance, custodial, food service, and transportation?	Yes

Our District Improvement Plan involves a structured process aimed at enhancing overall district performance and student outcomes. This policy is essential for setting strategic goals, improving educational practices, and ensuring accountability across the district. Stakeholders, including teachers, administrators, parents, students, and community members are involved in the process. The goals, strategies and expected outcomes are communicated to both the public and the Board of Trustees.

Campus improvement plans are developed through a collaborative process that involves input from various stakeholders, data analysis, and strategic planning. Student academic performance and attendance and behavior are analyzed. Feedback is also gathered from teachers, students and community members to gain insights into the needs of the campus. Academic, behavioral and climate goals are set, put into action with timelines followed by regular assessments and progress monitoring.

Facility capacity is compared to current enrollment along with the projected enrollment from the most recent demographic study. Understanding trends helps the District determine whether existing facilities can accommodate current and projected enrollment. The District prioritizes budget allocations according to this data. The District is conducting a TASB Staffing Study to have a more comprehensive and formula-based plan.

District Academic Information

Figure 18. Academic Information	Y/N/NA
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

The Matador Mentor program supports teachers with 0-1 years of experience by matching them with an experienced mentor. New hires receive the support of a mentor teacher for two years.

Decisions to adopt new programs or discontinue existing ones are based on a thorough analysis of quantifiable data and research with input from appropriate staff. When considering a new program staff review data on student performance, such as test scores, graduation rates, and assessments, to identify areas where new programs could make a significant impact. Gaps or deficiencies in current offerings are also considered. Clear objectives are set that the new program aims to achieve. For example, if adopting a new literacy program, a specific goal might be to improve reading proficiency scores by a certain percentage. Objectives are set to be measurable with a time frame so the program can be evaluated for effectiveness from both an academic and financial perspective.

The District uses a comprehensive approach to analyze student test results at both the district and campus levels to design, implement, and monitor curriculum and instructional programs. This ensures that educational practices are aligned with student needs and performance outcomes. Both standardized tests and formative and summative assessments are analyzed to identify needs and determine interventions. Professional development for teachers is based on this analysis to enhance their instructional strategies. Changes are then monitored with regular check ins and the collection of feedback.

The District uses a comprehensive approach to analyze student test results at both the district and campus levels to design, implement, and monitor curriculum and instructional programs. Both standardized tests and formative and summative assessments are analyzed to identify needs and determine interventions. Professional development for teachers is based on this analysis to enhance their instructional strategies. Targeted programs may be put into place or curriculum may be adjusted as well.

APPENDIX A – Data Sources

Figure 2. Accountability Rating Comparison

Source: TEA 2022 Ratings (2021-22)

Link: <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/accountability/academic-accountability/performance-reporting/2022-accountability-rating-system>

Figure 3. Accountability Ratings by Campus Level

Source: TEA 2022 Ratings (2021-22)

Link: <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/accountability/academic-accountability/performance-reporting/2022-accountability-rating-system>

Figure 4. School FIRST Rating

Source: TEA 20232 FIRST Ratings (2022-23)

Link: <https://tealprod.tea.state.tx.us/First/forms/Main.aspx>

Figure 5. Selected Student Characteristics

Source: PEIMS Standard Reports (2023-24)

Link: <https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/adhocrpt/adspr.html>;
<https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport/tapr/2022/download/DownloadData.html>

NOTE: Beginning in 2020-21, Career & Tech is not available. Career & Tech 2022-23 membership from TAPR (DPETVOCC, Total membership - DPETALLC) is used. State totals include charter students.

Figure 6. Attendance Rate

Source: TAPR (2022-23)

Link: <https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport/tapr/2022/download/DownloadData.html>

NOTE: DA0AT22R, DA0AT22N, DA0AT22D; State average is from the State Report

Figure 7. 5-Year Enrollment

Source: PEIMS Standard Reports (2018-19 through 2023-24)

Link: <https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/adhocrpt/adspr.html>

NOTE: Average Annual Percent Change is the average of each year's annual change year over year.

Figure 8. District Tax Revenue

Source: TEA PEIMS Financial Reports 2022-23

Link: <https://tea.texas.gov/finance-and-grants/state-funding/state-funding-reports-and-data/peims-financial-data-downloads>

NOTE: State Totals per Student exclude charter districts. Per student amounts are per enrolled student (not membership).

Item	FIELD Name
Local M&O Tax (Retained)	ALL FUNDS-LOCAL TAX REVENUE FROM M&O (excluding recapture)
State (Less TRS On-Behalf)	ALL FUNDS-STATE REVENUE (excludes TRS on-behalf)
Federal	ALL FUNDS-FEDERAL REVENUE
Other Local and Intermediate	ALL FUNDS-OTHER LOCAL & INTERMEDIATE REVENUE
TOTAL Revenue	Sum of Above

Figure 9. District Actual Operating Expenditures

Source: TEA PEIMS Financial Reports 2022-23

Link: <https://tea.texas.gov/finance-and-grants/state-funding/state-funding-reports-and-data/peims-financial-data-downloads>

NOTE: State Totals per Student exclude charter districts. Per student amounts are per enrolled student (not membership).

Item	PEIMS Function Code(s)	Field Name
Instruction	11, 95	ALL FUNDS-INSTRUCTION + TRANSFER EXPEND-FCT11,95
Instructional Resources & Media	12	ALL FUNDS-INSTRUC RESOURCE MEDIA SERVICE EXP, FCT12
Curriculum & Staff Development	13	ALL FUNDS-CURRICULUM/STAFF DEVELOPMENT EXP, FCT13
Instructional Leadership	21	ALL FUNDS-INSTRUC LEADERSHIP EXPEND, FCT21
School Leadership	23	ALL FUNDS-CAMPUS ADMINISTRATION EXPEND, FCT23
Guidance Counseling	31	ALL FUNDS-GUIDANCE & COUNSELING SERVICES EXP, FCT31
Social Work	32	ALL FUNDS-SOCIAL WORK SERVICES EXP, FCT32
Health	33	ALL FUNDS-HEALTH SERVICES EXP, FCT33
Transportation	34	ALL FUNDS-TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURES, FCT34
Food Service Operation	35	ALL FUNDS-FOOD SERVICE EXPENDITURES, FCT35
Extracurricular	36	ALL FUNDS-EXTRACURRICULAR EXPENDITURES, FCT36
General Administration	41, 92	ALL FUNDS-GENERAL ADMINISTRAT EXPEND-FCT41,92
Plant Maintenance & Operations	51	ALL FUNDS-PLANT MAINTENANCE/OPERA EXPEND, FCT51
Security & Monitoring	52	ALL FUNDS-SECURITY/MONITORING SERVICE EXPEND, FCT52
Data Processing	53	ALL FUNDS-DATA PROCESSING SERVICES EXPEND, FCT53
Community	61	ALL FUNDS-COMMUNITY SERVICES, FCT61

Figure 10. Payroll Expenditure Summary

Source: PEIMS Standard Report (2023-24) and PEIMS Actual Financial Reports (2022-23)

Link: Staff FTE Counts and Salary Reports - <https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/adhocrpt/adpeb.html>
 Payroll Expenditure - <https://tea.texas.gov/finance-and-grants/state-funding/state-funding-reports-and-data/peims-financial-data-downloads>

NOTE: Average Base Salary includes charter districts; Payroll expenditure state totals exclude charter districts.

Item	FIELD Name
Operating Expenditures	ALL FUNDS-TOTAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES BY OBJ
Payroll	ALL FUNDS-TOTAL PAYROLL EXPENDITURES

Figure 11. General Fund Balance

Source: PEIMS Standard Reports (2023-24); PEIMS Actual Financial Reports (2022-23)

Link: Fund Balance - <https://tea.texas.gov/finance-and-grants/state-funding/state-funding-reports-and-data/peims-single-file-financial-data-downloads>;
 Operating Expenditures - <https://tea.texas.gov/finance-and-grants/state-funding/state-funding-reports-and-data/peims-financial-data-downloads>

Note: Per student amounts are per enrolled student (not membership).

Item	FIELD Name
Unreserved/Unassigned Fund Balance	FUND = 199, OBJECT = 3600
Operating Expenditures	GEN FUNDS-TOTAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES BY OBJ

Figure 12. Staff Ratio Comparisons

Source: PEIMS Standard Reports (2023-24)

Link: <https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/adhocrpt/adpeb.html>

Figure 13. Teacher Turnover Rates

Source: TAPR (2022-23)

Link: <https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport/tapr/2022/download/DownloadData.html>

NOTE: DPSTURNR, DPSTURNN, DPSTURND

Figure 14. Special Program Characteristics

Source: TAPR (2022-23)

Link: <https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport/tapr/2022/download/DownloadData.html>

Note: Migrant (DPNTMIGC), TOTAL STUDENTS (DPNTALLC), Career & Tech membership (DPETVOCC and DPETALLC)

APPENDIX B – Target and Peer Group Data

Table 1. Accountability Data

District Name	Rating	Overall Score
SEGUIN ISD	Not Rated: Senate Bill 1365	67
COPPERAS COVE ISD	B	87
CORSICANA ISD	B	81
EANES ISD	A	97
GREENVILLE ISD	C	76
JACKSONVILLE ISD	B	86
LA PORTE ISD	B	87
MIDWAY ISD	A	96
WEATHERFORD ISD	B	86

Table 2. Student Data

District Name	Enroll.	Eco-Disadv.	English Learners	Special Ed	Bi-Ling	ESL	CTE Enrollment	Atten. Num.	Atten. Denom.	Atten. Rate
SEGUIN ISD	7,314	5,534	1,002	1,329	591	502	1,431	950,823	1,056,875	90.0
COPPERAS COVE ISD	7,959	4,892	546	1,503	79	342	2,570	1,097,154	1,202,676	91.2
CORSICANA ISD	6,075	4,834	1,815	923	271	1,281	2,005	822,584	900,705	91.3
EANES ISD	7,738	383	271	964	0	239	1,556	1,191,193	1,253,753	95.0
GREENVILLE ISD	5,418	4,324	1,578	901	520	656	1,608	682,426	753,866	90.5
JACKSONVILLE ISD	4,834	4,034	1,749	815	1,147	705	1,124	649,454	707,504	91.8
LA PORTE ISD	7,115	4,146	907	1,133	260	618	1,448	960,511	1,058,327	90.8
MIDWAY ISD	8,849	3,186	427	1,292	0	416	2,550	1,248,530	1,314,606	95.0
WEATHERFORD ISD	8,203	4,095	853	1,571	261	564	3,361	1,093,886	1,180,107	92.7

Table 3. Staff Data – Average Base Pay

District Name	Teacher FTE	Teacher Base Pay	Teacher Average Base Pay	Admin. FTE	Admin. Base Pay	Admin. Average Base Pay	Super. FTE	Super. Base Pay	Super. Average Base Pay
SEGUIN ISD	439.88	\$27,740,100	\$63,062	45.83	\$4,372,896	\$95,407	0.91	\$151,129	\$165,277
COPPERAS COVE ISD	581.55	\$35,718,870	\$61,420	53.14	\$4,309,644	\$81,095	1.00	\$287,928	\$287,928
CORSICANA ISD	401.79	\$24,264,657	\$60,391	35.14	\$3,453,539	\$98,287	1.00	\$250,583	\$250,583
EANES ISD	606.77	\$37,630,455	\$62,018	43.68	\$5,030,012	\$115,160	1.00	\$294,000	\$294,000
GREENVILLE ISD	372.95	\$20,736,329	\$55,601	41.10	\$4,149,235	\$100,960	1.00	\$205,000	\$205,000
JACKSONVILLE ISD	465.42	\$19,598,031	\$55,145	28.72	\$2,659,722	\$92,612	1.00	\$210,181	\$210,181
LA PORTE ISD	355.39	\$31,592,547	\$67,880	51.23	\$5,341,943	\$104,280	1.00	\$327,771	\$327,771
MIDWAY ISD	593.24	\$32,838,431	\$55,354	68.52	\$5,738,409	\$83,742	1.00	\$265,000	\$265,000
WEATHERFORD ISD	581.79	\$36,809,078	\$63,268	44.29	\$4,563,866	\$103,055	1.00	\$342,325	\$342,325

Table 4. Staff Data – Other Staff FTEs and Teacher Turnover

District Name	Support FTE	Paraprof. FTE	Auxiliary FTE	Total Staff FTE	Teacher Turnover Numerator	Teacher Turnover Denominator	Teacher Turnover Rate
SEGUIN ISD	152.41	130.64	308.58	1,077.34	153.3	485.1	31.6
COPPERAS COVE ISD	124.12	207.25	385.69	1,351.75	184.3	577.0	31.9
CORSICANA ISD	91.26	95.62	221.45	845.27	110.4	401.2	27.5
EANES ISD	140.69	80.59	255.67	1,127.40	123.8	599.8	20.6
GREENVILLE ISD	95.79	110.37	204.72	824.94	126.8	397.8	31.9
JACKSONVILLE ISD	86.82	166.33	192.47	829.73	79.2	351.3	22.6
LA PORTE ISD	121.48	154.69	292.41	1,085.22	94.0	461.2	20.4
MIDWAY ISD	145.47	149.85	306.41	1,263.50	148.8	547.5	27.2
WEATHERFORD ISD	146.21	144.62	237.84	1,154.75	155.8	571.8	27.3

Table 5. Financial Data – District Revenue

District Name	Local Tax Revenue (Retained)	State Revenue (less TRS On-Behalf)	Federal Revenue	Other Local Revenue	Total Revenue
SEGUIN ISD	\$42,073,033	\$21,551,888	\$22,405,964	\$2,985,148	\$89,016,033
COPPERAS COVE ISD	\$18,394,682	\$57,542,958	\$22,617,546	\$3,774,021	\$102,329,207
CORSICANA ISD	\$22,259,075	\$34,188,738	\$12,972,507	\$2,597,158	\$72,017,478
EANES ISD	\$67,688,838	\$5,096,998	\$5,818,360	\$17,025,120	\$95,629,316
GREENVILLE ISD	\$30,731,792	\$18,460,761	\$16,535,561	\$2,265,353	\$67,993,467
JACKSONVILLE ISD	\$14,233,222	\$32,271,618	\$14,657,477	\$2,636,826	\$63,799,143
LA PORTE ISD	\$69,872,996	\$5,832,642	\$13,966,125	\$10,007,885	\$99,679,648
MIDWAY ISD	\$62,731,349	\$11,773,226	\$8,788,555	\$7,174,061	\$90,467,191
WEATHERFORD ISD	\$57,967,177	\$21,048,128	\$12,316,801	\$7,145,338	\$98,477,444

Table 6. Financial Data – All Funds Operating Expenditures

District Name	11 + 95	12	13	21	23	31	32	33	34
SEGUIN ISD	\$47,987,505	\$1,084,915	\$1,570,989	\$2,928,098	\$5,957,750	\$3,787,886	\$1,445,368	\$1,055,263	\$3,092,187
COPPERAS COVE ISD	\$57,098,730	\$1,289,767	\$857,666	\$4,478,593	\$4,244,880	\$4,604,993	\$320,461	\$873,835	\$3,366,234
CORSICANA ISD	\$39,385,860	\$571,392	\$556,953	\$2,462,454	\$3,325,007	\$2,518,904	\$119,226	\$594,756	\$2,434,836
EANES ISD	\$53,016,248	\$967,698	\$2,498,984	\$1,599,432	\$4,510,376	\$3,936,104	\$151,505	\$785,724	\$2,356,662
GREENVILLE ISD	\$33,739,464	\$133,444	\$2,760,324	\$994,555	\$3,341,704	\$2,451,043	\$84,352	\$566,283	\$2,154,785
JACKSONVILLE ISD	\$33,029,269	\$386,096	\$2,673,363	\$730,853	\$3,095,661	\$2,293,391	\$88,430	\$492,473	\$2,110,338
LA PORTE ISD	\$49,773,942	\$559,626	\$2,095,526	\$1,426,022	\$4,964,778	\$4,410,603	\$348,924	\$1,137,655	\$3,578,405
MIDWAY ISD	\$52,652,629	\$916,374	\$1,335,104	\$2,311,110	\$4,773,051	\$3,654,750	\$244,604	\$928,738	\$3,073,907
WEATHERFORD ISD	\$53,432,922	\$943,065	\$1,782,519	\$1,351,578	\$4,958,764	\$4,457,710	\$234,221	\$1,485,105	\$3,220,609

Table 7. Financial Data – All Funds Operating Expenditures (cont.)

District Name	35	36	41+92	51	52	53	61	TOTAL
SEGUIN ISD	\$5,672,687	\$2,712,755	\$2,959,713	\$7,486,487	\$938,579	\$2,367,745	\$184,208	\$91,232,135
COPPERAS COVE ISD	\$4,697,597	\$3,205,780	\$2,303,777	\$9,860,934	\$1,435,907	\$2,712,740	\$195,483	\$101,547,377
CORSICANA ISD	\$5,662,263	\$2,369,593	\$1,304,280	\$7,400,898	\$1,711,615	\$2,131,227	\$68,050	\$72,617,314
EANES ISD	\$5,419,962	\$4,516,142	\$3,805,973	\$9,867,309	\$741,360	\$2,007,101	\$321,954	\$96,502,534
GREENVILLE ISD	\$4,037,619	\$2,221,677	\$2,472,135	\$6,507,684	\$1,452,934	\$2,596,352	\$221,741	\$65,736,096
JACKSONVILLE ISD	\$3,405,735	\$2,001,332	\$1,867,137	\$5,118,147	\$669,135	\$791,278	\$101,685	\$58,854,323
LA PORTE ISD	\$4,802,239	\$2,226,195	\$3,550,328	\$9,980,146	\$1,789,227	\$1,644,985	\$197,975	\$92,486,576
MIDWAY ISD	\$4,318,288	\$4,023,520	\$3,485,899	\$9,563,881	\$685,869	\$1,288,565	\$213,119	\$93,469,408
WEATHERFORD ISD	\$3,144,848	\$3,137,271	\$3,062,214	\$11,198,948	\$1,267,334	\$1,344,924	\$1,101,929	\$96,123,961