

Board of Trustees Agenda Item

Board Meeting Date: March 1, 2010

Title of Item: Annual Assessment of Fiscal Condition

Background and Analysis:

Pursuant to Education Code Section 84040, the Board of Governors is required to adopt criteria and standards for the periodic assessment of the fiscal condition of California community college districts. In October 2005, the State Chancellor's Office, in accordance with this requirement, issued standards for sound fiscal management and a process to monitor and evaluate the financial health of California's community college districts. The purpose of these standards is to identify districts that may benefit from preventative management assistance and those that may require fiscal crisis intervention to prevent emergency loans. These standards are intended to be progressive, with the focus on prevention and assistance at the initial level and more direct intervention at the highest level. These standards are based on the principles of sound fiscal management that are contained in California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 58311

This is a voluntary assessment tool at the point a district is not in a fiscal crisis. District staff believes this instrument provides a useful overview of a district's fiscal condition and undertakes and presents a new self-assessment each year. This document is shared with the Audit and Finance Committee and the Board of Trustees.

Recommendation: Information Only

Submitted by:	Andy Dunn, Vice Chancellor, ext. 6201
Additional contact names:	Bernata Slater, ext. 6261; Hector Quinonez, ext. 6250
Is backup provided?	Yes

Foothill-De Anza Community College District

January, 2010

Sound Fiscal Management Self-Assessment Checklist

1. Deficit Spending - Is this area acceptable? Yes

Is the district spending within their revenue budget in the current year?

California Community Colleges System Office uses financial reports from the Unrestricted General Fund that encompasses both the General Purpose Fund (Foothill-De Anza Fund 14) and the Self-Sustaining Fund (Foothill-De Anza Fund 15). The district concentrates on the General Purpose Fund (Fund 14) because this fund captures most of the district's operating revenue and expenses.

This Fiscal Self Management Self-Assessment Checklist summarizes activities for FY 2008/09 as well as projects balances into FY 2009/10. In FY 2008/09 the district adopted budget that was balanced using \$7.86M in one-time funds. This \$7.86M represents shortfall necessary to have structurally balanced budget. There were many factors that contributed to that deficit:

- No COLA increases from state
- Minimal growth budgeted
- Internal operating cost increases (projected benefit costs increase, utilities cost increases, step and column salary increases, etc.)

District designated following funds to offset the deficit:

- FY 2007/08 Unrestricted ending fund balance-\$3.8M
- restricted carryover from campuses and Central Services-\$530K
- recovery of FY 2007/08 property tax backfill-\$2.0M
- transfer in from the Internal Service Fund (Fund 61) / (use of savings generated in prior years)-\$1.53M

With the state budget worsening the district made tremendous efforts to improve its fiscal standing and reduce its operating deficit. During FY 2008/09 many initiatives have been implemented to reduce as much as possible non-essential spending, reduce conference and travel expense and preserve colleges and central Services B Budget to prepare for 2009/10 state cuts. These substantial changes, with addition of additional interest income on funds held, additional FTES funding from state apportionment recalculation, additional non-resident enrollment revenue as well as some savings in general operating expenses (utilities, benefits, telephones, insurance/property/ liability, software/hardware maintenance), savings from positions held vacant through the year, restricted spending of B budgets, resulted in higher than the budgeted ending fund balance. This was an intentional outcome of hard work and dedication of many departments in order to preserve our fiscal resources and be able to use them to offset cuts in FY 2009/10.

All the above reductions in expenditures and increases to revenue reduced the projected deficit and resulted in net operating gain of approximately \$2.9M. These one-time funds, in addition to the reminding fund balance from prior year were carried over in the General Fund (Fund 14) as total one time unrestricted carryover of \$5.4 in excess of the 5% reserves into FY 2009/10 (See Exhibit 1). The District designated those funds to offset FY 2009/10 operating deficit of approximately \$3.8 million (Adopted Budget estimate). The reminder is designated as Staff Protection Fund to offset FY 2010/11 state cuts.

We are currently well positioned to weather cuts in FY 2009/10 and potentially 2010/11 with district-wide, colleges and Central Services one-time carryover. To the extent this carryover is used in FY 2009/10, fewer funds will be available to offset any deficit in the following year and structural solutions to the budget will need to be implemented sooner. The District is currently working on a strategy to balance its internal deficit, projected in excess of \$4.1M in General Fund and \$6.5M in Categorical Programs, in FY 2010/11 and offset additional potential state cuts in FY 2010/11 with a combination of one-time and ongoing solutions. Although governor's January proposed budget for FY 2010/11 does not project any additional cuts to community colleges beyond those already incorporated into base budget of FY 2009/10, we have serious doubts that in the current economic and political climate we will be able to avoid some level of reductions to our apportionment funding. We are currently preparing contingency plan to prepare for late notice of reductions in revenue.

Has the district controlled deficit spending over multiple years?

Yes, the District's General Purpose Fund (Fund 14) Net Change in Fund Balance for FY 2003/04 was \$210,047; for FY 2004/05 was \$24,230; for FY 2005/06 was \$5,693,811; and for FY 2006/07 was \$12,702,807. In FY 2007/08 the district experienced mid-year cuts, which put the district's general Fund in deficit spending of \$3,520,962. In FY 2008/09 the district Net Change in Fund Balance was \$2,855,401 achieved mostly through reduced spending. (See Exhibit 1)

Is deficit spending addressed by fund balance, ongoing revenue increases, or expenditure reductions?

FY 2004/05, 2005/06 and 2006/07 ended with positive net changes in the fund balance. (See Exhibit 1) The following years resulted in a positive net change in the fund balance with the exception of 2007/08, the year in which mid-year cuts were implemented. In FY 2008/09 expenditure reduction and efforts to increase revenue through increased student enrollment resulted in positive net change in fund balance of \$2,855,401. Our current strategy is to close operating deficit of \$3.8M in FY 2009/10 with one time savings and start implementing ongoing solutions to bring the budget into structural balance in FY 2010/11.

Are district revenue estimates based upon past history?

District revenue estimates are based upon a combination of enrollment estimates generated from collaboration of Business Services and the campuses' enrollment management teams; historical data; campuses' input on locally generated income; state assumptions on COLA, growth, and the state funding formula (SB-361) as well as lottery estimates, etc.

Does the district automatically build in growth revenue estimates?

No, the District's growth revenue estimates are based on the colleges' FTES growth estimates.

2. **Fund Balance** – Is this area acceptable? **Yes**

Is the district's fund balance stable or consistently increasing?

Yes, the District's General Fund balance (Unrestricted) is very stable, varying between \$4.2M and \$5.4M in excess of 5% contingency for the past two years. (See Exhibit 1). In FY 2009/10 and beyond we are forced to use the unrestricted ending fund balance to cover operating deficit before structural solutions to balanced budget are put in place.

Is the fund balance increasing due to on-going revenue increases and/or expenditure reductions?

See question and answer above.

3. **Enrollment** - Is this area acceptable? **Yes**

Has the district's enrollment been increasing or stable for multiple years?

Enrollment declined in the FY 2004/05 year for a variety of reasons. The district was in "stability funding" that year and was able to regain the lost FTES in the FY 2005/06 year along with some modest growth. Growth was targeted again in the FY 2006/07 year but an actual decline resulted. In FY 2007/08 the district recovered from prior year decline and also grew by 2.52% above the recovered base FTES. In FY 2008/09 district grew 2.5% above the state funded FTES cap. This additional growth over cap will not be funded by state apportionment. For FY 2009/10 governor's budget did not incorporate any growth. In addition, base workload reduction measures were authorized in proportion to cuts in general apportionment funding. We have reduced our projected funded FTES by 4%. (See Exhibit 2)

Are the district's enrollment projections updated at least semiannually?

Yes, enrollment projections are reviewed and updated at the beginning of every academic quarter.

Are staffing adjustments consistent with the enrollment trends?

The Board approved a "growth model" which funds additional positions, teaching and support, in direct proportion to FTES growth. While the law requires an increase in full time faculty consistent with FTES increases, the district's model uses that same rationale for growth of non-teaching positions.

Does the district analyze enrollment and full time equivalent students (FTES) data?

Yes, every quarterly report includes an analysis of FTES and productivity. In addition to this report to the Board, the Office of Institutional Research sends out "dashboard" reports starting several weeks before the quarter to analyze trends and to display comparative data. Finally, district staff has access to an FTES database. This database shows enrollment trends down to the individual class and instructor level and can be aggregated by department, division and college.

Does the district track historical data to establish future trends between P-1 and annual for projection purposes?

Yes, the Chief Instructional Officer at each college is responsible for forecasting winter and spring enrollment at P-1. It is through that analysis that the "multiplier" is adjusted on the 320 Report to insure consistency with projections.

Has the district avoided stabilization funding?

No. As noted above, the district has experienced stabilization in two of the last four years but in FY 2007/08 the district recovered from prior year decline and also grew by 2.52% above the recovered base FTES and in FY 2008/09 grew 2.5% above the state funded FTES cap.

4. **Unrestricted General Fund Balance – Is this area acceptable? Yes**

Is the district's unrestricted general fund balance consistently maintained at or above the recommended minimum prudent level (5% of the total unrestricted general fund expenditures)?

Yes, the district's unrestricted general fund balance has been maintained above the minimum prudent level of 5%. The California Community Colleges System Office requires that we report the unrestricted general fund balance and other required financial information in the Annual Financial and Budget Report (CCFS-311). The unrestricted general fund balance includes the General Purpose Fund (Fund 14) and the Self-Sustaining Fund (Fund 15). The unrestricted general fund balance for the past five years is shown below:

	<u>Actual</u>
2004/05	12.8%
2005/06	15.5%
2006/07	21.8%
2007/08	18.4%
2008/09	19.8%

Is the district's unrestricted fund balance maintained throughout the year?

Yes, the district's unrestricted fund balance was maintained above 19.8% of the total unrestricted general fund expenditures in any given month throughout fiscal year 2008/09. It's our strategic plan to spend down the General Purpose Fund balance as outlined in the Deficit Spending section, in item No. 1, above. As a result of state budget challenges our discretionary spending has been curtailed in an effort to maximize ending fund balance and better prepare the district to weather this crisis.

5. **Cash Flow Borrowing - Is this area acceptable? Yes**

Can the district manage its cash flow without inter-fund borrowing?

Yes, the district managed a positive cash flow in the unrestricted general fund without inter-fund borrowings, with the exceptions of December 2002, December 2003, and January 2004 before receiving the December property tax allocations.

Is the district repaying TRANS and/or borrowed funds within the required statutory period?

The district has not borrowed funds from TRANS since fiscal year 1996/97 when it issued a TRAN in the amount of \$4.4 million. The district did not issue a TRANS in fiscal year 2008/09 and we do not anticipate issuing one in 2009/10.

6. **Bargaining Agreements - Is this area acceptable? Yes**

Has the district settled bargaining agreements within new revenue sources during the past three years?

Bargaining settlements have been funded through COLA and growth in fiscal years 2004/05, 2005/06 and 2006/07. Evidence of this can be seen by analyzing the operating revenues compared to the operating expenses which have been in the positive range for this period. Growth that was anticipated to occur in 2006/07 did not fully materialize although staffing

increases were implemented. That growth did occur in the 2007/08 fiscal year and the proceeds from that enrollment growth that would have otherwise been used for staffing were available for bargaining purposes. No settlements involving salary increases were agreed to in FY 2008-09. A restructuring of health benefits was agreed to as a cost containment measure.

Did the district conduct a pre-settlement analysis identifying an ongoing revenue source to support the agreement?

Yes, the Vice Chancellor, Business Services, confers with the lead negotiator (Vice Chancellor HR) on all proposals. Analyses of the proposals are jointly presented to the Board of Trustees in closed session. In many cases, the costs of proposals are jointly analyzed with the Faculty Association on complicated cost proposals so that there is no disagreement with the cost analysis.

Did the district correctly identify the related costs?

Yes, all related costs for "mandatory benefits" such as PERS, STRS, UI, Social Security, etc., are always included in the cost analysis of any proposal.

Did the district address budget reductions necessary to sustain the total compensation increase?

The district's budget planning process is addressing the potential of both the internal operating deficit and the state's budget crisis and pending mid-year cuts.

7. Unrestricted General Fund Staffing - Is this area acceptable? Yes

Is the district ensuring it is not using one-time funds to pay for permanent staff or other ongoing expenses?

Permanent staff are controlled through position control and are budgeted from ongoing revenue. Any increases in staffing are funded through the District developed growth model which is based on FTES growth and corresponding ongoing revenue growth.

Is the percentage of district general fund budget allocated to salaries and benefits at or less than the statewide average (i.e. the statewide average for 2003-04 is 85%)?

In FY 2003/04 the District was at 83%; in FY 2004/05 the District was at 80%; in FY 2005/06 the District was at 79%, and in FY 2006/07 the District was at 79%. The 2006/07 and 2007/08 percentages are artificially low (79% and 80% respectively) because of infusion of one-time funds received and distributed in FY 2006/07 that increased operating budget. (This data is utilizing data from System Office Fiscal Trend analysis which combines Funds 14 and 15, see Exhibit 3). For FY 2008/09 we have used our audited financial statements (311 report) since the state analysis has not been updated by the time this report was printed. The percentage of district general fund budget allocated to salaries and benefits that year was 81%. For FY 2009/10, the District is budgeting 78%.

8. Internal Controls - Is this area acceptable? Yes

Does the district have adequate internal controls to insure the integrity of the general ledger?

Yes, in addition to the annual financial audit report, which includes a report on internal control over financial reporting and tests of compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, grant agreements and other matters, the district has contracted with an independent certified public accounting firm over the past two years to perform performance audits on Measure E Overhead, De Anza College Cash Handling Procedures, District

Procurement Card, Foothill College Cash Handling Procedures, and Measure C Overhead. In FY 2008-09 and 2009-10, the district contracted to perform performance audits in the areas of Police Parking Fees Cash Handling Procedures, De Anza College Facilities Rental Cash Handling Procedures, and ERP Security. If circumstances dictate, Business Services is prepared to unilaterally initiate special audits.

Does the district have adequate internal controls to safeguard the district's assets?

Yes, the district has written cash handling procedures for De Anza College and Foothill College as well as written district petty cash procedures to safeguard cash. In addition to the required annual audit, the district goes above that requirement and contracts for annual performance audits at its various cash collection points. The district also has Board Policy and Administrative Procedures on Capitalization of District Property and on Disposal of District Property.

9. Management Information Systems - Is this area acceptable? Yes

Is the district data accurate and timely?

Yes, until recently access to financial, student and human resources data was obtained through the combination of the SIS, HRS and FRS systems combined with MAUI. This legacy system, while adequate, presented a number of difficulties having to do with integrating different databases. In addition, vendor support for the legacy system was due to expire at the end of Calendar Year (CY) 2011. This problem, along with a need to adopt a more modern information system capable of providing enhanced functionality prompted the district to include funds in the Measure C bond to acquire and install a new management information system. In February 2008 the Board authorized acquisition of major software packages for implementation as the new Educational Information System (EIS). A multi-year implementation plan was developed and on July 1, 2009, the Finance Module, the first of these major components went live. The HR/Payroll Module came on line on January 1, 2010, and the Student Information Module and Student Financial Aid Module will follow during FY 2009-10.

10. Position Control – Is this area acceptable? Yes

Is position control integrated with payroll?

Yes, there is a very strong position control system where a position number is necessary for each hire.

Does the district control unauthorized hiring?

Yes, all positions to be refilled or newly created positions are assigned a position control number. Each "staff requisition" which is necessary to start the hiring process must be approved by the Chancellor's Staff and must have a valid position control number.

Does the district have controls over part-time academic staff hiring?

Yes, for the most part. Each year the district budgets the dollar amount to be allocated for PT faculty (1320) based on total FTES, less the number of full time faculty, and driven by the agreed upon productivity numbers. The colleges are responsible for developing a schedule of classes synching with the agreed upon budget. Changes in FTES targets or productivity budgets need to be agreed upon at the district level so budgets can be adjusted accordingly. While there has been no formal administrative procedure in recent years for penalties or incentives if the colleges varied from FTES or productivity targets, there has been continuous adherence to these budgets with very little variance.

11. **Budget Monitoring** - Is this area acceptable? **Yes**

Is there sufficient consideration to the budget, related to long-term bargaining agreements?

Yes, see question 6.

Are budget revisions completed in a timely manner?

Yes, budget revisions are processed in a timely manner and subject to the board review and approval with each quarter end report.

Does the district openly discuss the impact of budget revisions at the board level?

Yes, the board receives a complete reconciliation of all revisions and transfers processed in each quarter and all questions are answered in a timely manner by the Vice Chancellor of Business Services or Director of Budget Operations.

Are budget revisions made or confirmed by the board in a timely manner after the collective bargaining agreements are ratified?

Yes, the board receives and approves a complete reconciliation of all revisions and transfers processed in each quarter, as well as the 311 report which includes a summary of costs due to collective bargaining agreements.

Has the district's long-term debt decreased from the prior fiscal year?

No. In November 2006 the District issued an \$11.3 million COP to partially finance construction of the Foothill College Campus Center, renovation of the De Anza College Campus Center, and equipment acquisition for the Foothill College Bookstore, which increased the District's long-term debt from the prior fiscal year. However, in previous years, the District's long-term debt steadily decreased, with the exception of year 2004/05 when the District entered into additional capital leases.

Has the district identified the repayment sources for the long-term debt?

Yes, the new long-term debt is financed through special revenue sources. The Foothill College Campus Center debt and the De Anza College Campus Center debt are financed through campus center use fees. The Foothill College Bookstore equipment acquisition is financed through the Foothill College Bookstore operations. None of the new long-term debt has a general fund obligation.

Does the district compile annualized revenue and expenditure projections throughout the year?

Yes, the District Budget Committee and Audit and Finance Committee review revenue and expense projections at each quarter end before they are approved in the Quarter End Report by the Board of Trustees.

12. **Retiree Health Benefits** - Is this area acceptable? **Yes**

Has the district completed an actuarial calculation to determine the unfunded liability?

Yes, the most recent actuarial was completed in July 2009. We are required to update this report every other year. We will budget the ARC using a three-year smoothing approach in order to minimize major fluctuations in the ARC.

Does the district have a plan for addressing the retiree benefits liabilities?

Yes, the Board of Trustees adopted a plan at the November 6, 2006 board meeting to fully fund the Annual Required Contribution (ARC) as calculated in the August 2006 actuarial study.

The annual contribution is intended to continue for the next 30 years as allowed under the provisions of GASB 43/45. While the district was a founding member of the Community College League of California (CCLC) retiree Joint Powers Authority and has set up the annual contributions in an irrevocable trust, in 2009, after an exhaustive evaluation process, the District opted to leave the CCLC program and join the California employees Retiree Benefit Trust (CERBT) as sponsored by the California Public Employee Retirement System (CalPERS). Proceeds under the management of the CCLC trust will be transferred to the CERBT in FY 2009-10.

13. **Leadership/Stability** - Is this area acceptable? **Yes**

Has the district experienced recent turnover in its management team (including the Chief Executive Officer, Chief Business Officer, and Board of Trustees)?

Until recently this had been a challenging area; however, all members of the Chancellors' Cabinet have now been in their respective positions since early 2008.

This past year however, Chancellor Martha Kanter was nominated by President Obama to serve as Under Secretary of Education. She was subsequently confirmed by the United States Senate and left the district in 2009. The Board of Trustees appointed former Vice Chancellor Mike Brandy as Interim Chancellor and embarked upon a nation-wide search for a permanent replacement. Through this process the Board ultimately selected Dr. Linda Thor who began her tenure as Chancellor in February 2010.

Board member Paul Fong won election to the State Assembly and was replaced by Board member Pearl Cheng. Board member Hal Plotkin resigned his seat on the Board to join Dr. Kanter in Washington. Trustee Plotkins' position on the Board was replaced by Joan Barum. As an indicator of community satisfaction with their elected representatives board members up for election in the most recent cycle ran unopposed.

14. **District Liability** – Is this area acceptable? **Yes**

Has the district performed the proper legal analysis regarding potential lawsuits that may require the district to maintain increased reserve levels?

Although the risk management is a decentralized activity across the district, we do maintain a Risk Management Department. This office, in an effort to identify and mitigate potential liabilities and/or litigation, maintains regular communication with administrators throughout the organization. In most cases careful decision making, foresight and actions prevent such situations from becoming legal actions. When necessary, external legal counsel is engaged.

15. **Reporting** – Is this area acceptable? **Yes**

Has the district filed the annual audit report with the System Office on a timely basis?

Yes, for FY 2004/05 through 2008/09 the annual audit report has been brought first to the Audit/Finance Committee and then to the Board of Trustees. As contractually agreed upon with our external auditors, the auditors have filed the annual audit report with the System Office on a timely basis.

Has the district taken appropriate actions to address material findings cited in their annual audit report?

Yes, each year we discuss the audit findings and recommendations of the fiscal year just ended with the Audit and Finance Committee. Subsequently, in February we provide the Audit and Finance Committee with the status of management's response and action taken to

correct these findings.

Has the district met the requirements of the 50 percent law?

Yes, for fiscal years 2004/05 through 2008/09 the district has met the requirements of the 50% law. The percentage of Instructional Salary Costs to Current Expense of Education for each of these years is:

2004/05	53.86%
2005/06	52.57%
2006/07	52.72%
2007/08	51.50%
2008/09	51.71%

Have the Quarterly Financial Status Reports (CCFS-311Q), Annual Financial and Budget Reports (CCFS311), and Apportionment Attendance Reports (CCFS-320) been submitted to the System Office on or before the stated deadlines?

Yes, for the years 2004/05 through 2008/09 each of these quarterly and annual reports has been submitted to the System Office by the stated deadlines.

Enrollment History

FTEs

	00/01 Actual	01/02 Actual	02/03 Actual	03/04 Actual	04/05 Actual	05/06 Actual	06/07 Actual	07/08 Actual	08/09 Actual	09/10 Budget
Resident	30,328	32,860	32,897	32,660	31,066	32,526	32,211	33,376	34,381	32,187
Non-Resident	3,187	3,534	3,363	3,268	2,986	2,968	3,568	3,988	4,189	4,189
Total FTEs	33,515	36,394	36,260	35,928	34,052	35,494	35,779	37,364	38,570	36,376

420		Unrestricted GF - Col. 2				Unrestricted GF - Fund 11, Col. 1					Year-to-Year Change								
Foothill-DeAnza Community College District		Budgeted		Actual		Actual		Actual		Actual		Change from 07/08 to 08/09		Change from 06/07 to 07/08		Change from 05/06 to 06/07		Change from 04/05 to 05/06	
EDP No.	Acct Description	2008-09	08/09 Line Item %	2007-08	07/08 Line Item %	2006-07	06/07 Line Item %	2005-06	05/06 Line Item %	2004-05	04/05 Line Item %	07/08 to 08/09 \$ Change	07/08 to 08/09 % Change	06/07 to 07/08 \$ Change	06/07 to 07/08 % Change	05/06 to 06/07 \$ Change	05/06 to 06/07 % Change	04/05 to 05/06 \$ Change	04/05 to 05/06 % Change
8100	Federal Revenues	2,089	0.0%	2,219	0.0%	2,269	0.0%	2,320	0.0%	2,052	0.0%	-130	-5.9%	-50	-2.2%	-51	-2.2%	268	13.1%
8600	State Revenues	91,378,979	46.4%	89,594,772	45.7%	95,755,895	48.9%	70,494,504	40.2%	56,532,678	35.0%	1,784,207	2.0%	-6,161,123	-6.4%	25,261,391	35.8%	13,961,826	24.7%
8800	Local Revenues	104,115,245	52.8%	106,272,802	54.1%	99,517,416	50.8%	104,386,528	59.5%	104,089,195	64.4%	-2,157,557	-2.0%	6,755,386	6.8%	-4,869,112	-4.7%	297,333	0.3%
8900	Other Financing Sources ①	1,564,007	0.8%	388,948	0.2%	460,696	0.2%	574,783	0.3%	958,824	0.6%	1,175,059	302.1%	-71,748	-15.6%	-114,087	-19.8%	-384,041	-40.1%
801	Total Revenues	197,060,320	100.0%	196,258,741	100.0%	195,736,276	100.0%	175,458,135	100.0%	161,582,749	100.0%	801,579	0.4%	522,465	0.3%	20,278,141	11.6%	13,875,386	8.6%
1000	Academic Salaries	82,024,469	37.4%	80,566,081	40.4%	73,256,762	40.2%	68,068,162	40.1%	66,026,145	41.1%	1,458,388	1.8%	7,309,319	10.0%	5,188,600	7.6%	2,042,017	3.1%
2000	Classified Salaries	40,792,446	18.6%	39,909,143	20.0%	35,675,866	19.6%	32,154,989	19.0%	31,275,743	19.5%	883,303	2.2%	4,233,277	11.9%	3,520,877	10.9%	879,246	2.8%
3000	Employee Benefits	43,599,577	19.9%	39,223,926	19.7%	35,620,591	19.5%	32,817,104	19.3%	30,181,758	18.8%	4,375,651	11.2%	3,603,335	10.1%	2,803,487	8.5%	2,635,346	8.7%
4000	Supplies and Materials	2,463,730	1.1%	4,986,939	2.5%	4,386,411	2.4%	3,839,244	2.3%	3,825,073	2.4%	-2,523,209	-50.6%	600,528	13.7%	547,167	14.3%	14,171	0.4%
5000	Other Operating Expenses and Services	41,979,707	19.2%	23,191,827	11.6%	21,116,411	11.6%	21,145,697	12.5%	16,420,485	10.2%	18,787,880	81.0%	2,075,416	9.8%	-29,286	-0.1%	4,725,212	28.8%
6000	Capital Outlay	181,566	0.1%	937,201	0.5%	1,214,566	0.7%	1,343,628	0.8%	824,342	0.5%	-755,635	-80.6%	-277,365	-22.8%	-129,062	-9.6%	519,286	63.0%
7000	Other Outgo ①	8,131,398	3.7%	10,501,345	5.3%	11,072,981	6.1%	10,312,117	6.1%	12,225,316	7.6%	-2,369,947	-22.6%	-571,636	-5.2%	760,864	7.4%	-1,913,199	-15.6%
501	Total Expenditures	219,172,893	100.0%	199,316,462	100.0%	182,343,588	100.0%	169,680,941	100.0%	160,778,862	100.0%	19,856,431	10.0%	16,972,874	9.3%	12,662,647	7.5%	8,902,079	5.5%
201	Excess/(Deficiency) of Rev. over Expenditures	-22,112,573	n/a	-3,057,721	n/a	13,392,688	n/a	5,777,194	n/a	803,887	n/a	-19,054,852	-623.2%	-16,450,409	-122.8%	7,615,494	131.8%	4,973,307	618.7%
901	Net Increase/(Decrease) in Fund Balance	-22,112,573	-151.7%	-3,057,721	-8.3%	13,392,688	33.7%	5,777,194	21.9%	803,887	3.9%	-19,054,852	-623.2%	-16,450,409	-122.8%	7,615,494	131.8%	4,973,307	618.7%
902	Net Beginning Balance, July 1	36,687,950	251.7%	39,745,671	108.3%	26,352,983	66.3%	20,575,789	78.1%	19,771,902	96.1%	-3,057,721	-7.7%	13,392,688	50.8%	5,777,194	28.1%	803,887	4.1%
903	Prior Year Adjustment		n/a	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0	n/a
904	Adjusted Beginning Balance		n/a	39,745,671	108.3%	26,352,983	66.3%	20,575,789	78.1%	19,771,902	96.1%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	5,777,194	28.1%	803,887	4.1%
905	Ending Balance, June 30	14,575,377	100.0%	36,687,950	100.0%	39,745,671	100.0%	26,352,983	100.0%	20,575,789	100.0%	-22,112,573	-60.3%	-3,057,721	-7.7%	13,392,688	50.8%	5,777,194	28.1%
chk				36,687,950		39,745,671		26,352,983		20,575,789		Change from 07/08 to 08/09		Change from 06/07 to 07/08		Change from 05/06 to 06/07		Change from 04/05 to 05/06	
Fund Balance:		2008-09		2007-08		2006-07		2005-06		2004-05		% Change		% Change		% Change		% Change	
	Fund Balance % [905/501]	6.7%		18.4%		21.8%		15.5%		12.8%			-11.8%		-3.4%		6.3%		2.7%
	Required Fund Balance to meet 5% threshold	10,958,645		9,965,823		9,117,179		8,484,047		8,038,943		992,822	10.0%	848,644	9.3%	633,132	7.5%	445,104	5.5%
	Over -Under 5% threshold	3,616,732		26,722,127		30,628,492		17,868,936		12,536,846		-23,105,395	-86.5%	-3,906,365	-12.8%	12,759,556	71.4%	5,332,090	42.5%
FTES: ②		2008-09 1st Qtr 311Q Report		2007-08		2006-07		2005-06		2004-05		Change from 07/08 to 08/09		Change from 06/07 to 07/08		Change from 05/06 to 06/07		Change from 04/05 to 05/06	
												# Change	% Change	# Change	% Change	# Change	% Change	# Change	% Change
	FTES - Resident	33,026		33,376		32,361		32,526		31,080		-350	-1.0%	1,015	3.1%	-165	-0.5%	1,446	4.7%
	FTES - Nonresident			3,988		3,613		3,096		2,987				375	10.4%	517	16.7%	109	3.6%
	FTES - Apprentice			897		799		750		783				98	12.3%	49	6.5%	-33	-4.2%
	Total FTES			38,261		36,773		36,372		34,850				1,488	4.0%	401	1.1%	1,522	4.4%
50 % Law: ③		2008-09		2007-08		2006-07		2005-06		2004-05		Change from 07/08 to 08/09		Change from 06/07 to 07/08		Change from 05/06 to 06/07		Change from 04/05 to 05/06	
	Instructional Salary Costs (AC 100-5000 and 6110)			89,659,134		83,579,589		77,552,121		73,714,642				6,079,545	7.3%	6,027,468	7.8%	3,837,479	5.2%
	Current Expense of Education (AC 100-6799)			174,082,993		158,544,391		147,515,299		136,866,959				15,538,602	9.8%	11,029,092	7.5%	10,648,340	7.8%
	% of Instructional Salary Costs to CCE			51.50%		52.72%		52.57%		53.86%					-1.2%		0.1%		-1.3%
	50% Requirement			87,041,497		79,272,196		73,757,650		68,433,480									
	Over -Under 50% Requirement			2,617,637		4,307,393		3,794,471		5,281,162									
Salaries and Benefits as % of Total Expenditures		75.9%		80.1%		79.3%		78.4%		79.3%			% Change		% Change		% Change		% Change
													-4.2%		0.8%		0.9%		-0.9%
GF Cash Balance (unrestricted and restricted):		2008-09 1st Qtr 311Q Report		2007-08 4th Qtr 311Q Report		2006-07 4th Qtr 311Q Report		2005-06 4th Qtr 311Q Report		2004-05 4th Qtr 311Q Report		Change from 07/08 to 08/09		Change from 06/07 to 07/08		Change from 05/06 to 06/07		Change from 04/05 to 05/06	
	Cash Balance Per 311Q (excluding investments)	17,935,567		40,195,026		52,768,176		38,606,430		32,926,287		\$ Change	% Change	\$ Change	% Change	\$ Change	% Change	\$ Change	% Change
												-22,259,459	-55.4%	-12,573,150	-23.8%	14,161,746	36.7%	5,680,143	17.3%

☐: For purposes of this analysis, Other Financing Sources is combined into Total Revenues and Other Outgo is combined with Tot al Expenditures.
☐: FTES data for 2007-08, 2006-07, 2005-06, and 2004-05 is from System Office Data Abstract ; 2008-09 Total Resident FTES from latest 311Q and is an projected amount.
☐: 50% law data from data abstract. (Instructional Salary Costs/Current Expense of Education) >= 50%
Note: If "no data" is displayed for any FTES or GF Cash Balance, the district did not submit CCFS -311Q as of the date of this analysis.