

(Dated: 3-17-2014)

## **THE PERMANENT SCHOOL FUND GUARANTEE PROGRAM**

This disclosure statement provides information relating to the program (the “Guarantee Program”) administered by the Texas Education Agency (the “TEA”) with respect to the Texas Permanent School Fund guarantee of tax-supported bonds issued by Texas school districts and the guarantee of revenue bonds issued by or for the benefit of Texas charter districts. The Guarantee Program was authorized by an amendment to the Texas Constitution in 1983 and by Subchapter C of Chapter 45 of the Texas Education Code, as amended (the “Act”). While the Guarantee Program applies to bonds issued by or for both school districts and charter districts, as described below, the Act and the program rules for the two types of districts have some distinctions. For convenience of description and reference, those aspects of the Guarantee Program that are applicable to school district bonds and to charter district bonds are referred to herein as the “School District Bond Guarantee Program” and the “Charter District Bond Guarantee Program,” respectively.

Some of the information contained in this Section may include projections or other forward-looking statements regarding future events or the future financial performance of the Texas Permanent School Fund (the “PSF” or the “Fund”). Actual results may differ materially from those contained in any such projections or forward-looking statements.

### **History and Purpose**

The PSF was created with a \$2,000,000 appropriation by the Texas Legislature (the “Legislature”) in 1854 expressly for the benefit of the public schools of Texas. The Constitution of 1876 stipulated that certain lands and all proceeds from the sale of these lands should also constitute the PSF. Additional acts later gave more public domain land and rights to the PSF. In 1953, the U.S. Congress passed the Submerged Lands Act that relinquished to coastal states all rights of the U.S. navigable waters within state boundaries. If the state, by law, had set a larger boundary prior to or at the time of admission to the Union, or if the boundary had been approved by Congress, then the larger boundary applied. After three years of litigation (1957-1960), the U. S. Supreme Court on May 31, 1960, affirmed Texas’ historic three marine leagues (10.35 miles) seaward boundary. Texas proved its submerged lands property rights to three leagues into the Gulf of Mexico by citing historic laws and treaties dating back to 1836. All lands lying within that limit belong to the PSF. The proceeds from the sale and the mineral-related rental of these lands, including bonuses, delay rentals and royalty payments, become the corpus of the Fund. Prior to the approval by the voters of the State of an amendment to the constitutional provision under which the Fund is established and administered, which occurred on September 13, 2003 (the “Total Return Constitutional Amendment”), and which is further described below, the PSF had as its main sources of revenues capital gains from securities transactions and royalties from the sale of oil and natural gas. The Total Return Constitutional Amendment provides that interest and dividends produced by Fund investments will be additional revenue to

the PSF. The State School Land Board (“SLB”) maintains the land endowment of the Fund on behalf of the Fund and is authorized to manage the investments of the capital gains, royalties and other investment income relating to the land endowment. The SLB is a three member board, the membership of which consists of the Commissioner of the Texas General Land Office (the “Land Commissioner”) and two citizen members, one appointed by the Governor and one by the Texas Attorney General (the “Attorney General”).

The Texas Constitution describes the PSF as “permanent” and “perpetual.” Prior to the approval by Total Return Constitutional Amendment, only the income produced by the PSF was to be used to complement taxes in financing public education.

On November 8, 1983, the voters of the State approved a constitutional amendment that provides for the guarantee by the PSF of bonds issued by school districts. On approval by the State Commissioner of Education (the “Commissioner”), bonds properly issued by a school district are fully guaranteed by the corpus of the PSF. See “The School District Bond Guarantee Program.”

In 2011, Senate Bill 1 (“SB 1”) was enacted by the Legislature. Among other provisions, SB 1 established the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program as a new component of the Guarantee Program, and authorized the use of the PSF to guarantee revenue bonds issued by or for the benefit of certain open-enrollment charter schools that are designated as “charter districts” by the Commissioner. On approval by the Commissioner, bonds properly issued by a charter district are fully guaranteed by the corpus of the PSF. As described below, the implementation of the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program was deferred pending receipt of guidance from the Internal Revenue Service (the “IRS”) which was received in September 2013, and the establishment of regulations to govern the program, which regulations were published for public comment on December 20, 2013, approved on January 30, 2014 and became effective on March 3, 2014. See “The Charter District Bond Guarantee Program.”

State law also permits charter schools to be chartered and operated by school districts and other political subdivisions, but bond financing of facilities for school district-operated charter schools is subject to the School District Bond Guarantee Program, not the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program.

While the School District Bond Guarantee Program and the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program relate to different types of bonds issued for different types of Texas public schools, and have different program regulations and requirements, a bond guaranteed under either part of the Guarantee Program has the same effect with respect to the guarantee obligation of the Fund thereto, and all guaranteed bonds are aggregated for purposes of determining the capacity of the Guarantee Program (see “Capacity Limits for the Guarantee Program”). The Charter District Bond Guarantee Program as enacted by State law has not been reviewed by any court, nor has the Texas Attorney General been requested to issue an opinion, with respect to its constitutional validity.

The sole purpose of the PSF is to assist in the funding of public education for present and future generations. Prior to the adoption of the Total Return Constitutional Amendment, all interest and dividends produced by Fund investments flowed into the Available School Fund (the “ASF”), where they are distributed to local school districts and open-enrollment charter schools based on average daily attendance. Any net gains from investments of the Fund accrue to the corpus of the PSF. Prior to the approval by the voters of the State of the Total Return Constitutional Amendment, costs of administering the PSF were allocated to the ASF. With the approval of the Total Return Constitutional Amendment, the administrative costs of the Fund have shifted from the ASF to the PSF. In fiscal year 2013, distributions to the ASF amounted to \$281.08 per student and the total amount distributed to the ASF was \$1.321 billion, including \$300 million distributed to the ASF by the SLB.

Audited financial information for the PSF is provided annually through the PSF Annual Report (the “Annual Report”), which is filed with the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (“MSRB”). The Annual Report includes the Message of the Executive Administrator of the Fund (the “Message”) and the Management’s Discussion and Analysis (“MD&A”). The Annual Report for the year ended August 31, 2013, as filed with the MSRB in accordance with the PSF undertaking and agreement made in accordance with Rule 15c2-12 (“Rule 15c2-12”) of the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (the “SEC”), as described below, is hereby incorporated by reference into this disclosure. Information included herein for the year ended August 31, 2013 is derived from the audited financial statements of the PSF, which are included in the Annual Report when it is filed and posted. Reference is made to the Annual Report for the complete Message and MD&A for the year ended August 31, 2013 and for a description of the financial results of the PSF for the year ended August 31, 2013, the most recent year for which audited financial information regarding the Fund is available. The 2013 Annual Report speaks only as of its date and the TEA has not obligated itself to update the 2013 Annual Report or any other Annual Report. The TEA posts each Annual Report, which includes statistical data regarding the Fund as of the close of each fiscal year, the most recent disclosure for the Guarantee Program, the Statement of Investment Objectives, Policies and Guidelines of the Texas Permanent School Fund, which is codified at 19 Texas Administrative Code, Chapter 33 (the “Investment Policy”), monthly updates with respect to the capacity of the Guarantee Program (collectively, the “Web Site Materials”) on the TEA web site at [http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=3413&menu\\_id=2147483695](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=3413&menu_id=2147483695) and with the MSRB at [www.emma.msrb.org](http://www.emma.msrb.org). Such monthly updates regarding the Guarantee Program are also incorporated herein and made a part hereof for all purposes. In addition to the Web Site Materials, the Fund is required to make quarterly filings with the SEC under Section 13(f) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Such filings, which consist of a list of the Fund’s holdings of securities specified in Section 13(f), including exchange-traded (*e.g.*, NYSE) or NASDAQ-quoted stocks, equity options and warrants, shares of closed-end investment companies and certain convertible debt securities, is available from the SEC at [www.sec.gov/edgar.shtml](http://www.sec.gov/edgar.shtml). A list of the Fund’s equity and fixed income holdings as of August 31 of each year is posted to the TEA web site and filed with the MSRB. Such list excludes holdings in the Fund’s securities

lending program. Such list, when filed, is incorporated herein and made a part hereof for all purposes.

### **The Total Return Constitutional Amendment**

The Total Return Constitutional Amendment approved a fundamental change in the way that distributions are made to the ASF from the PSF. The Total Return Constitutional Amendment requires that PSF distributions to the ASF be determined using a total-return-based formula instead of the current-income-based formula, which was used from 1964 to the end of the 2003 fiscal year. The Total Return Constitutional Amendment provides that the total amount distributed from the Fund to the ASF: (1) in each year of a State fiscal biennium must be an amount that is not more than 6% of the average of the market value of the Fund, excluding real property (the “Distribution Rate”), on the last day of each of the sixteen State fiscal quarters preceding the Regular Session of the Legislature that begins before that State fiscal biennium (the “Distribution Measurement Period”), in accordance with the rate adopted by: (a) a vote of two-thirds of the total membership of the State Board of Education (“SBOE”), taken before the Regular Session of the Legislature convenes or (b) the Legislature by general law or appropriation, if the SBOE does not adopt a rate as provided by clause (a); and (2) over the ten-year period consisting of the current State fiscal year and the nine preceding state fiscal years may not exceed the total return on all investment assets of the Fund over the same ten-year period (the “Ten Year Total Return”). In April 2009, the Attorney General issued a legal opinion, Op. Tex. Att’y Gen. No. GA-0707 (2009) (“GA-0707”), at the request of the Chairman of the SBOE with regard to certain matters pertaining to the Distribution Rate and the determination of the Ten Year Total Return. In GA-0707 the Attorney General opined, among other advice, that (i) the Ten Year Total Return should be calculated on an annual basis, (ii) a contingency plan adopted by the SBOE, to permit monthly transfers equal in aggregate to the annual Distribution Rate to be halted and subsequently made up if such transfers temporarily exceed the Ten Year Total Return, is not prohibited by State law, provided that such contingency plan applies only within a fiscal year time basis, not on a biennium basis, and (iii) that the amount distributed from the Fund in a fiscal year may not exceed 6% of the average of the market value of the Fund or the Ten Year Total Return. In accordance with GA-0707, in the event that the Ten Year Total Return is exceeded during a fiscal year, transfers to the ASF will be halted. However, if the Ten Year Total Return subsequently increases during that biennium, transfers may be resumed, if the SBOE has provided for that contingency, and made in full during the remaining period of the biennium, subject to the limit of 6% in any one fiscal year. Any shortfall in the transfer that results from such events from one biennium may not be paid over to the ASF in a subsequent biennium as the SBOE would make a separate payout determination for that subsequent biennium.

In determining the Distribution Rate, the SBOE has adopted the goal of maximizing the amount distributed from the Fund in a manner designed to preserve “intergenerational equity.” Intergenerational equity is the maintenance of endowment purchasing power to ensure that endowment spending keeps pace with inflation, with the ultimate goal being to ensure that

current and future generations are given equal levels of purchasing power. In making this determination, the SBOE takes into account various considerations, and relies particularly upon its external investment consultant, which undertakes a probability analysis for long term projection periods that includes certain assumptions. Among the assumptions used in the analysis are a projected rate of growth of the average daily scholastic attendance State-wide, the projected contributions and expenses of the Fund, projected returns in the capital markets and a projected inflation rate.

The SBOE established the Distribution Rate from the Fund to the ASF for fiscal years 2008 and 2009 at 3.5% and for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 at 2.5% of the average of the PSF market value during the respective Distribution Measurement Periods, which ended in November 2006 and November 2008, respectively. The decision of the SBOE regarding the Distribution Rate for 2008 through 2011 took into account a commitment by the SLB to transfer at least \$100 million per year in fiscal years 2008 through 2011. The distribution rate for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 produced total transfers of \$1.1535 billion to the ASF from the PSF during those years. The SBOE has set the Distribution Rate for the 2012-13 biennium at 4.2%, which rate was determined after the SLB authorized the release of a total of \$500 million to the PSF in quarterly installments during the 2012-13 biennium. In November 2012, the SBOE set the Distribution Rate for the 2014-15 biennium at 3.3%, which is expected to produce an effective rate of 3.5% taking into account the broadening of the calculation base for the Fund that was effected by a 2011 State constitutional amendment, which amendment did not increase Fund revenues. See “2011 Constitutional Amendment” below for a description of amendments made to the Texas Constitution on November 8, 2011 that permit the SLB to make transfers directly to the ASF up to the amount of \$300 million in each fiscal year.

Since the enactment of a prior amendment to the Texas Constitution in 1964, the investment of the Fund has been managed with the dual objectives of producing current income for transfer to the ASF and growing the Fund for the benefit of future generations. As a result of this prior constitutional framework, prior to the adoption of the 2004 Asset Allocation Policy (as defined below) the investment of the Fund historically included a significant amount of fixed income investments and dividend-yielding equity investments, to produce income for transfer to the ASF.

With respect to the management of the Fund’s financial assets portfolio, the single most significant change made to date as a result of the Total Return Constitutional Amendment has been new asset allocation policies adopted by the SBOE in February 2004 (the “2004 Asset Allocation Policy”), in July 2006 (as subsequently reaffirmed in July 2008 such asset allocation is referred to herein as the “2008 Asset Allocation Policy”) and in July 2010 (the “2010 Asset Allocation Policy”), which have significantly altered the asset allocations of the Fund. The SBOE further modified the asset allocation policy for the Fund in July 2012 (the “2012 Asset Allocation”). The Fund’s investment policy provides for minimum and maximum ranges among the components of each of the three general asset classifications: equities, fixed income and alternative asset investments. The 2004 Asset Allocation Policy decreased the fixed income

target from 45% to 25% of Fund investment assets and increased the allocation for equities from 55% to 75% of investment assets. In July 2006, the SBOE modified its asset allocation to reduce the equity allocation, including both domestic and foreign equity portfolios, to a target of 53% of Fund assets, further reduced the fixed income allocation target to 19% and added an alternative asset allocation, which included real estate, real return, absolute return and private equity components, totaling 28% of the Fund's asset target. Alternative asset classes diversify the SBOE-managed assets and are not as correlated to traditional asset classes, which is intended to increase investment returns over the long run while reducing risk and return volatility of the portfolio. In July 2010, the SBOE modified the 2008 Asset Allocation Policy by decreasing the equity allocation to 50%, and the fixed income allocation to 15%, while increasing the alternative asset allocation (which may include equity and fixed income investments as part of a variety of alternative investment strategies) to 35%. In July 2012, the SBOE modified the 2010 Asset Allocation Policy by decreasing the equity allocation to 46%, increasing the fixed income allocation to 17%, and increasing the alternative asset allocation (which may include equity and fixed income investments as part of a variety of alternative investment strategies) to 37%. The 2012 Asset Allocation changes decreased the target for large cap equity investments from 21% to 18%, replaced a 4% allocation for international small cap equities with a 3% allocation for emerging international equities, reduced core fixed income bond investments from 15% to 12% and added a new 5% allocation for emerging market debt in the fixed income portfolio. In July 2012 and April 2013, the SBOE also realigned the management of certain of the investment portfolios within the absolute return allocation of the alternative investments and its private equity asset class. These new alignments in investment portfolios have created strategic relationships between the external manager and investment staff of the PSF, which has reduced administrative costs with respect to those portfolios. In response to a legal opinion request made by the Chair of the SBOE in October 2012, the Attorney General has advised the SBOE in Op. Tex. Att'y Gen. No. GA-0998 (2013) ("GA-0998"), that the PSF is not subject to requirements of certain State competitive bidding laws with respect to the selection of investments. In GA-0998, the Attorney General also advised that the SBOE generally must use competitive bidding for the selection of investment managers and other third party providers of investment services, such as record keeping and insurance, but excluding certain professional services, such as accounting services, as State law prohibits the use of competitive bidding for specified professional services. GA-0998 provides guidance to the SBOE in connection with the direct management of alternative investments through investment vehicles to be created by the SBOE, in lieu of contracting with external managers for such services, as has been the recent practice of the PSF. The PSF Staff and the Fund's investment advisor are tasked with advising the SBOE with respect to the implementation of the 2010 Asset Allocation Policy, including the timing and manner of the selection of any external managers and other consultants. For a variety of reasons, each change in asset allocation for the Fund, including the 2012 Asset Allocation Policy, has been, and is being, implemented in phases. At August 31, 2013, the Fund's financial assets portfolio was invested as follows: 53.21% in public market equity investments; 18.16% in fixed income investments; 10.33% in absolute return assets; 2.67% in private equity assets; 3.16% in real estate assets; 6.46% in risk parity assets; 5.72% in real return assets; and 0.29% in cash.

In accordance with the Texas Constitution, the SBOE views the PSF as a perpetual institution, and the Fund is managed as an endowment fund with a long-term investment horizon. Under the total-return investment objective, the Investment Policy provides that the PSF shall be managed consistently with respect to the following: generating income for the benefit of the public free schools of Texas, the real growth of the corpus of the PSF, protecting capital, and balancing the needs of present and future generations of Texas school children. As described above, the Total Return Constitutional Amendment restricts the annual pay out from the Fund to the total-return on all investment assets of the Fund over a rolling ten-year period. State law provides that each transfer of funds from the PSF to the ASF is made monthly, with each transfer to be in the amount of one-twelfth of the annual distribution. The heavier weighting of equity securities relative to fixed income investments has resulted in greater volatility of the value of the Fund. Given the greater weighting in the overall portfolio of passively managed investments, it is expected that the Fund will reflect the general performance returns of the markets in which the Fund is invested.

The asset allocation of the Fund's financial assets portfolio is subject to change by the SBOE from time to time based upon a number of factors, including recommendations to the SBOE made by internal investment staff and external consultants, changes made by the SBOE without regard to such recommendations and directives of the Legislature. Fund performance may also be affected by factors other than asset allocation, including, without limitation, the general performance of the securities markets in the United States and abroad; political and investment considerations including those relating to socially responsible investing; application of the prudent person investment standard, which may eliminate certain investment opportunities for the Fund; management fees paid to external managers and embedded management fees for some fund investments; and limitations on the number and compensation of internal and external investment staff, which is subject to Legislative oversight. The Guarantee Program could also be impacted by changes in State or federal law or the implementation of new accounting standards.

### **Management and Administration of the Fund**

The Texas Constitution and applicable statutes delegate to the SBOE the authority and responsibility for investment of the PSF's financial assets. In investing the Fund, the SBOE is charged with exercising the judgment and care under the circumstances then prevailing which persons of ordinary prudence, discretion and intelligence exercise in the management of their own affairs, not in regard to speculation, but in regard to the permanent disposition of their funds, considering the probable income therefrom as well as the probable safety of their capital. The SBOE has adopted a "Statement of Investment Objectives, Policies, and Guidelines of the Texas Permanent School Fund," which is codified in the Texas Administrative Code beginning at 19 TAC section 33.1.

The Total Return Constitutional Amendment provides that expenses of managing the PSF are to be paid "by appropriation" from the PSF. In January 2005, at the request of the SBOE, the Attorney General issued a legal opinion, Op. Tex. Att'y Gen. No. GA-0293 (2005) ("GA-0293"),

that the Total Return Constitutional Amendment requires that SBOE expenditures for managing or administering PSF investments, including payments to external investment managers, be paid from appropriations made by the Legislature, but that the Total Return Constitutional Amendment does not require the SBOE to pay from such appropriated PSF funds the indirect management costs deducted from the assets of a mutual fund or other investment company in which PSF funds have been invested.

Texas law assigns control of the Fund's land and mineral rights to the three-member SLB, which consists of the elected Commissioner of the General Land Office ("GLO"), an appointee of the Governor, and an appointee of the Attorney General. Administrative duties related to the land and mineral rights reside with the GLO, which is under the guidance of the Commissioner of the GLO. In 2007, the Legislature established the real estate special fund account of the PSF (the "Real Estate Account") consisting of the land, mineral or royalty interest, real estate investment, or other interest, including revenue received from those sources, that is set apart to the PSF under the Texas Constitution and laws, together with the mineral estate in riverbeds, channels, and the tidelands, including islands. The investment of the Real Estate Account is subject to the sole and exclusive management and control of the SLB and the Land Commissioner, who is also the head of the GLO. The 2007 legislation presented constitutional questions regarding the respective roles of the SBOE and the SLB relating to the disposition of proceeds of real estate transactions to the ASF, among other questions. Amounts in the investment portfolio of the PSF are taken into account by the SBOE for purposes of determining the Distribution Rate. An amendment to the Texas Constitution was approved by State voters on November 8, 2011, which permits the SLB to make transfers directly to the ASF, see "2011 Constitutional Amendment" below.

The SBOE contracts with its securities custodial agent to measure the performance of the total return of the Fund's financial assets. A consultant is typically retained for the purpose of providing consultation with respect to strategic asset allocation decisions and to assist the SBOE in selecting external fund management advisors. The SBOE also contracts with financial institutions for custodial and securities lending services. The SBOE has established the Committee of Investment Advisors, which consists of independent investment experts each appointed by a member of the SBOE to closely advise the respective SBOE member on investment issues.

As noted above, the Texas Constitution and applicable statutes make the SBOE responsible for investment of the PSF's financial assets. By law, the Commissioner is appointed by the Governor, with Senate confirmation, and assists the SBOE, but the Commissioner can neither be hired nor dismissed by the SBOE. The Executive Administrator of the Fund is also hired by and reports to the Commissioner. Moreover, although the Fund's Executive Administrator and his staff implement the decisions of and provide information to the School Finance/PSF Committee of the SBOE and the full SBOE, the SBOE can neither select nor dismiss the Executive Administrator. TEA's General Counsel provides legal advice to the Executive Administrator and to the SBOE. The SBOE has also engaged outside counsel to advise it as to its duties over the Fund, including specific actions regarding the investment of the PSF to ensure compliance



with fiduciary standards, and to provide transactional advice in connection with the investment of Fund assets in non-traditional investments.

### **Capacity Limits for the Guarantee Program**

The capacity of the Fund to guarantee bonds under the Guarantee Program is limited in two ways: by State law (the “State Capacity Limit”) and by regulations and a notice issued by the IRS (the “IRS Limit”). Prior to May 20, 2003, the State Capacity Limit was equal to two times the lower of cost or fair market value of the Fund’s assets, exclusive of real estate. During the 78th Regular Session of the Legislature in 2003, legislation was enacted that increased the State Capacity Limit by 25%, to two and one half times the lower of cost or fair market value of the Fund’s assets as estimated by the SBOE and certified by the State Auditor, and eliminated the real estate exclusion from the calculation. Prior to the issuance of the IRS Notice (defined below), the capacity of the program under the IRS Limit was limited to two and one-half times the lower of cost or fair market value of the Fund’s assets adjusted by a factor that excluded additions to the Fund made since May 14, 1989. During the 2007 Texas Legislature, Senate Bill 389 (“SB 389”) was enacted providing for additional increases in the capacity of the Guarantee Program, and specifically providing that the SBOE may by rule increase the capacity of the Guarantee Program from two and one-half times the cost value of the PSF to an amount not to exceed five times the cost value of the PSF, provided that the increased limit does not violate federal law and regulations and does not prevent bonds guaranteed by the Guarantee Program from receiving the highest available credit rating, as determined by the SBOE. SB 389 further provides that the SBOE shall at least annually consider whether to change the capacity of the Guarantee Program. Since 2005, the Guarantee Program has twice reached capacity under the IRS Limit, and in each instance the Guarantee Program was closed to new bond guarantee applications until relief was obtained from the IRS. The most recent closure of the Guarantee Program commenced in March 2009 and the Guarantee Program reopened in February 2010 on the basis of receipt of the IRS Notice.

On December 16, 2009, the IRS published Notice 2010-5 (the “IRS Notice”) stating that the IRS will issue proposed regulations amending the existing regulations to raise the IRS limit to 500% of the total cost of the assets held by the PSF as of December 16, 2009. In accordance with the IRS Notice, the amount of any new bonds to be guaranteed by the PSF, together with the then outstanding amount of bonds previously guaranteed by the PSF, must not exceed the IRS limit on the sale date of the new bonds to be guaranteed. The IRS Notice further provides that the IRS Notice may be relied upon for bonds sold on or after December 16, 2009, and before the effective date of future regulations or other public administrative guidance affecting funds like the PSF.

On September 16, 2013, the IRS published proposed regulations (the “Proposed IRS Regulations”) that, among other things, would enact the IRS Notice. The preamble to the Proposed IRS Regulations provides that issuers may elect to apply the Proposed IRS

Regulations, in whole or in part, to bonds sold on or after September 16, 2013, and before the date that final regulations become effective.

The IRS Notice and the Proposed IRS Regulations establish a static capacity for the Guarantee Program based upon the cost value of Fund assets on December 16, 2009 multiplied by five. On December 16, 2009, the cost value of the Guarantee Program was \$23,463,730,608 (estimated and unaudited), thereby producing an IRS Limit of approximately \$117.3 billion. The State Capacity Limit is determined on the basis of the cost value of the Fund from time to time multiplied by the capacity multiplier determined annually by the SBOE, but not to exceed a multiplier of five. The capacity of the Guarantee Program will be limited to the lower of the State Capacity Limit and the IRS Limit. On May 21, 2010, the SBOE modified the regulations that govern the School District Bond Guarantee Program (the “SDBGP Rules”), and increased the State Law Capacity to an amount equal to three times the cost value of the PSF. Such modified regulations, including the revised capacity rule, became effective on July 1, 2010. The SDBGP Rules provide that the Commissioner may reduce the multiplier to maintain the AAA credit rating of the Guarantee Program, but provide that any changes to the multiplier made by the Commissioner are to be ratified or rejected by the SBOE at the next meeting following the change. See “Valuation of the PSF and Guaranteed Bonds,” below. The capacity limitation included in the SDBGP Rules is incorporated into the proposed regulations for the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program that are described below.

Since July 1991, when the SBOE amended the Guarantee Program Rules to broaden the range of bonds that are eligible for guarantee under the Guarantee Program to encompass most Texas school district bonds, the principal amount of bonds guaranteed under the Guarantee Program has increased sharply. In addition, in recent years a number of factors have caused an increase in the amount of bonds issued by school districts in the State. See the table “Permanent School Fund Guaranteed Bonds” below. Effective September 1, 2009, the Act provides that the SBOE may annually establish a percentage of the cost value of the Fund to be reserved from use in guaranteeing bonds. The capacity of the Guarantee Program in excess of any reserved portion is referred to herein as the “Capacity Reserve.” The SDBGP Rules provide for a minimum Capacity Reserve for the Guarantee Program of no less than 5%, and provide that the amount of the Capacity Reserve may be increased by a majority vote of the SBOE. The Commissioner is authorized to change the Capacity Reserve, which decision must be ratified or rejected by the SBOE at its next meeting following any change made by the Commissioner. The current Capacity Reserve is noted in the monthly updates with respect to the capacity of the Guarantee Program on the TEA web site at [http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=3413&menu\\_id=2147483695](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index4.aspx?id=3413&menu_id=2147483695), which are also filed with the MSRB.

Based upon historical performance of the Fund, the legal restrictions relating to the amount of bonds that may be guaranteed has generally resulted in a lower ratio of guaranteed bonds to available assets as compared to many other types of credit enhancements that may be available for Texas school district bonds and charter district bonds. However, changes in the value of the

Fund due to changes in securities markets, investment objectives of the Fund, an increase in bond issues by school districts in the State or legal restrictions on the Fund, the implementation of the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program, or an increase in the calculation base of the Fund for purposes of making transfers to the ASF, among other factors, could adversely affect the ratio of Fund assets to guaranteed bonds and the growth of the Fund in general. It is anticipated that the issuance of the IRS Notice and the Proposed IRS Regulations will likely result in a substantial increase in the amount of bonds guaranteed under the Guarantee Program. The implementation of the Charter School Bond Guarantee Program is also expected to increase the amount of guaranteed bonds.

The Act requires that the Commissioner prepare, and the SBOE approve, an annual report on the status of the Guarantee Program (the Annual Report). The State Auditor audits the financial statements of the PSF, which are separate from other State financial statements.

### **The School District Bond Guarantee Program**

The School District Bond Guarantee Program requires an application be made by a school district to the Commissioner for a guarantee of its bonds. If the conditions for the School District Bond Guarantee Program are satisfied, the guarantee becomes effective upon approval of the bonds by the Attorney General and remains in effect until the guaranteed bonds are paid or defeased, by a refunding or otherwise.

In the event of default, holders of guaranteed school district bonds will receive all payments due from the corpus of the PSF. Following a determination that a school district will be or is unable to pay maturing or matured principal or interest on any guaranteed bond, the Act requires the school district to notify the Commissioner not later than the fifth day before the stated maturity date of such bond or interest payment. Immediately following receipt of such notice, the Commissioner must cause to be transferred from the appropriate account in the PSF to the Paying Agent/Registrar an amount necessary to pay the maturing or matured principal and interest. Upon receipt of funds for payment of such principal or interest, the Paying Agent/Registrar must pay the amount due and forward the canceled bond or evidence of payment of the interest to the State Comptroller of Public Accounts (the "Comptroller"). The Commissioner will instruct the Comptroller to withhold the amount paid, plus interest, from the first State money payable to the school district. The amount withheld will be deposited to the credit of the PSF. The Comptroller must hold such canceled bond or evidence of payment of the interest on behalf of the PSF. Following full reimbursement of such payment by the school district to the PSF with interest, the Comptroller will cancel the bond or evidence of payment of the interest and forward it to the school district. The Act permits the Commissioner to order a school district to set a tax rate sufficient to reimburse the PSF for any payments made with respect to guaranteed bonds, and also sufficient to pay future payments on guaranteed bonds, and provides certain enforcement mechanisms to the Commissioner, including the appointment of a board of managers or annexation of a defaulting school district to another school district.

If a school district fails to pay principal or interest on a bond as it is stated to mature, other amounts not due and payable are not accelerated and do not become due and payable by virtue of the district's default. The School District Bond Guarantee Program does not apply to the payment of principal and interest upon redemption of bonds, except upon mandatory sinking fund redemption, and does not apply to the obligation, if any, of a school district to pay a redemption premium on its guaranteed bonds. The guarantee applies to all matured interest on guaranteed school district bonds, whether the bonds were issued with a fixed or variable interest rate and whether the interest rate changes as a result of an interest reset provision or other bond order provision requiring an interest rate change. The guarantee does not extend to any obligation of a school district under any agreement with a third party relating to guaranteed bonds that is defined or described in State law as a "bond enhancement agreement" or a "credit agreement," unless the right to payment of such third party is directly as a result of such third party being a bondholder.

In the event that two or more payments are made from the PSF on behalf of a district, the Commissioner shall request the Attorney General to institute legal action to compel the district and its officers, agents and employees to comply with the duties required of them by law in respect to the payment of guaranteed bonds.

The SBOE has approved and modified the SDBGP Rules in recent years, most recently in May 2010. Generally, the SDBGP Rules limit guarantees to certain types of notes and bonds, including, with respect to refunding bonds issued by school districts, a requirement that the bonds produce debt service savings, and that bonds issued for capital facilities of school districts must have been voted as unlimited tax debt of the issuing district. The Guarantee Program Rules include certain accreditation criteria for districts applying for a guarantee of their bonds, and limit guarantees to districts that have less than the amount of annual debt service per average daily attendance that represents the 90th percentile of annual debt service per average daily attendance for all school districts, but such limitation will not apply to school districts that have enrollment growth of at least 25% over the previous five school years. The SDBGP Rules are codified in the Texas Administrative Code at 19 TAC sections 33.65 et seq., and are available on the TEA web site at <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter033/index.html>.

### **Charter District Bond Guarantee Program**

The Charter District Bond Guarantee Program became effective March 3, 2014. The SBOE published final regulations in the Texas Register that provide for the administration of the Charter District Guarantee Program (the "CDBGP Rules"). The CDBGP Rules are codified at 19 TAC sections 33.67 et seq., and are available on the TEA web site at <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter033/index.html>.

The Charter District Bond Guarantee Program has been authorized through the enactment of amendments to the Act, which provide that a charter holder may make application to the Commissioner for designation as a "charter district" and for a guarantee by the PSF under the

Act of bonds issued on behalf of a charter district by a non-profit corporation. If the conditions for the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program are satisfied, the guarantee becomes effective upon approval of the bonds by the Attorney General and remains in effect until the guaranteed bonds are paid or defeased, by a refunding or otherwise.

The capacity of the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program is limited to the amount that equals the result of the percentage of the number of students enrolled in open-enrollment charter schools in the State compared to the total number of students enrolled in all public schools in the State multiplied by the available capacity of the Guarantee Program. Available capacity is defined as the maximum amount under SBOE rules, less Capacity Reserve and minus existing guarantees. The CDBGP Rules authorize the Commissioner to determine that ratio based on information provided to the TEA by school districts and open-enrollment charter schools, and the calculation will be made annually, on or about March 1 of each year. As of October 2013 (the most recent date for which data is available), the percentage of students enrolled in open-enrollment charter schools (excluding charter schools authorized by school districts) to the total State scholastic census was approximately 3.95%. As of March 7, 2014, there were 209 active open-enrollment charter schools in the State, and there were 613 charter school campuses operating under such charters. Section 12.101, Texas Education Code, as amended by the Legislature in 2013, provides that the Commissioner may grant not more than 215 charters through the end of fiscal year 2014, with the number increasing in each fiscal year thereafter through 2019 to a total number of 305 charters permitted by the statute. While legislation limits the number of charters that may be granted, it does not limit the number of campuses that may operate under a particular charter. For information regarding the capacity of the Guarantee Program, see “Capacity Limits for the Guarantee Program.” The Act provides that the Commissioner may not approve the guarantee of refunding or refinanced bonds under the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program in a total amount that exceeds one-half of the total amount available for the guarantee of charter district bonds under the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program.

In accordance with the Act, the Commissioner may not approve charter district bonds for guarantee if such guarantees will result in lower bond ratings for public school district bonds that are guaranteed under the School District Bond Guarantee Program. To be eligible for a guarantee, the Act provides that a charter district's bonds must be approved by the Attorney General, have an unenhanced investment grade rating from a nationally recognized investment rating firm, and satisfy a limited investigation conducted by the TEA.

With respect to the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program, the Act establishes a bond guarantee reserve fund in the State treasury (the “Charter District Reserve Fund”). Each charter district that has a bond guaranteed must annually remit to the Commissioner, for deposit in the Charter District Reserve Fund, an amount equal to 10% (or such higher amount as may be determined by the Commissioner) of the savings to the charter district that result from the lower interest rate on the bond due to the guarantee by the PSF. The Commissioner’s rule governing the calculation and payment of savings into the Charter District Reserve Fund has been proposed and will be in effect coinciding with the first date at which deposits are required to be made thereto.

The Charter District Bond Guarantee Program does not apply to the payment of principal and interest upon redemption of bonds, except upon mandatory sinking fund redemption, and does not apply to the obligation, if any, of a charter district to pay a redemption premium on its guaranteed bonds. The guarantee applies to all matured interest on guaranteed charter district bonds, whether the bonds were issued with a fixed or variable interest rate and whether the interest rate changes as a result of an interest reset provision or other bond resolution provision requiring an interest rate change. The guarantee does not extend to any obligation of a charter district under any agreement with a third party relating to guaranteed bonds that is defined or described in State law as a "bond enhancement agreement" or a "credit agreement," unless the right to payment of such third party is directly as a result of such third party being a bondholder.

The Act provides that immediately following receipt of notice that a charter district will be or is unable to pay maturing or matured principal or interest on a guaranteed bond, the Commissioner is required to instruct the Comptroller to transfer from the Charter District Reserve Fund to the district's paying agent an amount necessary to pay the maturing or matured principal or interest. If money in the Charter District Reserve Fund is insufficient to pay the amount due on a bond for which a notice of default has been received, the Commissioner is required to instruct the Comptroller to transfer from the PSF to the district's paying agent the amount necessary to pay the balance of the unpaid maturing or matured principal or interest. If a total of two or more payments are made under the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program on charter district bonds and the Commissioner determines that the charter district is acting in bad faith under the program, the Commissioner may request the Attorney General to institute appropriate legal action to compel the charter district and its officers, agents, and employees to comply with the duties required of them by law in regard to the guaranteed bonds. As is the case with the School District Bond Guarantee Program, the Act obligates the Commissioner to instruct the Comptroller to withhold the amount paid with respect to the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program, plus interest, from the first State money payable to a charter district that fails to make a guaranteed payment on its bonds. The amount withheld will be deposited, first, to the credit of the PSF, and then to restore any amount drawn from the Charter District Reserve Fund as a result of the non-payment.

The CDBGP Rules provide that the PSF may be used to guarantee bonds issued for the acquisition, construction, repair, or renovation of an educational facility for an open-enrollment charter holder and equipping real property of an open-enrollment charter school and/or to refinance promissory notes executed by an open-enrollment charter school, each in an amount in excess of \$500,000 the proceeds of which loans were used for a purposes described above (so-called new money bonds) or for refinancing bonds previously issued for the charter school that were approved by the attorney general (so-called refunding bonds). Refunding bonds may not be guaranteed under the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program if they do not result in a present value savings to the charter holder.

The CDBGP Rules provide that an open-enrollment charter holder applying for charter district designation and a guarantee of its bonds under the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program

satisfy various provisions of the regulations, including the following: It must (i) have operated at least one open-enrollment charter school with enrolled students in the State for at least three years; (ii) agree that the bonded indebtedness for which the guarantee is sought will be undertaken as an obligation of all entities under common control of the open-enrollment charter holder, and that all such entities will be liable for the obligation if the open-enrollment charter holder defaults on the bonded indebtedness, provided, however, that an entity that does not operate a charter school in Texas is subject to this provision only to the extent it has received state funds from the open-enrollment charter holder; (iii) have had completed for the past three years an audit for each such year that included unqualified or unmodified audit opinions; and (iv) have received an investment grade credit rating within the last year. Upon receipt of an application for guarantee under the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program, the Commissioner is required to conduct an investigation into the financial status of the applicant charter district and of the accreditation status of all open-enrollment charter schools operated under the charter, within the scope set forth in the CDBGP Rules. Such financial investigation must establish that an applying charter district has a historical debt service coverage ratio, based on annual debt service, of at least 1.1 for the most recently completed fiscal year, and a projected debt service coverage ratio, based on projected revenues and expenses and maximum annual debt service, of at least 1.2. The failure of an open-enrollment charter holder to comply with the Act or the applicable regulations, including by making any material misrepresentations in the charter holder's application for charter district designation or guarantee under the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program, constitutes a material violation of the open-enrollment charter holder's charter.

**Ratings of Bonds Guaranteed Under the Guarantee Program**

Moody’s Investors Service, Standard & Poor’s Rating Service, a Standard & Poor’s Financial Service LLC business, and Fitch Ratings rate bonds guaranteed by the PSF “Aaa,” “AAA” and “AAA,” respectively. Not all districts apply for multiple ratings on their bonds, however. See “Ratings” herein.

**Valuation of the PSF and Guaranteed Bonds**

<b>Permanent School Fund Valuations</b>		
<b>Fiscal Year Ended 8/31</b>	<b>Book Value<sup>(1)</sup></b>	<b>Market Value<sup>(1)</sup></b>
2009	\$23,117,052,793	\$25,443,104,623
2010	23,653,185,489	27,066,200,259
2011	24,701,156,685	29,643,439,794
2012	25,161,994,845	31,284,851,266
2013	25,596,193,826 <sup>(2)</sup>	33,131,028,540 <sup>(2)</sup>

<sup>(1)</sup> SLB managed assets are included in the market value and book value of the Fund. In determining the market value of the PSF from time to time during a fiscal year, the TEA uses current, unaudited values for TEA managed investment portfolios and cash held by the SLB.

With respect to SLB managed assets shown in the table above, market values of land and mineral interests, internally managed real estate, investments in externally managed real estate funds and cash are based upon information reported to the PSF by the SLB. Beginning in fiscal year 2009, the SLB reported that information to the PSF on a quarterly basis. The valuation of such assets at any point in time is dependent upon a variety of factors, including economic conditions in the State and nation in general, and the values of these assets, and, in particular, the valuation of mineral holdings administered by the SLB, can be volatile and subject to material changes from period to period. At August 31, 2013, land, mineral assets, internally managed discretionary real estate, external discretionary real estate investments and cash managed by the SLB had book values of approximately \$19.8 million, \$13.4 million, \$343.8 million, \$1.8 billion, and \$1.2 billion respectively, and market values of approximately \$366.2 million, \$2.3 billion, \$348.9 million, \$1.7 billion and \$1.2 billion, respectively.

<sup>(2)</sup> At February 28, 2014, the PSF had a book value of \$26,403,872,521 and a market value of \$35,871,072,992 (in each case, based on unaudited data).

<b>Permanent School Fund Guaranteed Bonds</b>	
At 8/31	Principal Amount <sup>(1)</sup>
2009	\$50,032,724,439
2010	49,301,683,338
2011	52,653,930,546
2012	53,634,455,141 <sup>(2)</sup>
2013	55,218,889,156

<sup>(1)</sup> Represents original principal amount; does not reflect any subsequent accretions in value for compound interest bonds (zero coupon securities). The amount shown excludes bonds that have been refunded and released from the Guarantee Program. The TEA does not maintain records of the accreted value of capital appreciation bonds that are guaranteed under the Guarantee Program.

<sup>(2)</sup> As of August 31, 2013, the TEA expected that the principal and interest to be paid by school districts over the remaining life of the bonds guaranteed by the Guarantee Program is \$91,490,196,730, of which \$36,271,307,574 represents interest to be paid. At February 28, 2014, there were \$56,050,507,440.14 of bonds guaranteed under the Guarantee Program and the capacity of the Guarantee Program was \$79,211,617,563 based on the three times cost value multiplier approved by the SBOE on May 21, 2010. Such capacity figures include the Reserve Capacity.

### **Discussion and Analysis Pertaining to Fiscal Year Ended August 31, 2013**

The following discussion is derived from the Annual Report for the year ended August 31, 2013, including the Message of the Executive Administrator of the Fund and the Management's Discussion and Analysis contained therein. Reference is made to the Annual Report, when filed, for the complete Message and MD&A. Investment assets managed by the fifteen member SBOE are referred to throughout this MD&A as the PSF(SBOE) assets. As of August 31, 2013, the Fund's land, mineral rights and certain real assets are managed by the three-member SLB and



these assets are referred to throughout as the PSF(SLB) assets. The 2012 SBOE Asset Allocation Policy includes an allocation for real estate investments, and as such investments are made, and become a part of the PSF investment portfolio, those investments will be managed by the SBOE and not the SLB.

At the end of fiscal 2013, the total Fund balance was \$30.6 billion. Fund balance increased \$1.80 billion from the prior year, primarily attributable to the increase in the fair value of the PSF(SBOE) equities and alternative investments, the (PSF(SLB) real assets investments and the recovering markets. During the year, the SBOE continued implementing its revised long term strategic asset allocation to diversify and strengthen the PSF(SBOE) investment assets of the Fund. The revised allocation is projected to increase returns over the long run while reducing risk and return volatility of the portfolio. The one year, three year, five year and ten year annualized total returns for the PSF(SBOE) assets were 10.16%, 11.07%, 6.16% and 7.26% respectively (total return takes into consideration the change in the market value of the Fund during the year as well as the interest and dividend income generated by the Fund's investments). In addition, the SLB continued its shift into externally managed real asset investment funds and the one year, three year, and five year annualized total returns for the PSF(SLB) real assets, including cash, are 7.60%, 9.56%, and 1.04% respectively.

The market value of the Fund's assets is directly impacted by the performance of the various financial markets in which the assets are invested. The most important factors affecting investment performance are the asset allocation decisions made by the SBOE and SLB. The current SBOE long term asset allocation policy allows for diversification of the PSF(SBOE) portfolio into alternative asset classes whose returns are not as correlated to traditional asset classes. The implementation of the long term asset allocation will occur over several fiscal years and is expected to provide incremental total return at reduced risk. As of August 31, 2013, the PSF(SBOE) portion of the Fund had diversified into emerging market large cap international equities, absolute return funds, real estate, private equity, risk parity, real return Treasury Inflation-Protected Securities and real return commodities. Other asset classes such as emerging market debt and emerging international equities securities will be strategically added commensurate with the economic environment and the goals and objectives of the SBOE. As of August 31, 2013, the SBOE had approved and the PSF(SBOE) made capital commitments to externally managed real estate funds in the amount of \$1.25 billion and capital commitments to four private equity limited partnerships in the total amount of \$2.2 billion. Unfunded commitments at August 31, 2013, were \$513.0 million in real estate and \$1.58 billion in private equity.

The PSF(SLB) portfolio is generally characterized by three broad categories: (1) discretionary real assets investments, (2) sovereign and other lands, and (3) mineral interests. Discretionary real assets investments consist of externally managed real estate, infrastructure, and energy/minerals investment funds; internally managed direct real estate investments, and cash. Sovereign and other lands consist primarily of the lands set aside to the PSF when it was created. Mineral interests consist of all of the minerals that are associated with PSF lands. The investment focus of PSF(SLB) discretionary real assets investments has shifted from internally

managed direct real estate investments to externally managed real assets investment funds. The PSF(SLB) makes investments in certain limited partnerships that legally commit it to possible future capital contributions. At August 31, 2013, the remaining commitments totaled approximately \$1.14 billion.

The PSF(SBOE)'s investment in public equity securities experienced a return of 17.709% during the fiscal year ended August 31, 2013. The PSF(SBOE)'s investment in fixed income securities produced a return of -2.02% during the fiscal year and absolute return investments yielded a return of 10.23%. The PSF(SBOE) real estate and private equity investments returned 11.85% and 26.89%, respectively. Risk parity assets produced a return of -3.28%, while real return assets yielded -7.99%. Combined, all PSF(SBOE) asset classes produced an investment return of 10.16% for the fiscal year ended August 31, 2013, underperforming the target index by approximately 25 basis points. All PSF(SLB) real assets (including cash) returned 7.60% for the fiscal year ending August 31, 2013.

For fiscal year 2013, total revenues, inclusive of unrealized gains and losses and net of security lending rebates and fees, totaled \$3.20 billion, an increase of \$251.6 million from fiscal year 2012 earnings of \$2.95 billion. This increase reflects the performance of the securities markets in which the Fund was invested in fiscal year 2013. In fiscal year 2013, revenues earned by the Fund included lease payments, bonuses and royalty income received from oil, gas and mineral leases; lease payments from commercial real estate; surface lease and easement revenues; revenues from the resale of natural and liquid gas supplies; dividends, interest, and securities lending revenues; the net change in the fair value of the investment portfolio; and, other miscellaneous fees and income.

Expenditures are paid from the Fund before distributions are made under the total return formula. Such expenditures include the costs incurred by the SLB to manage the land endowment, as well as operational costs of the Fund, including external management fees paid from appropriated funds. Total operating expenditures, net of security lending rebates and fees, increased 11.6% for the fiscal year ending August 31, 2013. This increase is primarily attributable to the operational costs related to managing alternative investments.

The Fund supports the public school system in the State by distributing a predetermined percentage of its asset value to the ASF. For fiscal years 2012 and 2013, the distribution from the SBOE to the ASF totaled \$1.021 billion and \$1.021 billion, respectively. Additionally, the SLB provided \$300 million to the ASF in fiscal year 2013.

At the end of the 2013 fiscal year, PSF assets guaranteed \$55.219 billion in bonds issued by 810 local school districts. Since its inception in 1983, the Fund has guaranteed 5,280 school district bond issues totaling \$112.0 billion in principal amount. During the 2013 fiscal year, the number of outstanding issues guaranteed under the Guarantee Program increased by 155, or 5.9%. The dollar amount of guaranteed school bond issues outstanding increased by \$1.58 billion or 3.0%. The guarantee capacity of the Fund increased by \$1.312 billion, or 1.7%, during fiscal year 2013 due to the investment performance of the Fund.

## **2011 Constitutional Amendment**

During the Regular Session of the 82nd Legislature, which concluded May 30, 2011, a joint resolution (“HJR 109”) was enacted proposing amendments to various sections of the Texas Constitution that pertain to the PSF. In accordance with HJR 109, a referendum was held in the State on November 8, 2011. At that referendum, voters of State approved non-substantive changes to the Texas Constitution to clarify references to the Fund, and, in addition, approved an amendment that effects an increase to the base amount used in calculating the Distribution Rate from the Fund to the ASF. The amendments approved at the referendum include an increase to the base used to calculate the Distribution Rate by adding to the calculation base certain discretionary real assets and cash in the Fund that is managed by entities other than the SBOE (at present, by the SLB). The value of those assets were already included in the value of the Fund for purposes of the Guarantee Program, but prior to the amendment had not been included in the calculation base for purposes of making transfers from the Fund to the ASF. While the amendment provides for an increase in the base for the calculation of approximately \$2 billion, no new resources were provided for deposit to the Fund. As described under “The Total Return Constitutional Amendment” the SBOE is prevented from approving a Distribution Rate or making a pay out from the Fund if the amount distributed would exceed 6% of the average of the market value of the Fund, excluding real property in the Fund, but including discretionary real asset investments on the last day of each of the sixteen State fiscal quarters preceding the Regular Session of the Legislature that begins before that State fiscal biennium or if such pay out would exceed the Ten Year Total Return. The new calculation base is required to be used to determine all payments to the ASF from the Fund beginning with the 2012-13 biennium. As described under “The Total Return Constitutional Amendment” the SBOE approved a Distribution Rate of 4.2% in January 2011 based on a commitment of the SLB to transfer \$500 million to the PSF during the biennium. In November 2012, the SBOE established a 3.3% Distribution Rate for the 2014-15 biennium.

The constitutional amendments approved on November 8, 2011 also provides authority to the GLO or other entity other than the SBOE that has responsibility for the management of land or other properties of the Fund to determine in its sole discretion whether to transfer each year from Fund assets to the ASF revenue derived from such land or properties, an amount not to exceed \$300 million. Any amount transferred to the ASF by an entity other than the SBOE is excluded from the 6% Distribution Rate limitation applicable to SBOE transfers.

The impact of the increase in the base against which the Distribution Rate is applied will be an increase in the distributions from the PSF to the ASF, provided that there are no reductions in the percentage established biennially by the SBOE to be the Distribution Rate. For the 2012-13 biennium, the Distribution Rate has been set by the SBOE at 4.2%. Given the increase in the calculation base effected by the November 8, 2011 constitutional amendment, the effect on transfers made by the SBOE in 2012-13 will be an increase in the total return distribution by an estimated \$73.7 million in each year of the biennium. Going forward, it may be necessary for the SBOE to reduce the Distribution Rate in order to preserve the corpus of the Fund in

accordance with its management objective of preserving intergenerational equity, and the Distribution Rate for the 2014-15 biennium has been reduced to 3.3%, as described above. If the SBOE were to maintain a Distribution Rate in future years at the level set for 2012-13, prior to the enactment of the 2011 constitutional amendment, as the value of the real assets investments increase annually, distributions to the ASF would increase in the out years. The increased amounts distributed from the Fund will be a loss to either the investment corpus of the PSF managed by SBOE or, should the SLB increase its transfers to the SBOE to cover this share of the distribution, to the assets managed by the SLB. In addition, the changes made by the amendment will reduce the compounding interest in the Fund that would be derived from these assets remaining in the corpus of the Fund. Other factors that may affect the corpus of the Fund that are associated with this change include the decisions that are made by the SLB or others that are or may in the future be authorized to make transfers of funds from the PSF to the ASF. While the SBOE has oversight of the Guarantee Program, it will not have the decision making power with respect to all transfers to the ASF, as it has had in the past, which could adversely affect the ability of the SBOE to optimally manage its portion of the PSF assets.

### **Other Events and Disclosures**

The State Investment Ethics Code governs the ethics and disclosure requirements for financial advisors and other service providers who advise certain State governmental entities, including the PSF. In accordance with the provisions of the State Investment Ethics Code, the SBOE periodically modifies its code of ethics, which occurred most recently in May 2010. The SBOE code of ethics includes prohibitions on sharing confidential information, avoiding conflict of interests and requiring disclosure filings with respect to contributions made or received in connection with the operation or management of the Fund. The code of ethics applies to members of the SBOE as well as to persons who are responsible by contract or by virtue of being a TEA PSF staff member for managing, investing, executing brokerage transactions, providing consultant services, or acting as a custodian of the PSF, and persons who provide investment and management advice to a member of the SBOE, with or without compensation under certain circumstances. The code of ethics is codified in the Texas Administrative Code at 19 TAC sections 33.5 et seq., and is available on the TEA web site at <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter033/index.html>.

Since 2007, TEA has made supplemental appropriation requests to the Legislature for the purpose of funding the implementation of the 2008 Asset Allocation Policy, but those requests have been denied or partly funded. In the 2011 legislative session, the Legislature approved an increase of 31 positions in the full-time equivalent employees for the administration of the Fund, which was funded as part of an \$18 million appropriation for each year of the 2012-13 biennium, in addition to the operational appropriation of \$11 million for each year of the biennium. The TEA has begun increasing the PSF administrative staff in accordance with the 2011 legislative appropriation, and the TEA received an appropriation of \$30.0 million for the administration of the PSF for each year of the 2014-15 biennium.

As of August 31, 2013, certain lawsuits were pending against the State and/or the GLO, which challenge the Fund's title to certain real property and/or past or future mineral income from that property, and other litigation arising in the normal course of the investment activities of the PSF. Reference is made to the Annual Report, when filed, for a description of such lawsuits that are pending, which may represent contingent liabilities of the Fund.

The SBOE is a named defendant in litigation described in the Official Statement pertaining to the Bonds that has been filed in State District Court that has challenged the constitutionality of the Texas public school finance system, and which, among other relief requested, seeks an injunction to prohibit the State and its officials from distributing any funds under the current finance system until a constitutional system is created. The TEA does not anticipate that the security for payment of bonds guaranteed under the Guarantee Program would be adversely affected by such litigation.

### **PSF Continuing Disclosure Undertaking**

The SBOE has adopted an investment policy rule (the "TEA Rule") pertaining to the PSF and the Guarantee Program. The TEA Rule is codified in Section I of the TEA Investment Procedure Manual, which relates to the Guarantee Program. The most recent amendment to the TEA Rule was adopted by the SBOE on November 19, 2010, and is summarized below. Through the adoption of the TEA Rule and its commitment to guarantee bonds, the SBOE has made the following agreement for the benefit of the issuers, holders and beneficial owners of guaranteed bonds. The TEA (or its successor with respect to the management of the Guarantee Program) is required to observe the agreement for so long as it remains an "obligated person," within the meaning of Rule 15c2-12, with respect to guaranteed bonds. Nothing in the TEA Rule obligates the TEA to make any filings or disclosures with respect to guaranteed bonds, as the obligations of the TEA under the TEA Rule pertain solely to the Guarantee Program. The issuer or an "obligated person" of the guaranteed bonds has assumed the applicable obligation under Rule 15c-12 to make all disclosures and filings relating directly to guaranteed bonds, and the TEA takes no responsibility with respect to such undertakings. Under the TEA agreement, the TEA will be obligated to provide annually certain updated financial information and operating data, and timely notice of specified material events, to the MSRB.

The MSRB has established the Electronic Municipal Market Access ("EMMA") system, and the TEA is required to file its continuing disclosure information using the EMMA system. Investors may access continuing disclosure information filed with the MSRB at [www.emma.msrb.org](http://www.emma.msrb.org).

### **Annual Reports**

The TEA will annually provide certain updated financial information and operating data to the MSRB. The information to be updated includes all quantitative financial information and operating data with respect to the Guarantee Program and the PSF of the general type included in this Official Statement under the heading "THE PERMANENT SCHOOL FUND

GUARANTEE PROGRAM.” The information also includes the Annual Report. The TEA will update and provide this information within six months after the end of each fiscal year.

The TEA may provide updated information in full text or may incorporate by reference certain other publicly-available documents, as permitted by Rule 15c2-12. The updated information includes audited financial statements of, or relating to, the State or the PSF, when and if such audits are commissioned and available. Financial statements of the State will be prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles as applied to state governments, as such principles may be changed from time to time, or such other accounting principles as the State Auditor is required to employ from time to time pursuant to State law or regulation. The financial statements of the Fund were prepared to conform to U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles as established by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board.

The Fund is reported by the State of Texas as a permanent fund and accounted for on a current financial resources measurement focus and the modified accrual basis of accounting. Measurement focus refers to the definition of the resource flows measured. Under the modified accrual basis of accounting, all revenues reported are recognized based on the criteria of availability and measurability. Assets are defined as available if they are in the form of cash or can be converted into cash within 60 days to be usable for payment of current liabilities. Amounts are defined as measurable if they can be estimated or otherwise determined. Expenditures are recognized when the related fund liability is incurred.

The State’s current fiscal year end is August 31. Accordingly, the TEA must provide updated information by the last day of February in each year, unless the State changes its fiscal year. If the State changes its fiscal year, the TEA will notify the MSRB of the change.

### **Material Event Notices**

The TEA will also provide timely notices of certain events to the MSRB. Such notices will be provided not more than ten business days after the occurrence of the event. The TEA will provide notice of any of the following events with respect to the Guarantee Program: (1) principal and interest payment delinquencies; (2) non-payment related defaults, if such event is material within the meaning of the federal securities laws; (3) unscheduled draws on debt service reserves reflecting financial difficulties; (4) unscheduled draws on credit enhancements reflecting financial difficulties; (5) substitution of credit or liquidity providers, or their failure to perform; (6) adverse tax opinions, the issuance by the IRS of proposed or final determinations of taxability, Notices of Proposed Issue (IRS Form 5701-TEB), or other material notices or determinations with respect to the tax-exempt status of the Guarantee Program, or other material events affecting the tax status of the Guarantee Program; (7) modifications to rights of holders of bonds guaranteed by the Guarantee Program, if such event is material within the meaning of the federal securities laws; (8) bond calls, if such event is material within the meaning of the federal securities laws, and tender offers; (9) defeasances; (10) release, substitution, or sale of property securing repayment of bonds guaranteed by the Guarantee Program, if such event is material within the meaning of the federal securities laws; (11) rating changes; (12) bankruptcy,

insolvency, receivership, or similar event of the Guarantee Program (which is considered to occur when any of the following occur: the appointment of a receiver, fiscal agent, or similar officer for the Guarantee Program in a proceeding under the United States Bankruptcy Code or in any other proceeding under state or federal law in which a court or governmental authority has assumed jurisdiction over substantially all of the assets or business of the Guarantee Program, or if such jurisdiction has been assumed by leaving the existing governing body and officials or officers in possession but subject to the supervision and orders of a court or governmental authority, or the entry of an order confirming a plan of reorganization, arrangement, or liquidation by a court or governmental authority having supervision or jurisdiction over substantially all of the assets or business of the Guarantee Program); (13) the consummation of a merger, consolidation, or acquisition involving the Guarantee Program or the sale of all or substantially all of its assets, other than in the ordinary course of business, the entry into of a definitive agreement to undertake such an action or the termination of a definitive agreement relating to any such actions, other than pursuant to its terms, if material; and (14) the appointment of a successor or additional trustee with respect to the Guarantee Program or the change of name of a trustee, if such event is material within the meaning of the federal securities laws. (Neither the Act nor any other law, regulation or instrument pertaining to the Guarantee Program make any provision with respect to the Guarantee Program for bond calls, debt service reserves, credit enhancement, liquidity enhancement, early redemption or the appointment of a trustee with respect to the Guarantee Program.) In addition, the TEA will provide timely notice of any failure by the TEA to provide information, data, or financial statements in accordance with its agreement described above under “Annual Reports.”

### **Availability of Information**

The TEA has agreed to provide the foregoing information only to the MSRB and to transmit such information electronically to the MSRB in such format and accompanied by such identifying information as prescribed by the MSRB. The information is available from the MSRB to the public without charge at [www.emma.msrb.org](http://www.emma.msrb.org).

### **Limitations and Amendments**

The TEA has agreed to update information and to provide notices of material events only as described above. The TEA has not agreed to provide other information that may be relevant or material to a complete presentation of its financial results of operations, condition, or prospects or agreed to update any information that is provided, except as described above. The TEA makes no representation or warranty concerning such information or concerning its usefulness to a decision to invest in or sell Bonds at any future date. The TEA disclaims any contractual or tort liability for damages resulting in whole or in part from any breach of its continuing disclosure agreement or from any statement made pursuant to its agreement, although holders of Bonds may seek a writ of mandamus to compel the TEA to comply with its agreement.

The continuing disclosure agreement of the TEA is made only with respect to the PSF and the Guarantee Program. The issuer of guaranteed bonds or an obligated person with respect to

guaranteed bonds may make a continuing disclosure undertaking in accordance with Rule 15c2-12 with respect to its obligations arising under Rule 15c2-12 pertaining to financial and operating data concerning such entity and notices of material events relating to such guaranteed bonds. A description of such undertaking, if any, is included elsewhere in the Official Statement.

This continuing disclosure agreement may be amended by the TEA from time to time to adapt to changed circumstances that arise from a change in legal requirements, a change in law, or a change in the identity, nature, status, or type of operations of the TEA, but only if (1) the provisions, as so amended, would have permitted an underwriter to purchase or sell guaranteed bonds in the primary offering of such bonds in compliance with Rule 15c2-12, taking into account any amendments or interpretations of Rule 15c2-12 since such offering as well as such changed circumstances and (2) either (a) the holders of a majority in aggregate principal amount of the outstanding bonds guaranteed by the Guarantee Program consent to such amendment or (b) a person that is unaffiliated with the TEA (such as nationally recognized bond counsel) determines that such amendment will not materially impair the interest of the holders and beneficial owners of the bonds guaranteed by the Guarantee Program. The TEA may also amend or repeal the provisions of its continuing disclosure agreement if the SEC amends or repeals the applicable provision of Rule 15c2-12 or a court of final jurisdiction enters judgment that such provisions of the Rule are invalid, but only if and to the extent that the provisions of this sentence would not prevent an underwriter from lawfully purchasing or selling bonds guaranteed by the Guarantee Program in the primary offering of such bonds.

### **Compliance with Prior Undertakings**

The TEA has not previously failed to substantially comply with its previous continuing disclosure agreements in accordance with Rule 15c2-12.

### **SEC Exemptive Relief**

On February 9, 1996, the TEA received a letter from the Chief Counsel of the SEC that pertains to the availability of the “small issuer exemption” set forth in paragraph (d)(2) of Rule 15c2-12. The letter provides that Texas school districts which offer municipal securities that are guaranteed under the Guarantee Program may undertake to comply with the provisions of paragraph (d)(2) of Rule 15c2-12 if their offerings otherwise qualify for such exemption, notwithstanding the guarantee of the school district securities under the Guarantee Program. Among other requirements established by Rule 15c2-12, a school district offering may qualify for the small issuer exemption if, upon issuance of the proposed series of securities, the school district will have no more than \$10 million of outstanding municipal securities.