

(Dated: April 29, 2022)

## **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 is governed 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.

During the 87th Regular Session of the Texas Legislature (the “87<sup>th</sup> Regular Session”), which concluded on May 31, 2021, Senate Bill 1232 (“SB 1232” or “the bill”) was enacted, and the bill became effective on September 1, 2021. SB 1232 provides for a variety of changes to the operations and management of the Fund, including the creation of the Permanent School Fund Corporation (the “PSF Corporation”), and the delegation of responsibility to manage the portion of the Fund previously under the management supervision of the State Board of Education (the “SBOE”) to the PSF Corporation. SB 1232 also requires changes with respect to the management of certain investments previously made at the discretion of the Texas School Land Board (“the “SLB”), including limiting the types of investments that may be made by the SLB and mandating the transfer of cash and certain other investment properties from the SLB to the PSF Corporation once the PSF Corporation is created. Certain of the authorizations of SB 1232, including the creation of the PSF Corporation have occurred, but other authorized changes are expected to be implemented in phases, generally from the first quarter of calendar year 2022 through the end of calendar year 2023. See “Management Transition to the PSF Corporation” for a summary of SB 1232 and its expected impact on the management and operations of the Fund.

### **History and Purpose**

The PSF supports the State’s public school system in two major ways: distributions to the constitutionally established Available School Fund (the “ASF”), as described below, and the guarantee of school district and charter district issued bonds through the Guarantee Program. 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, with the sole purpose of assisting in

the funding of public education for present and future generations. The Constitution of 1876 described that the PSF would be “permanent,” and 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, only the income produced by the PSF could be used to complement taxes in financing public education, which primarily consisted of income from securities, 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.

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 “Education Commissioner”), bonds properly issued by a school district are fully guaranteed by the PSF. See “The School District Bond Guarantee Program.”

In 2011, legislation was enacted that established the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program as a new component of the Guarantee Program. That legislation 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 Education Commissioner. On approval by the Education Commissioner, bonds properly issued by a charter district participating in the Guarantee Program are fully guaranteed by the PSF. The Charter District Bond Guarantee Program 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 (the “Attorney General”) been requested to issue an opinion, with respect to its constitutional validity.

Audited financial information for the SBOE financial portfolios of the PSF is provided annually through the PSF Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (the “Annual Report”), which is filed with the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (“MSRB”). The SLB’s land and real assets investment operations, which are part of the PSF as described below, are included in the annual financial report of the Texas General Land Office (the “GLO”) that is included in the comprehensive annual report of the State of Texas. 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, 2021, when 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, 2021 is derived from the audited financial statements of the PSF, which are included in the Annual Report when and as 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, 2021 and for a description of the financial results of the PSF for the year ended August 31, 2021, the most recent year for which audited financial information regarding the Fund is available. The 2021 Annual Report speaks only as of its date and the TEA has not obligated itself to update the 2021 Annual Report or any other Annual Report. The TEA posts (i) each Annual Report, which includes statistical data regarding the Fund as of the close of each fiscal year, (ii) the most recent disclosure for the Guarantee Program, (iii) 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”), and (iv) monthly updates with respect to the capacity of the Guarantee Program (collectively, the “Web Site Materials”) on the TEA web site at [http://tea.texas.gov/Finance\\_and\\_Grants/Permanent\\_School\\_Fund/](http://tea.texas.gov/Finance_and_Grants/Permanent_School_Fund/) 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, as filed, is incorporated herein and made a part hereof for all purposes. See “Management Transition to the PSF Corporation” for ongoing changes in the management structure of the Fund that may result in changes to the annual audit prepared with respect to the Fund.

### **Management and Administration of the Fund Prior to the Implementation of SB 1232**

*The following discussion describes the legal and management structure of the Fund prior to full implementation of SB 1232, which has begun and is expected to continue in phases over an*

*approximately two year period. See “Management Transition to the PSF Corporation” for summaries of certain laws applicable to the Fund pursuant to the Texas Constitution and SB 1232 and the ongoing changes in the management structure 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. The SBOE consists of 15 members who are elected by territorial districts in the State to four year terms of office.

The Texas Constitution provides that the Fund shall be managed through the exercise of 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 “Prudent Person Standard”). 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.

In accordance with the Texas Constitution, the SBOE views the PSF as a perpetual endowment, 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 below, the Total Return Constitutional Amendment restricts the annual pay-out from the Fund to both (i) 6% of the average of the market value of the Fund, excluding real property, 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, and (ii) the total-return on all investment assets of the Fund over a rolling ten-year period.

By law, the Education Commissioner is appointed by the Governor, with Senate confirmation, and assists the SBOE, but the Education Commissioner can neither be hired nor dismissed by the SBOE. The Executive Administrator of the Fund is hired by and reports to the Education Commissioner. Moreover, although the Fund’s Executive Administrator and the PSF staff at TEA implement the decisions of and provide information to the School Finance/PSF Committee of the SBOE (the “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.

The Total Return Constitutional Amendment shifted administrative costs of the Fund from the ASF to the PSF, providing that expenses of managing the PSF are to be paid “by appropriation” from the PSF. In January 2005, the Attorney General issued a legal opinion, Op. Tex. Att’y Gen. No. GA-0293 (2005), stating 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.

The SBOE/PSF investment staff and the SBOE's investment consultant for the Fund are tasked with advising the SBOE with respect to the implementation of the Fund's asset allocation policy, including the timing and manner of the selection of any external managers and other consultants.

The SBOE contracts with a financial institution for custodial and securities lending services in addition to the performance measurement of the total return of the Fund's financial assets managed by the SBOE. 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. Like other State agencies and instrumentalities that manage large investment portfolios, the PSF has an incentive compensation plan that may provide additional compensation for investment personnel, depending upon the criteria relating to the investment performance of the Fund.

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

Texas law assigns to the SLB the ability to control of the Fund's land and mineral rights and make investments in real assets. Administrative duties related to the land and mineral rights reside with the GLO, which is under the guidance of the elected commissioner of the GLO (the "Land Commissioner. The SLB manages the proceeds of the land and mineral rights that are administrated by the GLO on behalf of the Fund. The SLB is governed by a five member board, the membership of which consists of the Land Commissioner, who sits as the chairman of the board, and four citizen members appointed by the Governor. The SLB and is generally authorized to invest in the following asset classes:

- Discretionary real assets investments consisting of externally managed real estate, infrastructure, and energy/minerals investment funds, separate accounts, and co-investment vehicles; internally managed direct real estate investments, and associated cash;
- Sovereign and other lands, being the lands set aside for the Fund when it was created, and other various lands not considered discretionary real asset investments; and,
- Mineral interests associated with Fund lands.

At August 31, 2021, the SLB managed approximately 15% of the PSF, as reflected in the fund balance of the PSF at that date. See "Management Transition to the PSF Corporation" for a summary of SB 1232 and its expected impact on the management and operations of the Fund.

In 2019, the Texas Legislature enacted legislation that required an annual joint meeting of the SLB and the SBOE for the purpose of discussing the allocation of the assets of the PSF and the

investment of money in the PSF. Other legislation enacted in 2019 included a bill that created a “permanent school fund liquid account” (the “Liquid Account”) in the PSF for the purpose of receiving funds transferred from the SLB on a quarterly basis that are not then invested by the SLB or needed within the forthcoming quarter for investment by the SBOE. That legislation also provided for the SBOE to administer and invest the Liquid Account and required the TEA, in consultation with the GLO, to conduct a study regarding distributions to the ASF from the PSF. That study (the “PSF Distribution Study”), dated August 31, 2020, is available at <https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/TEA-Distribution-Study.pdf>.

### **Management Transition to the PSF Corporation**

In accordance with SB 1232, at its November 2021 board meeting, the SBOE approved the articles of formation of the PSF Corporation. The articles were filed on December 1, 2021, thus effecting the creation of the PSF Corporation. SB 1232 authorizes the SBOE to delegate investment authority over the PSF and the Charter District Reserve Fund to the PSF Corporation. The bill also provides that the PSF Corporation, the SBOE and TEA must coordinate to determine the PSF Corporation’s role in the operation and management of the Guarantee Program to ensure the proper and efficient operation of the program.

The description of SB 1232 that follows summarizes some key provisions of the bill. The full text of the bill can be found at <https://capitol.texas.gov/BillLookup/Text.aspx?LegSess=87R&Bill=SB1232>. SB 1232 provides for various transition dates relating to implementation of the bill, with the latest dates generally occurring in calendar year 2023. As a result, the full implementation of SB 1232 will necessarily evolve over time with the timing of certain aspects of its implementation yet to be determined.

As allowed by SB 1232, the PSF Corporation has been created as a special-purpose governmental corporation and instrumentality of the State which is entitled to sovereign immunity. The PSF Corporation is to be governed by nine-member board of directors (the “Board”), consisting of five members of the SBOE, the Land Commissioner, and three appointed members who have substantial background and expertise in investments and asset management; with one of the appointees being appointed by the Land Commissioner and the other two appointed by the Governor with confirmation by the Senate.

At the inaugural meeting of the Board in January 2022, the Board appointed the Executive Administrator of the Fund as the interim chief executive officer of the PSF Corporation and in April 2022 the Executive Administrator of the Fund was confirmed as the chief executive officer of the PSF Corporation. The chief executive officer will report to the Board. Any amendments to the PSF Corporation’s articles of formation and bylaws will be adopted by the Board but are subject to approval by the SBOE.

Notwithstanding the management transition for the Fund from the SBOE to the PSF Corporation, the provisions of the Texas Constitution that formerly applied to the SBOE’s management will continue to provide a framework for the management of the Fund. In particular, the Prudent Person Standard is applicable to the PSF Corporation, and the Total Return Constitutional Amendment

will govern distributions from the PSF to the ASF by the SBOE. A separate constitutional provision allowing distributions from the PSF to the ASF that is currently used by the SLB was also granted to the PSF Corporation. When determining any amount to distribute, the PSF Corporation may consider distributions made by the SBOE. In addition, the Fund will continue to be managed as a perpetual endowment for the benefit of citizens of the State.

The SLB's investments in real estate investment funds and real asset investment funds will transfer to the PSF Corporation. Beginning December 31, 2022, the SLB will no longer be authorized to make investments into funds; however, the SLB will still be able to invest in land, mineral and royalty interests, and direct real estate holdings; the SLB will also be required to send PSF mineral revenue to the PSF Corporation for investment, subject to designation via the appropriations process to cover GLO expenses of managing the minerals. Tentatively, the transfer of SLB assets to the management of the PSF Corporation is expected to occur in late 2022 or early 2023, but exceptions could be made for specific investments.

In connection with the transfer of SLB's investment funds to the PSF Corporation, the PSF Corporation will also determine when the Liquid Account can be abolished, and any remaining balance transferred to the PSF managed by the PSF Corporation.

Not less than once each year, the Board must submit an audit report to the Legislative Budget Board ("LBB") regarding the operations of the PSF Corporation. The PSF Corporation may contract with a certified public accountant or the State Auditor to conduct an independent audit of the operations of the PSF Corporation, but such authorization does not affect the State Auditor's authority to conduct an audit of the PSF Corporation in accordance with other State laws.

As required by State law, during the 87<sup>th</sup> Regular Session the LBB issued a fiscal note on SB 1232. The fiscal note stated that uncertainty exists regarding the nature of future returns and the effect of the bill on distributions from all components of the PSF to the ASF, such that the financial impact of the bill could not be determined during the legislative session. However, the fiscal note stated that TEA and the GLO projected that the changes effected by the bill will have a positive fiscal impact in terms of growth of the Fund and future Fund distributions. No assurances can be given as to future investment results for the Fund.

The State general appropriations act for fiscal years 2022-23 required TEA (and GLO) to submit a plan to the LBB describing the steps required to implement SB 1232, and the plan was submitted on September 1, 2021. The plan included a description of appropriated funds and full time equivalent employees ("FTEs") to be transferred to PSF Corporation and identified costs to accrue to TEA as a result of such transfers. The plan identified a cost range of approximately \$8,000,000 to \$11,000,000 required in connection with the establishment of the PSF Corporation. During the Summer or Fall of 2022, an appropriation request is expected to be made by the chief executive officer of the PSF Corporation acting in cooperation with the Board to LBB in preparation for the 2024-2025 State biennium.

## **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. Prior to the adoption of the Total Return Constitutional Amendment, all interest and dividend income produced by Fund investments flowed into the ASF, where they were distributed to local school districts and open-enrollment charter schools based on average daily attendance, any net gains from investments of the Fund were reflected in the value of the PSF, and costs of administering the PSF were allocated to the ASF. 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, in accordance with the rate adopted by: (a) a vote of two-thirds of the total membership of the 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”), 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.” The definition of intergenerational equity that the SBOE has generally followed is the maintenance of 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 real terms. In making this determination, the SBOE takes into account various considerations, and relies upon its staff and external investment consultants, which undertake analysis for long-term projection periods that includes certain assumptions. Among the assumptions used in the analysis are a projected rate of growth of student enrollment State-wide, the projected

contributions and expenses of the Fund, projected returns in the capital markets and a projected inflation rate.

On November 8, 2011, a referendum was held in the State at which voters of the State approved amendments that effected an increase to the base amount used in calculating the Distribution Rate from the Fund to the ASF and authorized the SLB to make direct transfers to the ASF, as described below.

The November 8, 2011 referendum included 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 was 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 provided 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 constitutional amendments approved on November 8, 2011, also provided authority to the GLO or another entity (described in statute as the SLB) that has responsibility for the management of revenues derived from land or other properties of the PSF to determine whether to transfer an amount each year to the ASF from the revenue derived during the current year from such land or properties. Prior to November 2019, the amount authorized to be transferred to the ASF from the GLO or SLB was limited to \$300 million per year. On November 5, 2019, a constitutional amendment was approved by State voters that increased the maximum transfer to the ASF to \$600 million each year from the revenue derived during that year from the PSF from the GLO, the SBOE or another entity to the extent such entity has the responsibility for the management of revenues derived from such land or other properties. Any amount transferred to the ASF pursuant to this constitutional provision is excluded from the 6% Distribution Rate limitation applicable to SBOE transfers.

The following table shows amounts distributed to the ASF from the portions of the Fund administered by the SBOE (the “PSF(SBOE)”) and the SLB (the “PSF(SLB)”).

**Annual Distributions to the Available School Fund<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Fiscal Year Ending</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>
PSF(SBOE) Distribution	\$1,021	\$1,021	\$839	\$839	\$1,056	\$1,056	\$1,236	\$1,236	\$1,102	\$1,102
PSF(SLB) Distribution	\$0	\$300	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$300	\$600	\$600 <sup>2</sup>
Per Student Distribution	\$221	\$281	\$175	\$173	\$215	\$212	\$247	\$306	\$347	\$341

<sup>1</sup> In millions of dollars. Source: PSF Annual Report for year ended August 31, 2021.

<sup>2</sup> In September 2020, the SBOE approved a special, one-time transfer of \$300 million from the portion of the PSF managed by the SBOE to the portion of the PSF managed by the SLB, which amount is to be transferred to the ASF by the SLB in fiscal year 2021. In approving the special transfer, the SBOE determined that the transfer was in the best interest of the PSF due to the historic nature of the public health and economic circumstances resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on the school children of Texas.

In November 2020, the SBOE approved a projected \$3.4 billion distribution to the ASF for State fiscal biennium 2022-2023. In making its determination of the 2022-2023 Distribution Rate, the SBOE took into account the announced planned distribution to the ASF by the SLB of \$875 million for the biennium.

Efforts to achieve the intergenerational equity objective, as described above, result in changes in the Distribution Rate for each biennial period. The following table sets forth the Distribution Rates announced by the SBOE in the fall of each even numbered year to be applicable for the following biennium.

<u>State Fiscal Biennium</u>	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2010-11</u>	<u>2012-13</u>	<u>2014-15</u>	<u>2016-17</u>	<u>2018-19</u>	<u>2020-21</u>	<u>2022-23</u>
<u>SBOE Distribution Rate<sup>1</sup></u>	3.5%	2.5%	4.2%	3.3%	3.5%	3.7%	2.974%	4.18%

<sup>1</sup> Includes only distributions made to the ASF by the SBOE; see the immediately preceding table for amounts of direct SLB distributions to the ASF.

See “Management Transition to the PSF Corporation” for a discussion of planned changes in the management of the Fund that may impact distributions to the ASF.

### **Asset Allocation of Fund Portfolios**

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 from time to time by the SBOE. The SBOE generally reviews the asset allocations during its summer meeting in even-numbered years. The first asset allocation policy adopted by the SBOE following the Total Return Constitutional Amendment was in February 2004, and the policy was reviewed and modified or reaffirmed in the summers of each even-numbered year, most recently in July 2020. The Fund’s Investment Policy provides for minimum and maximum ranges among the components of each of the asset classifications: equities, fixed income and alternative asset investments. The alternative asset allocation category includes real estate, real return, absolute return and private equity components. 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. 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 most recent asset allocation of the PSF(SBOE), approved by the SBOE in July 2020, is set forth below, along with the current asset allocations of the PSF(SLB) and the asset allocation of the Liquid Account (the Liquid Account asset allocation was most recently revised in November

2021). The next scheduled review of the PSF(SBOE) asset allocation is June 2022. See “Management Transition to the PSF Corporation” for a discussion of planned changes in the management of the Fund that could affect the responsibility for review of the asset allocation and the timing of asset allocation review, as well as elimination of the Liquid Account.

### PSF Strategic Asset Allocations

	<b>PSF Total</b>	<b>PSF(SBOE)</b>	<b>PSF(SLB)</b>	<b>Liquid Account</b>
<b>Equity Total</b>	47%	52%	0%	60%
<b>Public Equity Total</b>	34%	37%	0%	60%
Large Cap US Equity	13%	14%	0%	30%
Small/Mid Cap US Equity	5%	6%	0%	7%
International Equities	13%	14%	0%	23%
Emerging Markets Equity	2%	3%	0%	0%
<b>Private Equity</b>	13%	15%	0%	0%
<b>Fixed Income Total</b>	27%	25%	0%	38%
Core Bonds	11%	12%	0%	10%
High Yield	2%	3%	0%	0%
Emerging Markets Debt	6%	7%	0%	0%
Treasuries	2%	3%	0%	0%
TIPS	3%	0%	0%	5%
Short Duration	2%	0%	0%	23%
<b>Alternative Investments Total</b>	25%	22%	100%	0%
Absolute Return	6%	7%	0%	0%
Real Estate	12%	11%	33%	0%
Real Return	1%	4%	0%	0%
Energy	3%	0%	35%	0%
Infrastructure	3%	0%	32%	0%
<b>Emerging Manager Program</b>	0%	1%	0%	0%
<b>Cash</b>	2%	0%	0%	2%

For a variety of reasons, each change in asset allocation for the Fund has been implemented in phases, and that approach is likely to be carried forward when and if the asset allocation policy is again modified.

The table below sets forth the comparative investments of the PSF(SBOE) for the years ending August 31, 2020 and 2021.

## Comparative Investment Schedule - PSF(SBOE)<sup>1</sup>

Fair Value (in millions) August 31, 2021 and 2020				
ASSET CLASS	August 31, 2021	August 31, 2020	Amount of Increase (Decrease)	Percent Change
<b>EQUITY</b>				
Domestic Small Cap	\$ 2,597.3	\$ 2,005.8	\$ 591.5	29.5%
Domestic Large Cap	<u>6,218.7</u>	<u>5,106.3</u>	<u>1,112.4</u>	<u>21.8%</u>
Total Domestic Equity	8,816.0	7,112.1	1,703.9	24.0%
International Equity	<u>8,062.1</u>	<u>6,380.9</u>	<u>1,681.2</u>	<u>26.3%</u>
<b>TOTAL EQUITY</b>	<b>16,878.1</b>	<b>13,493.0</b>	<b>3,385.1</b>	<b>25.1%</b>
<b>FIXED INCOME</b>				
Domestic Fixed Income	4,853.1	4,232.6	620.5	14.7%
U.S. Treasuries	1,243.3	918.7	324.6	35.3%
Emerging Market Debt	<u>2,683.7</u>	<u>2,450.7</u>	<u>233.0</u>	<u>9.5%</u>
<b>TOTAL FIXED INCOME</b>	<b>8,780.1</b>	<b>7,602.0</b>	<b>1,178.1</b>	<b>15.5%</b>
<b>ALTERNATIVE INVESTMENTS</b>				
Absolute Return	3,546.0	3,517.2	28.8	0.8%
Real Estate	3,706.0	3,102.1	603.9	19.5%
Private Equity	7,724.6	4,761.5	2,963.1	62.2%
Risk Parity	-	1,164.9	(1,164.9)	-100.0%
Real Return	<u>1,675.5</u>	<u>2,047.4</u>	<u>(371.9)</u>	<u>-18.2%</u>
<b>TOT ALT INVESTMENTS</b>	<b>16,652.1</b>	<b>14,593.1</b>	<b>2,059.0</b>	<b>14.1%</b>
UNALLOCATED CASH	<u>262.9</u>	<u>122.9</u>	<u>140.0</u>	<u>113.9%</u>
<b>TOTAL PSF(SBOE) INVESTMENTS</b>	<b>\$ 42,573.2</b>	<b>\$ 35,811.0</b>	<b>\$ 6,762.2</b>	<b>18.9%</b>

Source: PSF Annual Report for year ended August 31, 2021.

<sup>1</sup> The investments shown in the table above at August 31, 2021 do not fully reflect the changes made to the PSF Strategic Asset Allocation in 2020, as those changes were still being phased in at the end of the fiscal year.

In accordance with legislation enacted during 2019, the PSF has established the Liquid Account for purposes of investing cash received from the SLB to be invested in liquid assets and managed by the SBOE in the same manner it manages the PSF. That cash was previously included in the PSF valuation but was held and invested by the State Comptroller. In July 2020, the SBOE adopted an asset allocation policy for the Liquid Account and that policy was revised in November 2021 (the current allocation is as shown in the table “PSF Strategic Asset Allocations” above). As so amended, the Liquid Account asset allocation is expected to be fully implemented in the first calendar quarter of calendar year 2022. See “Management Transition to the PSF Corporation” for a discussion of planned changes in the management of the Fund that could result in the dissolution of the Liquid Account and a blending of assets held in the Liquidity Account into the general investment portfolio of the Fund.

The table below sets forth the investments of the Liquid Account for the year ended August 31, 2021.

### Liquid Account Fair Value at August 31, 2021<sup>1</sup>

Fair Value (in millions) August 31, 2021 and 2020

<u>ASSET CLASS</u>	August 31, <u>2021</u>	August 31, <u>2020</u>	Amount of Increase (Decrease)	Percent Change
Equity				
Domestic Small/Mid Cap	\$228.3	-	\$228.3	N/A
Domestic Large Cap	<u>578.6</u>	-	<u>578.6</u>	N/A
Total Domestic Equity	806.9	-	806.9	N/A
International Equity	<u>392.6</u>	-	<u>392.6</u>	N/A
TOTAL EQUITY	1,199.5	-	1,199.5	N/A
Fixed Income				
Short-Term Fixed Income	1,074.8	\$1,597.3	(522.5)	-32.7%
Core Bonds	413.1	-	413.1	N/A
TIPS	<u>213.9</u>	-	<u>213.9</u>	N/A
TOTAL FIXED INCOME	1,701.8	1,597.3	104.5	6.5%
Unallocated Cash	<u>1,420.5</u>	<u>2,453.3</u>	<u>(1,032.8)</u>	-42.1%
Total Liquid Account Investments	\$4,321.8	\$4,050.6	\$271.2	6.7%

<sup>1</sup> In millions of dollars.

Source: PSF Annual Report for year ended August 31, 2021.

The table below sets forth the comparative investments of the PSF(SLB) for the years ending August 31, 2020 and 2021.

### Comparative Investment Schedule - PSF(SLB)

Fair Value (in millions) August 31, 2021 and 2020

Asset Class	As of <u>8-31-21</u>	As of <u>8-31-20</u>	Increase (Decrease)	Percent Change
Discretionary Real Assets Investments				
Externally Managed				
Real Assets Investment Funds <sup>1</sup>				
Energy/Minerals	\$1,707.5	\$1,164.0	\$543.5	46.7%
Infrastructure	1,652.3	1,485.4	166.9	11.2%
Real Estate	<u>1,276.8</u>	<u>1,174.8</u>	<u>102.0</u>	8.7%
Internally Managed Direct				
Real Estate	223.9	219.5	4.4	2.0%
Investments				
Total Discretionary				

Real Assets Investments	4,860.5	4,043.7	816.8	20.2%
Dom. Equity Rec'd as In-Kind Distribution	1.7	0.9	0.8	88.9%
Sovereign and Other Lands	405.4	408.6	(3.2)	-0.8%
Mineral Interests	2,720.4	2,115.4	605	28.6%
Cash at State Treasury <sup>2</sup>	<u>699.2</u>	<u>333.8</u>	<u>365.4</u>	109.5%
Total PSF(SLB) Investments	\$8,687.2	\$6,902.4	\$1,784.8	25.9%

<sup>1</sup> The fair values of externally managed real assets investment funds, separate accounts, and co-investment vehicles are estimated using the most recent valuations available, adjusted for subsequent contributions and withdrawals.

<sup>2</sup> Cash at State Treasury represents amounts that have been deposited in the State Treasury and temporarily invested in short-term investments until called for investment by the external real assets investment funds, separate accounts, and co-investment vehicles to which PSF(SLB) has made capital commitments. Prior to September 1, 2019, PSF(SLB) was required by statute to deposit cash designated by the SLB for investment in real assets in the State Treasury until it is drawn for investment. After September 1, 2019, that cash was moved to the Liquid Account to be invested by the SBOE.

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. Fund performance may also be affected by factors other than asset allocation, including, without limitation, the general performance of the securities markets and other capital markets in the United States and abroad, which may be affected by different levels of economic activity; decisions of political officeholders; significant adverse weather events and the market impact of domestic and international climate change; development of hostilities in and among nations; cybersecurity threats and events; changes in international trade policies or practices; application of the Prudent Person 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, PSF operational limitations impacted by Texas law or legislative appropriation. See "Management Transition to the PSF Corporation" for a discussion of planned changes in the management of the Fund that may affect these factors. The Guarantee Program could also be impacted by changes in State or federal law or regulations or the implementation of new accounting standards.

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

The School District Bond Guarantee Program requires an application be made by a school district to the Education 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 Education 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 Education 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 Education 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 pursuant to this funding “intercept” feature 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 Education 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 Education 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 Education 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.

Generally, the regulations that govern the School District Bond Guarantee Program (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 section 33.65 and are available at <https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/ch033a.pdf>.

### **The 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 Bond Guarantee Program (the “CDBGP Rules”). The CDBGP Rules are codified at 19 TAC section 33.67 and are available at <https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/ch033a.pdf>.

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 Education 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.

As of March 2022 (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 6.98%. At April 29, 2022, there were 191 active open-enrollment charter schools in the State and there were 908 charter school campuses active under such charters (though as of such date, 25 of such campuses are not currently serving students for various reasons). Section 12.101, Texas Education Code, as amended by the Legislature in 2013, limits the number of charters that the Education Commissioner may grant to 215 charters as of the end of fiscal year 2014, with the number increasing in each fiscal year thereafter through 2019 to a total number of 305 charters. 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 Education 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 Education 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.

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 Education 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 Education 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 Education Commissioner determines that the charter district is acting in bad faith under the program, the Education 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 provides a funding “intercept” feature that obligates the Education 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 purpose 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 Education 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.

From time to time, TEA has limited new guarantees under the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program to conform to capacity limits specified by the Act. Legislation enacted during the Legislature's 2017 regular session modified the manner of calculating the capacity of the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program (the "CDBGP Capacity"), which further increased the amount of the CDBGP Capacity, beginning with State fiscal year 2018, but that provision of the law does not increase overall Program capacity, it merely makes available to the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program a greater share of capacity in the Guarantee Program. The CDBGP Capacity is made available from the capacity of the Guarantee Program but is not reserved exclusively for the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program. See "Capacity Limits for the Guarantee Program" and "2017 Legislative Changes to the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program." Other factors that could increase the CDBGP Capacity include Fund investment performance, future increases in the Guarantee Program multiplier, changes in State law that govern the calculation of the CDBGP Capacity, as described below, changes in State or federal law or regulations related to the Guarantee Program limit, growth in the relative percentage of students enrolled in open-enrollment charter schools to the total State scholastic census, legislative and administrative changes in funding for charter districts, changes in level of school district or charter district participation in the Guarantee Program, or a combination of such circumstances.

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

The capacity of the Fund to guarantee bonds under the Guarantee Program is limited to the lessor of that imposed by State law (the "State Capacity Limit") and that imposed by regulations and a notice issued by the IRS (the "IRS Limit", with the limit in effect at any given time being the "Capacity Limit"). From 2005 through 2009, the Guarantee Program 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.

Prior to 2007, various legislation was enacted modifying the calculation of the State Capacity limit; however, in 2007, Senate Bill 389 (“SB 389”) was enacted, providing for 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 provided that the SBOE shall at least annually consider whether to change the capacity of the Guarantee Program. Additionally, on May 21, 2010, the SBOE modified the SDBGP Rules, and increased the State Capacity Limit 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 Education Commissioner may reduce the multiplier to maintain the AAA credit rating of the Guarantee Program but also provide that any changes to the multiplier made by the Education 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.

Since September 2015, the SBOE has periodically voted to change the capacity multiplier as shown in the following table.

<u>Changes in SBOE-determined multiplier for State Capacity Limit</u>	
<u>Date</u>	<u>Multiplier</u>
Prior to May 2010	2.50
May 2010	3.00
September 2015	3.25
February 2017	3.50
September 2017	3.75
February 2018 (current)	3.50

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. On December 16, 2009, the IRS published Notice 2010-5 (the “IRS Notice”) stating that the IRS would 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 provided 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 became effective.

On July 18, 2016, the IRS issued final regulations enacting the IRS Notice (the “Final IRS Regulations”). The Final IRS Regulations are effective for bonds sold on or after October 17, 2016. The IRS Notice, the Proposed IRS Regulations and the Final 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.

In September 2015, the SBOE also approved a new 5% capacity reserve for the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program. The State Capacity Limit increased from \$128,247,002,583 on August 31, 2020 to \$135,449,634,408 on August 31, 2021 (but at such date the IRS Limit (\$117,318,653,038) remained the lower of the two, so it is the current Capacity Limit for the Fund).

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 Reserve”). The SDBGP Rules provide for a minimum Capacity Reserve for the overall 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 CDBGP Rules provide for an additional 5% reserve of CDBGP Capacity. The Education 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 Education 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://tea.texas.gov/Finance\\_and\\_Grants/Permanent\\_School\\_Fund/](http://tea.texas.gov/Finance_and_Grants/Permanent_School_Fund/), 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, the ratio of Fund assets to guaranteed bonds and the growth of the Fund in general could be adversely affected by a number of factors, including Fund investment performance, investment objectives of the Fund, an increase in bond issues by school districts in the State or legal restrictions on the Fund, changes in State laws that implement funding decisions for school districts and charter districts, which could adversely affect the credit quality of those districts, the implementation of the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program, or significant changes in distributions to the ASF. The issuance of the IRS Notice and the Final IRS Regulations resulted in a substantial increase in the amount of bonds

guaranteed under the Guarantee Program. As the amount of guaranteed bonds approaches the IRS Limit, the SBOE is seeking changes to the existing federal tax law requirements regarding the Guarantee Program with the objective of obtaining an increase in the IRS Limit, but no assurances can be given that the SBOE will be successful in that undertaking. The implementation of the Charter School Bond Guarantee Program has also increased the total amount of guaranteed bonds.

### **2017 Legislative Changes to the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program**

The CDBGP Capacity is established by the Act. During the 85th Texas Legislature, which concluded on May 29, 2017, Senate Bill 1480 (“SB 1480”) was enacted. SB 1480 amended the Act to modify how the CDBGP Capacity is established effective as of September 1, 2017 and made other substantive changes to the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program. Prior to the enactment of SB 1480, the CDBGP Capacity was calculated as the Capacity Limit less the amount of outstanding bond guarantees under the Guarantee Program multiplied by the percentage of charter district scholastic population relative to the total public school scholastic population. SB 1480 amended the CDBGP Capacity calculation so that the Capacity Limit is multiplied by the percentage of charter district scholastic population relative to the total public school scholastic population prior to the subtraction of the outstanding bond guarantees, thereby increasing the CDBGP Capacity. SB 1480 provided for the implementation of the new method of calculating the CDBGP Capacity to begin with the State fiscal year that commences September 1, 2021 (the State’s fiscal year 2022) but authorized the SBOE discretion to increase the CDBGP Capacity incrementally in the intervening four fiscal years, beginning with fiscal year 2018 by up to a cumulative 20% in each fiscal year (for a total maximum increase of 80% in fiscal year 2021) as compared to the capacity figure calculated under the Act as of January 1, 2017, which it has done.

The percentage of the charter district scholastic population to the overall public school scholastic population has grown from 3.53% in September 2012 to 6.83% in March 2021. TEA is unable to predict how the ratio of charter district students to the total State scholastic population will change over time.

In addition to modifying the manner of determining the CDBGP Capacity, SB 1480 provided that the Education Commissioner’s investigation of a charter district application for guarantee may include an evaluation of whether the charter district bond security documents provide a security interest in real property pledged as collateral for the bond and the repayment obligation under the proposed guarantee. The Education Commissioner may decline to approve the application if the Education Commissioner determines that sufficient security is not provided. The Act and the CDBGP Rules previously required the Education Commissioner to make an investigation of the accreditation status and certain financial criteria for a charter district applying for a bond guarantee, which remain in place.

Since the initial authorization of the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program, the Act has established a bond guarantee reserve fund in the State treasury (the “Charter District Reserve Fund”). Formerly, the Act provided that each charter district that has a bond guaranteed must annually remit to the Education Commissioner, for deposit in the Charter District Reserve Fund, an amount equal to 10% of the savings to the charter district that is a result of the lower interest

rate on its bonds due to the guarantee by the PSF. SB 1480 modified the Act insofar as it pertains to the Charter District Reserve Fund. Effective September 1, 2017, the Act provides that a charter district that has a bond guaranteed must remit to the Education Commissioner, for deposit in the Charter District Reserve Fund, an amount equal to 20% of the savings to the charter district that is a result of the lower interest rate on the bond due to the guarantee by the PSF. The amount due shall be paid on receipt by the charter district of the bond proceeds. However, the deposit requirement will not apply if the balance of the Charter District Reserve Fund is at least equal to 3.00% of the total amount of outstanding guaranteed bonds issued by charter districts. At March 31, 2022, the Charter District Reserve Fund contained \$75,612,752, which represented approximately 2.1% of the guaranteed charter district bonds. The Reserve Fund is held and invested as a non-commingled fund under the administration of the PSF staff.

### **Charter District Risk Factors**

Open-enrollment charter schools in the State may not charge tuition and, unlike school districts, charter districts have no taxing power. Funding for charter district operations is largely from amounts appropriated by the Legislature. Additionally, the amount of State payments a charter district receives is based on a variety of factors, including the enrollment at the schools operated by a charter district, and may be affected by the State's economic performance and other budgetary considerations and various political considerations.

Other than credit support for charter district bonds that is provided to qualifying charter districts by the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program, State funding for charter district facilities construction is limited to a program established by the Legislature in 2017, which provides \$60 million per year for eligible charter districts with an acceptable performance rating for a variety of funding purposes, including for lease or purchase payments for instructional facilities. Since State funding for charter facilities is limited, charter schools generally issue revenue bonds to fund facility construction and acquisition, or fund facilities from cash flows of the school. Some charter districts have issued non-guaranteed debt in addition to debt guaranteed under the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program, and such non-guaranteed debt is likely to be secured by a deed of trust covering all or part of the charter district's facilities. In March 2017, the TEA began requiring charter districts to provide the TEA with a lien against charter district property as a condition to receiving a guarantee under the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program. However, charter district bonds issued and guaranteed under the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program prior to the implementation of the new requirement did not have the benefit of a security interest in real property, although other existing debts of such charter districts that are not guaranteed under the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program may be secured by real property that could be foreclosed on in the event of a bond default.

As a general rule, the operation of a charter school involves fewer State requirements and regulations for charter holders as compared to other public schools, but the maintenance of a State-granted charter is dependent upon on-going compliance with State law and regulations, which are monitored by TEA. TEA has a broad range of enforcement and remedial actions that it can take as corrective measures, and such actions may include the loss of the State charter, the appointment of a new board of directors to govern a charter district, the assignment of operations to another

charter operator, or, as a last resort, the dissolution of an open-enrollment charter school. Charter holders are governed by a private board of directors, as compared to the elected boards of trustees that govern school districts.

As described above, the Act includes a funding “intercept” function that applies to both the School District Bond Guarantee Program and the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program. However, school districts are viewed as the “educator of last resort” for students residing in the geographical territory of the district, which makes it unlikely that State funding for those school districts would be discontinued, although the TEA can require the dissolution and merger into another school district if necessary to ensure sound education and financial management of a school district. That is not the case with a charter district, however, and open-enrollment charter schools in the State have been dissolved by TEA from time to time. If a charter district that has bonds outstanding that are guaranteed by the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program should be dissolved, debt service on guaranteed bonds of the district would continue to be paid to bondholders in accordance with the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program, but there would be no funding available for reimbursement of the PSF by the Comptroller for such payments. As described under “The Charter District Bond Guarantee Program,” the Act established the Charter District Reserve Fund, which could in the future be a significant reimbursement resource for the PSF.

### **Infectious Disease Outbreak**

Since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020, TEA and TEA investment management for the PSF have continued to operate and function pursuant to the TEA continuity of operations plan developed as mandated in accordance with Texas Labor Code Section 412.054. That plan was designed to ensure performance of the Agency’s essential missions and functions under such threats and conditions in the event of, among other emergencies, a pandemic event.

Results of the PSF operations through the fiscal year ended August 31, 2021 and at other periodic points in time are set forth herein or incorporated herein by reference. Fund management is of the view that since the onset of the pandemic the Fund has performed generally in accordance with its portfolio benchmarks and with returns generally seen in the national and international investment markets in which the Fund is invested (see “Discussion and Analysis Pertaining to Fiscal Year Ended August 31, 2021”).

Circumstances regarding the COVID-19 pandemic continue to evolve; for additional information on these events in the State, reference is made to the website of the Governor, <https://gov.texas.gov/>, and, with respect to public school events, the website of TEA, <https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/safe-and-healthy-schools/coronavirus-covid-19-support-and-guidance>.

TEA cannot predict whether any school or charter district may experience short- or longer-term cash flow emergencies as a direct or indirect effect of COVID-19 that would require a payment from the PSF to be made to a paying agent for a guaranteed bond. However, through the end of December 2021, no school district or charter district had failed to perform with respect to making required payments on their guaranteed bonds. Information regarding the respective financial

operations of the issuer of bonds guaranteed, or to be guaranteed, by the PSF is provided by such issuers in their respective bond offering documents and the TEA takes no responsibility for the respective information, as it is provided by the respective issuers.

For information on the September 2020 special, one-time transfer of \$300 million from the portion of the PSF managed by the SBOE to the portion of the PSF managed by the SLB, that was made in light of the public health and economic circumstances resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on the school children of Texas, see “The Total Return Constitutional Amendment.”

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

Moody’s Investors Service, S&P Global Ratings 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>
2017	\$31,870,581,428	\$41,438,672,573
2018	33,860,358,647	44,074,197,940
2019	35,288,344,219	46,464,447,981
2020	36,642,000,738	46,764,059,745
2021 <sup>(2)</sup>	38,699,045,012	55,581,401,632

<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. The SLB reports 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.

<sup>(2)</sup> At August 31, 2021, mineral assets, sovereign and other lands and internally managed discretionary real estate, external discretionary real estate investments, domestic equities, and cash managed by the SLB had book values of approximately \$13.4 million, \$183.7 million, \$4,655.9 million, \$4.7 million, and \$699.2 million, respectively, and market values of approximately \$2,720.4 million, \$629.3 million, \$4,636.6 million, \$1.8 million, and \$699.2 million, respectively. At March 31, 2022, the PSF had a book value of \$40,697,026,320 and a market value of

\$54,743,079,871. March 31, 2022 values are based on unaudited data, which is subject to adjustment.

<b>Permanent School Fund Guaranteed Bonds</b>	
<u>At 8/31</u>	<u>Principal Amount<sup>(1)</sup></u>
2017	\$74,266,090,023
2018	79,080,901,069
2019	84,397,900,203
2020	90,336,680,245
2021	95,259,161,922 <sup>(2)</sup>

<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> At August 31, 2021 (the most recent date for which such data is available), the TEA expected that the principal and interest to be paid by school districts and charter districts over the remaining life of the bonds guaranteed by the Guarantee Program was \$144,196,223,433, of which \$48,937,061,511 represents interest to be paid. As shown in the table above, at August 31, 2021, there were \$95,259,161,922 in principal amount of bonds guaranteed under the Guarantee Program. Using the IRS Limit of \$117,318,653,038 (the IRS Limit is currently the Capacity Limit), net of the Capacity Reserve, as of March 31, 2022, 6.98% of the Guarantee Program's capacity was available to the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program. As of March 31, 2022, the amount of outstanding bond guarantees represented 83.27% of the Capacity Limit (which is currently the IRS Limit). March 31, 2022 values are based on unaudited data, which is subject to adjustment.

**Permanent School Fund Guaranteed Bonds by Category<sup>(1)</sup>**

Fiscal Year Ended	<u>School District Bonds</u>		<u>Charter District Bonds</u>		<u>Totals</u>	
	<u>No. of Issues</u>	<u>Principal Amount</u>	<u>No. of Issues</u>	<u>Principal Amount</u>	<u>No. of Issues</u>	<u>Principal Amount</u>
8/31						
2017	3,253	\$72,884,480,023	40	\$1,381,610,000	3,293	\$74,266,090,023
2018	3,249	77,647,966,069	44	1,432,935,000	3,293	79,080,901,069
2019	3,297	82,537,755,203	49	1,860,145,000	3,346	84,397,900,203
2020	3,296	87,800,478,245	64	2,536,202,000	3,360	90,336,680,245
2021 <sup>(2)</sup>	3,346	91,951,175,922	83	3,307,986,000	3,429	95,259,161,922

<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.

<sup>(2)</sup> At March 31, 2022 (based on unaudited data, which is subject to adjustment), there were \$97,691,155,818 of bonds guaranteed under the Guarantee Program, representing 3,341 school district issues, aggregating \$94,160,444,818 in principal amount and 91 charter district issues,

aggregating \$3,530,711,000 in principal amount. At March 31, 2022, the CDBGP Capacity was \$7,779,399,883 (based on unaudited data, which is subject to adjustment).

### **Discussion and Analysis Pertaining to Fiscal Year Ended August 31, 2021**

The following discussion is derived from the Annual Report for the year ended August 31, 2021, 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, as filed with the MSRB, 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) and, with respect to the Liquid Account, Liquid(SBOE) assets. As of August 31, 2021, the Fund's land, mineral rights and certain real assets are managed by the five-member SLB and these assets are referred to throughout as the PSF(SLB) assets. The current PSF(SBOE) asset allocation policy includes an allocation for real estate investments, and as such investments are made, and become a part of the PSF(SBOE) investment portfolio, those investments will be managed by the SBOE and not the SLB.

At the end of fiscal 2021, the Fund balance was \$55.6 billion, an increase of \$8.9 billion from the prior year. This increase is primarily due to overall net increases in value of the asset classes in which the Fund is invested. During the year, the SBOE continued implementing the long-term strategic asset allocation, diversifying the PSF(SBOE) to strengthen the Fund. The asset allocation is projected to increase returns over the long run while reducing risk and portfolio return volatility. The PSF(SBOE) annual rates of return for the one-year, five-year, and ten-year periods ending August 31, 2021, net of fees, were 22.97%, 10.49% and 9.05%, respectively, and the Liquid(SBOE) annual rate of return for the one-year period ending August 31, 2021, net of fees, was 4.90% (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, five-year, and ten-year annualized total returns for the PSF(SLB) externally managed real assets, net of fees and including cash, were 12.81%, 1.56%, and 4.18%, 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 positively correlated as 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. See "Comparative Investment Schedule - PSF(SBOE)" for the PSF(SBOE) holdings as of August 31, 2021.

As of August 31, 2021, the SBOE has approved, and the Fund made capital commitments to, externally managed real estate investment funds in a total amount of \$5.7 billion and capital commitments to private equity limited partnerships for a total of \$7.5 billion. Unfunded commitments at August 31, 2021, totaled \$2.0 billion in real estate investments and \$2.4 billion in private equity investments.

**PSF Returns Fiscal Year Ended 8-31-2021<sup>1</sup>**

<u>Portfolio</u>	<u>Return</u>	<u>Benchmark Return<sup>2</sup></u>
Total PSF(SBOE) Portfolio	22.97%	20.73%
Domestic Large Cap Equities(SBOE)	31.26	31.17
Domestic Small/Mid Cap Equities(SBOE)	47.88	47.40
International Equities(SBOE)	25.27	24.87
Emerging Market Equity(SBOE)	19.33	21.12
Fixed Income(SBOE)	1.64	-0.08
Treasuries	-7.02	-7.27
Absolute Return(SBOE)	13.84	13.05
Real Estate(SBOE)	12.06	9.34
Private Equity(SBOE)	53.88	43.38
Real Return(SBOE)	16.06	18.08
Emerging Market Debt(SBOE)	5.92	4.14
Liquid Large Cap Equity(SBOE)	43.24	38.19
Liquid Small Cap Equity(SBOE)	61.97	52.07
Liquid International Equity(SBOE)	12.20	12.18
Liquid Short-Term Fixed Income(SBOE)	0.91	0.37
Liquid Core Bonds(SBOE)	-0.07	-0.18
Liquid TIPS(SBOE)	6.09	6.20
Liquid Transition Cash Reserves(SBOE)	0.44	0.08
Liquid Combined(SBOE)	4.90	4.27
PSF(SLB)	12.81	N/A

<sup>1</sup> Time weighted rates of return adjusted for cash flows for the PSF(SBOE) investment assets. Does not include GLO managed real estate or real assets. Returns are net of fees. Source: PSF Annual Report for year ended August 31, 2021.

<sup>2</sup> Benchmarks are as set forth in the PSF Annual Report for year ended August 31, 2021.

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, 2021, the remaining commitments totaled approximately \$2.24 billion.

For fiscal year 2021, total revenues, inclusive of unrealized gains and losses and net of security lending rebates and fees, totaled \$10.8 billion, an increase of \$8.8 billion from fiscal year 2020 earnings of \$2.0 billion. This increase reflects the performance of the securities markets in which the Fund was invested in fiscal year 2021. In fiscal year 2021, 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 42.5% for the fiscal year ending August 31, 2021. This increase is primarily attributable to an increase in PSF(SLB) quantities of purchased gas for resale in the State Energy Management Program, which is administered by the SLB as part of the Fund.

The Fund directly supports the public school system in the State by distributing a predetermined percentage of its asset value to the ASF. For fiscal years 2020 and 2021, the distribution from the SBOE to the ASF totaled \$1.1 billion and \$1.1 billion, respectively. Distributions from the SLB to the ASF for fiscal years 2020 and 2021 totaled \$600 and \$600 million, respectively.

At the end of the 2021 fiscal year, PSF assets guaranteed \$95.3 billion in bonds issued by 880 local school districts and charter districts, the latter of which entered into the Guarantee Program during the 2014 fiscal year. Since its inception in 1983, the Fund has guaranteed 8,203 school district and charter district bond issues totaling \$220.2 billion in principal amount. During the 2021 fiscal year, the number of outstanding issues guaranteed under the Guarantee Program totaled 3,429. The dollar amount of guaranteed school and charter bond issues outstanding increased by \$4.9 billion or 5.4%. The State Capacity Limit increased by \$7.2 billion, or 5.6%, during fiscal year 2021 due to continued growth in the cost basis of the Fund used to calculate that Program capacity limit. The effective capacity of the Guarantee Program did not increase during fiscal year 2021 as the IRS Limit was reached in a prior fiscal year, and it is the lower of the two State and federal capacity limits for the Guarantee Program.

### **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 April 2018. 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 <https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/ch033a.pdf>.

In addition, the GLO has established processes and controls over its administration of real estate transactions and is subject to provisions of the Texas Natural Resources Code and its own internal procedures in administering real estate transactions for assets it manages for the Fund.

The TEA received an appropriation of \$30.4 million for each of the fiscal years 2020, and 2021.

As of August 31, 2021, 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.

### **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 and is posted to the TEA web site at [http://tea.texas.gov/Finance\\_and\\_Grants/Texas\\_Permanent\\_School\\_Fund/Texas\\_Permanent\\_School\\_Fund\\_Disclosure\\_Statement\\_-\\_Bond\\_Guarantee\\_Program/](http://tea.texas.gov/Finance_and_Grants/Texas_Permanent_School_Fund/Texas_Permanent_School_Fund_Disclosure_Statement_-_Bond_Guarantee_Program/). The most recent amendment to the TEA Rule was adopted by the SBOE on February 1, 2019 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 15c2-12 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), and the continuing disclosure filings of the TEA with respect to the PSF can be found at <https://emma.msrb.org/IssueView/Details/ER355077> or by searching for “Texas Permanent School Fund Bond Guarantee Program” on EMMA.

## **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.

## **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 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 of the Guarantee Program; (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 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 such event is material within the meaning of the federal securities laws; (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; (15) the incurrence of a financial obligation of the Guarantee Program, if material, or agreement to covenants, events of default, remedies, priority rights, or other similar terms of a financial obligation of the Guarantee Program, any of which affect security holders, if material; and (16) default, event of acceleration, termination event, modification of terms, or other similar events under the terms of a financial obligation of the Guarantee Program, any of which reflect financial difficulties. (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 information and operating data concerning such entity and events notices 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 Rule 15c2-12 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**

Except as stated below, during the last five years, the TEA has not failed to substantially comply with its previous continuing disclosure agreements in accordance with Rule 15c2-12. On April 28, 2022 TEA became aware that it had not timely filed its 2021 Annual Report with EMMA due to an administrative oversight. TEA took corrective action and filed the 2021 Annual Report with EMMA on April 28, 2022, followed by a notice of late filing made with EMMA on April 29, 2022. TEA notes that the 2021 Annual Report was timely filed on the TEA website by the required filing

date and that website posting has been incorporated by reference into TEA's Bond Guarantee Program disclosures that are included in school district and charter district offering documents.

### **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.