THE PERMANENT SCHOOL FUND GUARANTEE PROGRAM

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

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

History and Purpose

The PSF was created with a $2,000,000 appropriation by the Texas Legislature (the “Legislature”) in 1854 expressly for the benefit of the public schools of Texas. The Constitution of 1876 stipulated that certain lands and all proceeds from the sale of these lands should also constitute the PSF. Additional acts later gave more public domain land and rights to the PSF. In 1953, the U.S. Congress passed the Submerged Lands Act that relinquished to coastal states all rights of the U.S. navigable waters within state boundaries. If the state, by law, had set a larger boundary prior to or at the time of admission to the Union, or if the boundary had been approved by Congress, then the larger boundary applied. After three years of litigation (1957-1960), the U. S. Supreme Court on May 31, 1960, affirmed Texas’ historic three marine leagues (10.35 miles) seaward boundary. Texas proved its submerged lands property rights to three leagues into the Gulf of Mexico by citing historic laws and treaties dating back to 1836. All lands lying within that limit belong to the PSF. The proceeds from the sale and the mineral-related rental of these lands, including bonuses, delay rentals and royalty payments, become the corpus of the Fund. Prior to the approval by the voters of the State of an amendment to the constitutional provision under which the Fund is established and administered, which occurred on September 13, 2003 (the “Total Return Constitutional Amendment”), and which is further described below, the PSF had as its main sources of revenues capital gains from securities transactions and royalties from the sale of oil and natural gas. The Total Return Constitutional Amendment provides that interest and dividends produced by Fund investments will be additional revenue to the PSF. The State School Land Board (“SLB”) maintains the land endowment of the Fund on behalf of the Fund and is generally authorized to manage the investments of the capital gains, royalties and other investment income relating to the
land endowment. The SLB is a five-member board, the membership of which consists of the Commissioner of the Texas General Land Office (the “Land Commissioner”) and four citizen members appointed by the Governor. (See “2019 Texas Legislative Session” for a description of legislation that changed the composition of the SLB). As of August 31, 2019, the General Land Office (the “GLO”) managed approximately 26% of the PSF, as reflected in the fund balance of the PSF at that date.

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

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

In 2011, 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 Commissioner. On approval by the Commissioner, bonds properly issued by a charter district participating in the Program are fully guaranteed by the corpus of the PSF. As described below, the implementation of the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program was deferred pending receipt of guidance from the Internal Revenue Service (the “IRS”) which was received in September 2013, and the establishment of regulations to govern the program, which regulations became effective on March 3, 2014. See “The Charter District Bond Guarantee Program.”

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

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

The sole purpose of the PSF is to assist in the funding of public education for present and future generations. Prior to the adoption of the Total Return Constitutional Amendment, all interest and dividends produced by Fund investments flowed into the Available School Fund (the “ASF”),
where they are distributed to local school districts and open-enrollment charter schools based on average daily attendance. Any net gains from investments of the Fund accrue to the corpus of the PSF. Prior to the approval by the voters of the State of the Total Return Constitutional Amendment, costs of administering the PSF were allocated to the ASF. With the approval of the Total Return Constitutional Amendment, the administrative costs of the Fund have shifted from the ASF to the PSF. In fiscal year 2019, distributions to the ASF amounted to an estimated $306 per student and the total amount distributed to the ASF was $1,535.8 million.

Audited financial information for 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 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, 2019, as filed with the MSRB in accordance with the PSF undertaking and agreement made in accordance with Rule 15c2-12 (“Rule 15c2-12”) of the federal Securities and Exchange Commission (the “SEC”), as described below, is hereby incorporated by reference into this disclosure. Information included herein for the year ended August 31, 2019 is derived from the audited financial statements of the PSF, which are included in the Annual Report 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, 2019 and for a description of the financial results of the PSF for the year ended August 31, 2019, the most recent year for which audited financial information regarding the Fund is available. The 2019 Annual Report speaks only as of its date and the TEA has not obligated itself to update the 2019 Annual Report or any other Annual Report. The TEA posts each Annual Report, which includes statistical data regarding the Fund as of the close of each fiscal year, the most recent disclosure for the Guarantee Program, the Statement of Investment Objectives, Policies and Guidelines of the Texas Permanent School Fund, which is codified at 19 Texas Administrative Code, Chapter 33 (the “Investment Policy”), monthly updates with respect to the capacity of the Guarantee Program (collectively, the “Web Site Materials”) on the TEA web site at http://tea.texas.gov/Finance_and_Grants/Permanent_School_Fund/ and with the MSRB at 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. 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.

2019 Texas Legislative Session

During the 86th Regular Session of the Texas Legislature, which concluded on May 27, 2019 (the “86th Session”), various bills were enacted that relate to the PSF. Among such enacted legislation
are bills that relate to the composition of the SLB and its relationship to the SBOE with respect to
the management of the PSF. Legislation was approved that changed the composition of the SLB
to a five member board from a three member board. Under that bill, the Land Commissioner will
continue to head the SLB, but the remaining four members are appointed by the Governor, and of
those four members, two are required to be selected from a list of nominees to be submitted to the
Governor by the SBOE. That legislation also requires 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 enacted legislation requires the SLB and the SBOE to provide quarterly
financial reports to each other and creates a “permanent school fund 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. Such
funds shall be invested in liquid assets in the same manner that the PSF is managed until such time
as the funds are required for investment by the SLB. That legislation also requires the Texas
Education Agency, in consultation with the GLO, to conduct a study regarding distributions to the
ASF from the PSF. In addition, a joint resolution was approved that proposed a constitutional
amendment to the Texas Constitution to increase the permissible amount of distributions to the
ASF from revenue derived during a year from PSF land or other properties from $300 million to
$600 million annually by one or more entities. That constitutional change was approved by State
voters at a referendum on November 5, 2019. See “2011 and 2019 Constitutional Amendments.”

Other legislation enacted during the 86th Session provides for the winding up of the affairs of an
open-enrollment charter school that ceases operations, including as a result of the revocation or
other termination of its charter. In particular, among other provisions, the legislation addresses
the disposition of real and personal property of a discontinued charter school and provides under
certain circumstances for reimbursement to be made to the State, if the disposed property was
acquired with State funds; authorizes the Commissioner to adopt a rule to govern related party
transactions by charter schools; and creates a “charter school liquidation fund” for the management
of any reclaimed State funds, including, in addition to other potential uses, for the use of deposit
of such reclaimed funds to the Charter District Reserve Fund.

No assessment has been made by the TEA or PSF staff as to the potential financial impact of any
legislation enacted during the 86th Session, including the increase in the permissible amount that
may be transferred from the PSF to the ASF, as approved by State voters at the November 5, 2019
referendum.

**The Total Return Constitutional Amendment**

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

In determining the Distribution Rate, the SBOE has adopted the goal of maximizing the amount distributed from the Fund in a manner designed to preserve “intergenerational equity.” Intergenerational equity is the maintenance of 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 consultant, 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 the average daily scholastic attendance State-wide, the projected contributions and expenses of the Fund, projected returns in the capital markets and a projected inflation rate.

See “2011 and 2019 Constitutional Amendments” below for a discussion of the historic and current Distribution Rates, and a description of amendments made to the Texas Constitution on November 8, 2011 and November 5, 2019 that may affect Distribution Rate decisions.

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

With respect to the management of the Fund’s financial assets portfolio, the single most significant change made to date as a result of the Total Return Constitutional Amendment has been new asset allocation policies adopted 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. Periodic changes in the asset allocation policies have been made with the objective of providing diversity to Fund assets, and have included an alternative asset allocation in addition to the fixed income and equity allocations. 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. The most recent asset allocation, approved in July 2020, is as follows: (i) an equity allocation of 37% (consisting of U.S. large cap equities targeted at 14%, international large cap equities at 14%, emerging market equities at 3%, and U.S. small/mid cap equities at 6%), (ii) a fixed income allocation of 25% (consisting of a 12% allocation for core bonds, a 7% allocation for emerging market debt in local currency, a 3% allocation for high yield bonds, and a 3% allocation for U.S. Treasury bonds), and (iii) an alternative asset allocation of 38% (consisting of a private equity allocation of 15%, a real estate allocation of 11%, an absolute return allocation of 7%, a 1% allocation for private equity and real estate for emerging managers, and a real return allocation of 4%). As compared to the 2016 asset allocation, the 2020 asset allocation increased U.S. large cap equities and small/mid-cap U.S. equities by a combined 2%, added high yield bonds and U.S. Treasury bonds to the fixed income allocation in the amounts noted above, increased combined private equity and real estate from 23% to 27%, eliminated the risk parity allocation, which was previously a 7% allocation within the global risk control strategy category of alternative assets, and reduced the absolute return allocation within the global risk control strategy category of alternative assets to 7% from 10%.

In accordance with legislation enacted during the 86th Session and effective September 1, 2019, the PSF has established an investment account for purposes of investing cash received from the GLO to be invested in liquid assets and managed by the SBOE in the same manner it manages the PSF. That cash has previously been 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 liquidity account consisting of 20% cash, 40% equities and 40% fixed income. The liquidity account equity allocation consists of U.S. large cap, U.S. small/mid cap and international large cap equities of 20%, 5% and 15%, respectively. The liquidity account fixed income allocation consists of core bonds, Treasury Inflation Protection Securities and short duration fixed income categories of 5%, 10% and 25%, respectively.
For a variety of reasons, each change in asset allocation for the Fund, including the 2020 modifications, have been or will be implemented in phases, and that approach is likely to be carried forward when and if the asset allocation policy is again modified. At August 31, 2019, the Fund’s financial assets portfolio was invested as follows: 34.91% in public market equity investments; 13.35% in fixed income investments; 10.58% in absolute return assets; 11.31% in private equity assets; 8.71% in real estate assets; 7.46% in risk parity assets; 6.16% in real return assets; 7.03% in emerging market debt; and 0.49% in unallocated cash.

Following on previous decisions to create strategic relationships with investment managers in certain asset classes, in September 2015 and January 2016, the SBOE approved the implementation of direct investment programs in private equity and absolute return assets, respectively, which has continued to reduce administrative costs within those portfolios. The Attorney General has advised the SBOE in Op. Tex. Att’y Gen. No. GA-0998 (2013) (“GA-0998”), that the PSF is not subject to requirements of certain State competitive bidding laws with respect to the selection of investments. In GA-0998, the Attorney General also advised that the SBOE generally must use competitive bidding for the selection of investment managers and other third party providers of investment services, such as record keeping and insurance, but excluding certain professional services, such as accounting services, as State law prohibits the use of competitive bidding for specified professional services. GA-0998 provides guidance to the SBOE in connection with the direct management of alternative investments through investment vehicles to be created by the SBOE, in lieu of contracting with external managers for such services, as has been the recent practice of the PSF. The PSF staff and the Fund’s investment advisor are tasked with advising the SBOE with respect to the implementation of the Fund's asset allocation policy, including the timing and manner of the selection of any external managers and other consultants.

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

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

Management and Administration of the Fund

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

The Total Return Constitutional Amendment provides that expenses of managing the PSF are to be paid “by appropriation” from the PSF. In January 2005, at the request of the SBOE, the Attorney General issued a legal opinion, Op. Tex. Att’y Gen. No. GA-0293 (2005), that the Total Return Constitutional Amendment requires that SBOE expenditures for managing or administering PSF investments, including payments to external investment managers, be paid from appropriations made by the Legislature, but that the Total Return Constitutional Amendment does not require the SBOE to pay from such appropriated PSF funds the indirect management costs deducted from the assets of a mutual fund or other investment company in which PSF funds have been invested.

Texas law assigns control of the Fund’s land and mineral rights to the SLB. Administrative duties related to the land and mineral rights reside with the GLO, which is under the guidance of the Commissioner of the GLO. In 2007, the Legislature established the real estate special fund account of the PSF (the “Real Estate Account”) consisting of proceeds and revenue from land, mineral or royalty interest, real estate investment, or other interest, including revenue received from those sources, that is set apart to the PSF under the Texas Constitution and laws, together with the mineral estate in riverbeds, channels, and the tidelands, including islands. The investment of the Real Estate Account is subject to the sole and exclusive management and control of the SLB and the Land Commissioner, who is also the head of the GLO. The 2007 legislation presented constitutional questions regarding the respective roles of the SBOE and the SLB relating to the
disposition of proceeds of real estate transactions to the ASF, among other questions. Amounts in
the investment portfolio of the PSF are taken into account by the SBOE for purposes of
determining the Distribution Rate. An amendment to the Texas Constitution was approved by
State voters on November 8, 2011, which permits the SLB to make transfers directly to the ASF,
see “2011 and 2019 Constitutional Amendments” below.

The SBOE contracts with its securities custodial agent to measure the performance of the total
return of the Fund’s financial assets. A consultant is typically retained for the purpose of providing
consultation with respect to strategic asset allocation decisions and to assist the SBOE in selecting
external fund management advisors. The SBOE also contracts with financial institutions for
custodial and securities lending services. Like other State agencies and instrumentalities that
manage large investment portfolios, the PSF has implemented an incentive compensation plan that
may provide additional compensation for investment personnel, depending upon the criteria
relating to the investment performance of the Fund.

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

**Capacity Limits for the Guarantee Program**

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

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

On September 16, 2013, the IRS published proposed regulations (the “Proposed IRS Regulations”) that, among other things, would enact the IRS Notice. The preamble to the Proposed IRS Regulations provides that issuers may elect to apply the Proposed IRS Regulations, in whole or in part, to bonds sold on or after September 16, 2013, and before the date that final regulations become effective.

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. The State Capacity Limit is determined on the basis of the cost value of the Fund from time to time multiplied by the capacity multiplier determined annually by the SBOE, but not to exceed a multiplier of five. The capacity of the Guarantee Program will be limited to the lower of the State Capacity Limit or the IRS Limit. On May 21, 2010, the SBOE modified the regulations that govern the School District Bond Guarantee Program (the “SDBGP Rules”), and increased the State Law Capacity to an amount equal to three times the cost value of the PSF. Such modified regulations, including the revised capacity rule, became effective on July 1, 2010. The SDBGP Rules provide that the Commissioner may reduce the multiplier to maintain the AAA credit rating of the Guarantee Program, but provide that any changes to the multiplier made by the Commissioner are to be ratified or rejected by the SBOE at the next meeting following the change. See “Valuation of the PSF and Guaranteed Bonds,” below.

At its September 2015 meeting, the SBOE voted to modify the SDBGP Rules and the CDBGP Rules to increase the State Law Capacity from 3 times the cost value multiplier to 3.25 times. At
that meeting, the SBOE also approved a new 5% capacity reserve for the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program. The change to the State Law Capacity became effective on February 1, 2016. At its November 2016 meeting, the SBOE again voted to increase the State Law Capacity and, in accordance with applicable requirements for the modification of SDBGP and CDBGP Rules, a second and final vote to approve the increase in the State Law Capacity occurred on February 3, 2017. As a result, the State Law Capacity increased from 3.25 times the cost value multiplier to 3.50 times effective March 1, 2017. The State Law Capacity increased from $118,511,255,268 on August 31, 2018 to $123,509,204,770 on August 31, 2019 (but at such date the IRS Limit was lower, $117,318,653,038, so it is the currently effective 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 of the Guarantee Program in excess of any reserved portion is referred to herein as the “Capacity Reserve.” The SDBGP Rules provide for a minimum Capacity Reserve for the 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 Commissioner is authorized to change the Capacity Reserve, which decision must be ratified or rejected by the SBOE at its next meeting following any change made by the Commissioner. The current Capacity Reserve is noted in the monthly updates with respect to the capacity of the Guarantee Program on the TEA web site at http://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 changes in the value of the Fund due to changes in securities markets, investment objectives of the Fund, an increase in bond issues by school districts in the State or legal restrictions on the Fund, 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 an increase in the calculation base of the Fund for purposes of making transfers to the ASF. It is anticipated that the issuance of the IRS Notice and the Final IRS Regulations will result in a substantial increase in the amount of bonds guaranteed under the Guarantee Program, and as the amount of guaranteed bonds approaches the IRS Limit, it is expected that the SBOE will seek changes to the existing IRS guidance regarding the Guarantee Program with the objective of obtaining an increase in the IRS...
The implementation of the Charter School Bond Guarantee Program is also expected to increase the amount of guaranteed bonds.

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

The School District Bond Guarantee Program

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

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

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

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

Generally, the SDBGP Rules limit guarantees to certain types of notes and bonds, including, with respect to refunding bonds issued by school districts, a requirement that the bonds produce debt service savings, and that bonds issued for capital facilities of school districts must have been voted as unlimited tax debt of the issuing district. The Guarantee Program Rules include certain accreditation criteria for districts applying for a guarantee of their bonds, and limit guarantees to districts that have less than the amount of annual debt service per average daily attendance that represents the 90th percentile of annual debt service per average daily attendance for all school districts, but such limitation will not apply to school districts that have enrollment growth of at least 25% over the previous five school years. The SDBGP Rules are codified in the Texas Administrative Code at 19 TAC section 33.65, and are available at http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter033/ch033a.html#33.65.

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 http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter033/ch033a.html#33.67.

The Charter District Bond Guarantee Program has been authorized through the enactment of amendments to the Act, which provide that a charter holder may make application to the Commissioner for designation as a “charter district” and for a guarantee by the PSF under the Act of bonds issued on behalf of a charter district by a non-profit corporation. If the conditions for the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program are satisfied, the guarantee becomes effective upon approval of the bonds by the Attorney General and remains in effect until the guaranteed bonds are paid or defeased, by a refunding or otherwise.

As of March 20, 2020 (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 6.15%. At September 10, 2020, there were 182 active open-enrollment charter schools in the State and there were 840 charter school campuses active under such charters (though as of such date, 19 of such campuses are not
Section 12.101, Texas Education Code, as amended by the Legislature in 2013, limits the number of charters that the 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 Commissioner may not approve the guarantee of refunding or refinanced bonds under the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program in a total amount that exceeds one-half of the total amount available for the guarantee of charter district bonds under the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program.

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

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

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

The CDBGP Rules provide that the PSF may be used to guarantee bonds issued for the acquisition, construction, repair, or renovation of an educational facility for an open-enrollment charter holder and equipping real property of an open-enrollment charter school and/or to refinance promissory notes executed by an open-enrollment charter school, each in an amount in excess of $500,000 the proceeds of which loans were used for a 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 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 allocates capacity between the School District Bond Guarantee Program and 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, 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 Program, or a combination of such circumstances.

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. The complete text of SB 1480 can be found at http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/tlodocs/85R/billtext/pdf/SB01480F.pdf#navpanes=0. SB 1480 modified how the CDBGP Capacity will be established under the Act effective as of September 1, 2017, and made other substantive changes to the Act that affects the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program. Prior to the enactment of SB 1480, the CDBGP Capacity was calculated as the State 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. As of August 31, 2019, the amount of outstanding bond guarantees represented 71.94% of the IRS Limit (which is currently the applicable capacity limit) for the Guarantee Program (based on unaudited data). SB 1480 amended the CDBGP Capacity calculation so that the State 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 potentially substantially increasing the CDBGP Capacity. However, certain provisions of SB 1480, described below, and other additional factors described herein, could result in less than the maximum amount of the potential increase provided by SB 1480 being implemented by the SBOE or otherwise used by charter districts. Still other factors used in determining the CDBGP Capacity, such as the percentage of the charter district scholastic population to the overall public school scholastic population, could, in and of itself, increase the CDBGP Capacity, as that percentage has grown from 3.53% in September, 2012 to 6.15% in March 2020. TEA is unable to predict how the ratio of charter district students to the total State scholastic population will change over time.

SB 1480 provides that the implementation of the new method of calculating the CDBGP Capacity will begin with the State fiscal year that commences September 1, 2021 (the State’s fiscal year 2022). However, for the intervening four fiscal years, beginning with fiscal year 2018, SB 1480 provides that the SBOE may establish a CDBGP Capacity that increases the amount of charter
district bonds that may be guaranteed 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. However, SB 1480 provides that in making its annual determination of the magnitude of an increase for any year, the SBOE may establish a lower (or no) increase if the SBOE determines that an increase in the CDBGP Capacity would likely result in a negative impact on the bond ratings for the Bond Guarantee Program (see “Ratings of Bonds Guaranteed Under the Guarantee Program”) or if one or more charter districts default on payment of principal or interest on a guaranteed bond, resulting in a negative impact on the bond ratings of the Bond Guarantee Program. The provisions of SB 1480 that provide for discretionary, incremental increases in the CDBGP expire September 1, 2022. If the SBOE makes a determination for any year based upon the potential ratings impact on the Bond Guarantee Program and modifies the increase that would otherwise be implemented under SB 1480 for that year, the SBOE may also make appropriate adjustments to the schedule for subsequent years to reflect the modification, provided that the CDBGP Capacity for any year may not exceed the limit provided in the schedule set forth in SB 1480. As a result of SB 1480, the amount of charter district bonds eligible for guarantee in fiscal years 2018, 2019 and 2020 increased by the full 20% increase permitted by SB 1480, which increased the relative capacity of the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program to the School District Bond Guarantee Program for those fiscal years.

Taking into account the enactment of SB 1480 and the increase in the CDBGP Capacity effected thereby, at the Winter 2018 meeting the SBOE determined not to implement a previously approved multiplier increase to 3.75 times market value, opting to increase the multiplier to 3.50 times effective in late March 2018.

In addition to modifying the manner of determining the CDBGP Capacity, SB 1480 provides that the Commissioner, in making a determination as to whether to approve a guarantee for a charter district, may consider any additional reasonable factor that the Commissioner determines to be necessary to protect the Bond Guarantee Program or minimize risk to the PSF, including: (1) whether the charter district had an average daily attendance of more than 75 percent of its student capacity for each of the preceding three school years, or for each school year of operation if the charter district has not been in operation for the preceding three school years; (2) the performance of the charter district under certain performance criteria set forth in Education Code Sections 39.053 and 39.054; and (3) any other indicator of performance that could affect the charter district's financial performance. Also, SB 1480 provides that the 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 Commissioner may decline to approve the application if the Commissioner determines that sufficient security is not provided. The Act and the CDBGP Rules previously required the 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 Commissioner, for deposit in the Charter District Reserve Fund, an amount equal to 10 percent 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 Commissioner, for deposit in the Charter District Reserve Fund, an amount equal to 20 percent 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 three percent (3.00%) of the total amount of outstanding guaranteed bonds issued by charter districts. As of July 31, 2020, the Charter District Reserve Fund contained $39,357,006, which represented approximately 1.56% of the guaranteed charter district bonds. SB 1480 also authorized the SBOE to manage the Charter District Reserve Fund in the same manner as it manages the PSF. Previously, the Charter District Reserve Fund was held by the Comptroller, but effective April 1, 2018, the management of the Reserve Fund was transferred to the PSF division of TEA, where it will be 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. The amount of such State payments a charter district receives is based on a variety of factors, including the enrollment at the schools operated by a charter district. The overall amount of education aid provided by the State for charter schools in any year is also subject to appropriation by the Legislature. The Legislature may base its decisions about appropriations for charter schools on many factors, including the State's economic performance. Further, because some public officials, their constituents, commentators and others have viewed charter schools as controversial, political factors may also come to bear on charter school funding, and such factors are subject to change.

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 so 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
The maintenance of a State-granted charter is dependent upon on-going compliance with State law and TEA regulations, and TEA monitors compliance with applicable standards. 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.

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 establishes a Charter District Reserve Fund, which could in the future be a significant reimbursement resource for the PSF.

Infectious Disease Outbreak

A respiratory disease named “2019 novel coronavirus” (“COVID-19”) has recently spread to many parts of the world, including Texas and elsewhere in the U.S. On March 13, 2020, the U.S. president declared a national emergency and the Governor of Texas (the “Governor”) declared COVID-19 as a statewide public health disaster (the “COVID-19 Declarations”). Subsequent actions by the Governor imposed temporary restrictions on certain businesses and ordered all schools in the State to temporarily close. This situation is rapidly developing; 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.
Potential Impact of COVID-19 in the State and Investment Markets

The anticipated continued spread of COVID-19, and measures taken to prevent or reduce its spread, have adversely impacted State, national and global economic activities and, accordingly, materially adversely impacted the financial condition and performance of the State. The continued spread of COVID-19, and measures taken to prevent or reduce its spread, may also adversely affect the tax bases of school districts in the State, including districts that have bonds that are guaranteed under the Guarantee Program.

As noted herein, the PSF investments are in diversified investment portfolios and it is expected that the Fund will reflect the general performance returns of the markets in which it is invested. Stock values, crude oil prices and other investment categories in the U.S. and globally in which the Fund is invested or which provide income to the Fund, have seen significant volatility attributed to COVID-19 concerns, which could adversely affect the Fund's values.

TEA Continuity of Operations

Since 2007, Texas Labor Code Section 412.054 has required each State agency to develop and submit to the State Office of Risk Management an agency-level continuity of operations plan to keep the agency operational in case of disruptions to production, finance, administration or other essential operations. Such plans may be implemented during the occurrence or imminent threat of events such as extreme weather, natural disasters and infectious disease outbreaks. TEA has adopted a continuity of operations plan, which provides for, among other measures and conditions, steps to be taken to ensure performance of its essential missions and functions under such threats and conditions in the event of a pandemic event. TEA annually conducts risk assessments and risk impact analysis that include stress testing and availability analysis of system resources, including systems that enable TEA employees to work remotely, as is occurring as a result of the COVID-19 declarations. As noted above, under “The School District Bond Guarantee Program,” the Guarantee Program is in significant part an intercept program whereby State funding for school districts and charter districts reimburse the Fund for any guarantee payment from the Fund for a non-performing district. In addition to the continuity of operations plan provisions noted above, the Fund maintains cash positions in its portfolios that are intended to provide liquidity to the Fund for payments under the Guarantee Program pending reimbursement of the Fund by the Comptroller. Fund management is of the view that its liquidity position, which changes from time to time in light of then current circumstances, is sufficient for payment of claims made on the Guarantee Program.
Impact of COVID-19 on School Districts and Charter Districts

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. Most school district bonds in the State are issued as fixed rate debt, with semiannual payments in February and August. Taxes levied by school districts for payment of bonds are generally collected by the end of January in each year. Consequently, scheduled bond payments for school districts for the 2020 calendar year have generally not been affected by COVID-19. TEA has issued guidance to school districts and charter districts regarding a variety of matters pertaining to school operations in light of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Certain aspects of TEA’s guidance include waivers pertaining to State funding provisions, local financial matters and general operations. TEA has implemented “hold harmless” funding for school districts and charter districts for the last 12 weeks of school year 2019–2020 and during the first 12 weeks of the 2020–21 school year. Additional information in this regard is available at the TEA website at https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/health-safety-discipline/covid/coronavirus-covid-19-support-and-guidance.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year Ended 8/31</th>
<th>Book Value(^{(1)})</th>
<th>Market Value(^{(1)})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$29,081,052,900</td>
<td>$36,196,265,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>30,128,037,903</td>
<td>37,279,799,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>31,870,581,428</td>
<td>41,438,672,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>33,860,358,647</td>
<td>44,074,197,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019(^{(2)})</td>
<td>35,288,344,219</td>
<td>46,464,447,981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(1)}\) 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.

(2) At August 31, 2019, 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, $216.7 million, $3,640.2 million, $7.5 million, and $4,457.3 million, respectively, and market values of approximately $3,198.2 million, $619.7 million, $3,927.6 million, $1.3 million, and $4,457.3 million, respectively. At July 31, 2020, the PSF had a book value of $36,431,148,233 and a market value of $47,621,722,583. July 31, 2020 values are based on unaudited data, which is subject to adjustment.

### Permanent School Fund Guaranteed Bonds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Principal Amount(1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$63,955,449,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>68,303,328,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>74,266,090,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>79,080,901,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>84,397,900,203(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) 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.

(2) As of August 31, 2019 (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 $133,188,149,265, of which $48,790,249,062 represents interest to be paid. As shown in the table above, at August 31, 2019, there were $84,397,900,203 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 lower of the two federal and State capacity limits of Program capacity), net of the Program’s 5% reserve, as of July 31, 2020, 95.92% of Program capacity was available to the School District Bond Guarantee Program and 4.08% was available to the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program.

### Permanent School Fund Guaranteed Bonds by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year Ended 8/31</th>
<th>School District Bonds</th>
<th>Charter District Bonds</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Issues</td>
<td>Principal Amount</td>
<td>No. of Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3,089</td>
<td>$63,197,514,047</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3,244</td>
<td>67,342,303,445</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>3,253</td>
<td>72,884,480,023</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3,249</td>
<td>77,647,966,069</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019(2)</td>
<td>3,297</td>
<td>82,537,755,203</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) 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.

(2) At July 31, 2020 (based on unaudited data, which is subject to adjustment), there were $90,353,133,727 of bonds guaranteed under the Guarantee Program, representing 3,388 school district issues, aggregating $87,833,583,727 in principal amount and 61 charter district issues, aggregating $2,519,550,000 in principal amount. At July 31, 2020, the capacity allocation of the Charter District Bond Guarantee Program was $4,551,091,422 (based on unaudited data, which is subject to adjustment).

Discussion and Analysis Pertaining to Fiscal Year Ended August 31, 2019

The following discussion is derived from the Annual Report for the year ended August 31, 2019, 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) assets. As of August 31, 2019, the Fund’s land, mineral rights and certain real assets are managed by the three-member SLB and these assets are referred to throughout as the PSF(SLB) assets. The current PSF asset allocation policy includes an allocation for real estate investments, and as such investments are made, and become a part of the PSF investment portfolio, those investments will be managed by the SBOE and not the SLB.

At the end of fiscal 2019, the Fund balance was $46.5 billion, an increase of $2.4 billion from the prior year. This increase is primarily due to overall increases in value of all asset classes in which the Fund has invested and restatements of fund balance. 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, 2019, net of fees, were 4.17%, 5.25% and 8.18%, respectively (total return takes into consideration the change in the market value of the Fund during the year as well as the interest and dividend income generated by the Fund’s investments). In addition, the SLB continued its shift into externally managed real asset investment funds, and the one-year, five-year, and ten-year annualized total returns for the PSF(SLB) externally managed real assets, net of fees and including cash, were 5.84%, 6.13%, and 6.41%, 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. As of August 31, 2019, the
PSF(SBOE) portion of the Fund had diversified into emerging market and large cap international equities, absolute return funds, real estate, private equity, risk parity, real return Treasury Inflation-Protected Securities, real return commodities, and emerging market debt.

As of August 31, 2019, the SBOE has approved and the Fund made capital commitments to externally managed real estate investment funds in a total amount of $5.1 billion and capital commitments to private equity limited partnerships for a total of $6.3 billion. Unfunded commitments at August 31, 2019, totaled $1.9 billion in real estate investments and $2.3 billion in private equity investments.

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, 2019, the remaining commitments totaled approximately $2.5 billion.

The PSF(SBOE)’s investment in domestic large cap, domestic small/mid cap, international large cap, and emerging market equity securities experienced returns, net of fees, of 3.14%, -8.99%, -2.93%, and -4.15%, respectively, during the fiscal year ended August 31, 2019. The PSF(SBOE)’s investment in domestic fixed income securities produced a return of 10.54% during the fiscal year and absolute return investments yielded a return of 2.28%. The PSF(SBOE) real estate and private equity investments returned 7.22% and 11.93%, respectively. Risk parity assets produced a return of 10.89%, while real return assets yielded 0.71%. Emerging market debt produced a return of 10.40%. Combined, all PSF(SBOE) asset classes produced an investment return, net of fees, of 4.17% for the fiscal year ended August 31, 2019, out-performing the benchmark index of 3.76% by approximately 41 basis points. All PSF(SLB) externally managed investments (including cash) returned 6.41% net of fees for the fiscal year ending August 31, 2019.

For fiscal year 2019, total revenues, inclusive of unrealized gains and losses and net of security lending rebates and fees, totaled $3.7 billion, a decrease of $0.3 billion from fiscal year 2018 earnings of $4.0 billion. This decrease reflects the performance of the securities markets in which the Fund was invested in fiscal year 2019. In fiscal year 2019, 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, decreased 10.0% for the fiscal year ending August 31, 2019. This decrease is primarily attributable to a decrease 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 supports the public school system in the State by distributing a predetermined percentage of its asset value to the ASF. For fiscal years 2018 and 2019, the distribution from the SBOE to the ASF totaled $1.2 billion and $1.2 billion, respectively. Distributions from the SLB to the ASF for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 totaled $0 and $300 million, respectively.

At the end of the 2019 fiscal year, PSF assets guaranteed $84.4 billion in bonds issued by 863 local school districts and charter districts, the latter of which entered into the Program during the 2014 fiscal year. Since its inception in 1983, the Fund has guaranteed 7,443 school district and charter district bond issues totaling $186.2 billion in principal amount. During the 2019 fiscal year, the number of outstanding issues guaranteed under the Guarantee Program totaled 3,346. The dollar amount of guaranteed school and charter bond issues outstanding increased by $5.3 billion or 6.7%. The State Capacity Limit increased by $5.0 billion, or 4.2%, during fiscal year 2019 due to continued growth in the cost basis of the Fund used to calculate that Program capacity limit. The effective capacity of the Program did not increase during fiscal year 2019 as the IRS Limit was reached during the prior fiscal year, and it is the lower of the two State and federal capacity limits for the Program.

2011 and 2019 Constitutional Amendments

On November 8, 2011, a referendum was held in the State as a result of legislation enacted that year that proposed amendments to various sections of the Texas Constitution pertaining to the PSF. At that referendum, voters of State approved non-substantive changes to the Texas Constitution to clarify references to the Fund, and, in addition, 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 amendments approved at the 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 were already included in the value of the Fund for purposes of the Guarantee Program, but prior to the amendment had not been included in the calculation base for purposes of making transfers from the Fund to the ASF. While the amendment 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.

If there are no reductions in the percentage established biennially by the SBOE to be the Distribution Rate, the impact of the increase in the base against which the Distribution Rate is applied will be an increase in the distributions from the PSF to the ASF. As a result, going forward, it may be necessary for the SBOE to reduce the Distribution Rate in order to preserve the corpus of the Fund in accordance with its management objective of preserving intergenerational equity.

The Distribution Rates for the Fund were set at 3.5%, 2.5%, 4.2%, 3.3%, 3.5% and 3.7% for each of two year periods 2008-2009, 2010-2011, 2012-2013, 2014-2015, 2016-2017 and 2018-2019, respectively. In November 2018, the SBOE approved a $2.2 billion distribution to the ASF for State fiscal biennium 2020-2021, to be made in equal monthly increments of $92.2 million, which represents a 2.981% Distribution Rate for the biennium and a per student distribution of $220.97, based on 2018 preliminary student average daily attendance of 5,004,998. In making the 2020-2021 biennium distribution decision, the SBOE took into account a commitment of the SLB to transfer $10 million to the PSF in fiscal year 2020 and $45 million in fiscal year 2021.

Changes in the Distribution Rate for each biennial period have been based on a number of financial and political reasons, as well as commitments made by the SLB in some years to transfer certain sums to the ASF. The new calculation base described above has been used to determine all payments to the ASF from the Fund beginning with the 2012-13 biennium. The broader base for the Distribution Rate calculation could increase transfers from the PSF to the ASF, although the effect of the broader calculation base has been somewhat offset since the 2014-2015 biennium by the establishment by the SBOE of somewhat lower Distribution Rates than for the 2012-2013 biennium. In addition, the changes made by the amendment that increased the calculation base that could affect the corpus of the Fund include the decisions that are made by the SLB or others that are, or may in the future be, authorized to make transfers of funds from the PSF to the ASF.
The constitutional amendments approved on November 8, 2011 also provided authority to the GLO or any other entity (other than the SBOE) that has responsibility for the management of 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 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 each of the GLO, the SBOE or any other entity that may have the responsibility to manage such properties (at present there are no such other entities). Any amount transferred to the ASF pursuant to this constitutional provision is excluded from the 6% Distribution Rate limitation applicable to SBOE transfers. The exercise of the increased authorization for such transfers is subject to the discretion of the GLO and the SBOE, and such transfers could be taken into account by the SBOE for purposes of its distributions to the ASF that are made pursuant to the Total Return Constitutional Amendment. However, future legal and/or financial analysis may be needed before the impact on the Fund of the constitutional change effected in November 2019 can be determined.

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 http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter033/ch033a.html#33.5.

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.

In the 2011 legislative session, the Legislature approved an increase of 31 positions in the full-time equivalent employees for the administration of the Fund, which was funded as part of an $18 million appropriation for each year of the 2012-13 biennium, in addition to the operational appropriation of $11 million for each year of the biennium. The TEA has begun increasing the PSF administrative staff in accordance with the 2011 legislative appropriation, and the TEA
received an appropriation of $30.2 million for the administration of the PSF for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, respectively, and $30.4 million for each of the fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

As of August 31, 2019, 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/. 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, 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-exempt status of the Guarantee Program, or other material events affecting the tax status of the Guarantee Program; (7) modifications to rights of holders of bonds guaranteed by the Guarantee Program, if such event is material within the meaning of the federal securities laws; (8) bond calls, if such event is material within the meaning of the federal securities laws, and tender offers; (9) defeasances; (10) release, substitution, or sale of property securing repayment of bonds guaranteed by the Guarantee Program, if such event is material within the meaning of the federal securities laws; (11) rating changes; (12) bankruptcy, insolvency, receivership, or similar event of
the Guarantee Program (which is considered to occur when any of the following occur: the appointment of a receiver, fiscal agent, or similar officer for the Guarantee Program in a proceeding under the United States Bankruptcy Code or in any other proceeding under state or federal law in which a court or governmental authority has assumed jurisdiction over substantially all of the assets or business of the Guarantee Program, or if such jurisdiction has been assumed by leaving the existing governing body and officials or officers in possession but subject to the supervision and orders of a court or governmental authority, or the entry of an order confirming a plan of reorganization, arrangement, or liquidation by a court or governmental authority having supervision or jurisdiction over substantially all of the assets or business of the Guarantee Program; (13) the consummation of a merger, consolidation, or acquisition involving the Guarantee Program or the sale of all or substantially all of its assets, other than in the ordinary course of business, the entry into of a definitive agreement to undertake such an action or the termination of a definitive agreement relating to any such actions, other than pursuant to its terms, if material; (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 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.
Limitations and Amendments

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

The continuing disclosure agreement of the TEA is made only with respect to the PSF and the Guarantee Program. The issuer of guaranteed bonds or an obligated person with respect to guaranteed bonds may make a continuing disclosure undertaking in accordance with Rule 15c2-12 with respect to its obligations arising under Rule 15c2-12 pertaining to financial and operating data concerning such entity and notices of material events relating to such guaranteed bonds. A description of such undertaking, if any, is included elsewhere in the Official Statement.

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

Compliance with Prior Undertakings

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.
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.