



In 1969, the Accounting Principles Board issued APB Opinion No. 15, "Earnings per Share". APB Opinion No. 15 required that EPS be reported and prescribed how these amounts would be computed and disclosed. APB Opinion No. 15 defined a simple capital structure for which it prescribed a single EPS presentation, and a complex capital structure for which it prescribed a dual EPS presentation. APB Opinion No. 15 has been amended several times by statement of the Financial Accounting Standard since 1969. Recently, FASB statement No. 128, "Earnings per Share" supersedes APB Opinion No. 15 and the related Interpretations of Opinion 15.

Instructions

- (a) Explain why the existence of convertible securities and other financing instruments necessitated the reporting requirements for EPS prescribed by APB Opinion No. 15.
- (b) Much of the effort involved in reporting EPS concerns the identification of common stock equivalents.
  1. In addition to convertible securities that meet the yield test for common stock equivalence, what other items are considered common stock equivalents?
  2. Describe the circumstances under which a convertible security that meets the yield test for common stock equivalence would not be assumed to be converted in the computation of EPS.
- (c) *Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 55, "Determining Whether a Convertible Security is a Common Stock Equivalent,"* which was adopted in 1982, changed the test for common stock equivalence from "a cash yield of less than 66% percent of the then current bank prime interest rate" as prescribed in APB Opinion No. 15, to "a cash yield of less than 66% percent of the then current average AA corporate bond yield." Explain the reason for this change.
- (d) *Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 85, "Yield Test for Determining Whether a Convertible Security is a Common Stock Equivalent,"* which was adopted in 1985, changed the test for common stock equivalence from the "cash yield test" as prescribed in APB Opinion No. 15 and continued in *Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 55*, to the "effective yield test." Explain the reason for this change.
- (e) List the main requirements prescribed by SFAS No. 128, which changed those prescribed by APB Opinion No. 15. Explain the reason for this change.

(25%)

三. Balboa Manufacturing Company, a California corporation listed on the Pacific Coast Stock Exchange, budgeted activities for 1996 as follows:

	Amount	Units
Net sales	\$9,000,000	1,000,000
Cost of goods sold	<u>5,400,000</u>	
Gross margin	\$3,600,000	
Selling, general, and administrative expenses	<u>2,100,000</u>	
Operating income	\$1,500,000	
Nonoperating revenues and expenses	-0-	
Income before income taxes	\$1,500,000	
Estimated income taxes (current and deferred)	<u>800,000</u>	
Net income	<u>\$ 700,000</u>	
Earnings per share of common stock	<u>\$9.00</u>	

Balboa has operated profitably for many years and has experienced a seasonal pattern of sales volume and production similar to those below forecasted for 1996. Sales volume is expected to follow a quarterly pattern of 10%, 20%, 35%, 35%, respectively, because of the seasonality of the industry. Also, owing to production and storage capacity limitations, it is expected that production will follow a pattern of 20%, 25%, 30%, 25%, per quarter, respectively.

At the conclusion of the first quarter of 1996, Vasco DeGama, the controller of Balboa, has prepared and issued the following interim report for public release:

	Amount	Units
Net sales	\$ 600,000	100,000
Cost of goods sold	<u>540,000</u>	100,000
Gross margin	\$ 60,000	
Selling, general, and administrative expenses	<u>412,500</u>	
Operating loss	\$ (52,500)	
Loss from warehouse fire	<u>(262,500)</u>	
Loss before income taxes	\$ (315,000)	
Estimated income taxes	-0-	
Net loss	<u>\$ (315,000)</u>	
Loss per share of common stock	<u>\$ (3.15)</u>	

The following additional information is available for the first quarter just completed, but was not included in the public information released:

1. Assume that the warehouse fire loss met the conditions of an extraordinary loss. The warehouse had an undepreciated cost of \$480,000; \$217,500 was recovered from insurance on the warehouse. No other gains or losses are anticipated this year from similar events or transactions, and Balboa had no similar losses in preceding years; thus, the full loss will be deductible as an ordinary loss for income tax purposes.
2. The company uses a standard cost system in which standards are set at currently attainable levels on an annual basis. At the end of the first quarter there was underapplied fixed factory overhead (volume variance) of \$75,000 that was treated as an asset at the end of the quarter. Production during the quarter was 200,000 units, of which 100,000 were sold.
3. The selling, general, and administrative expenses were budgeted on a basis of \$1,350,000 fixed expenses for the year plus 75¢ variable expenses per unit of sales.
4. The effective income tax rate, for federal and state taxes combined, is expected to average 40% of earnings before income taxes during 1996. There are no permanent differences between pretax accounting earnings and taxable income.
5. Earnings per share were computed on the basis of 100,000 shares of capital stock outstanding. Balboa has only one class of stock issued, no long-term debt outstanding, and no stock option plan.

Instructions:

- (a) Without reference to the specific situation described above, what are the standards of disclosure for interim financial data (published interim financial reports) for publicly traded companies? Explain.
- (b) Identify the weaknesses in form and content of Balboa's interim report without reference to the additional information. Explain.
- (c) For each of the five items of additional information, indicate the preferable treatment for each item for interim reporting purposes and explain why that treatment is preferable.

(25%)

UFS

"Why not?" thought Alan Burke. "My first day on the job at the bank and instead of getting a company with a nice single set of financial statements, I get five separate sets of statements that supposedly fit together."

Alan Burke had just started as a new credit analyst for the First National Bank of Austin, having just completed an MBA degree with a major in finance at the local university. From the loan officer responsible for this client, Alan learned the following information about each of the four companies associated with UFS Corporation and about the UFS Corporation itself.

**UFS CORPORATION**

The UFS Corporation was a manufacturing company whose principal products were microwave ovens, refrigerators, and conventional ovens. The company had had a long history (over 50 years) of selling high-quality, high-priced home appliances; however, recent reductions in the prices of competitor products had forced UFS to consider ways to provide assistance to its customers to help them buy its products. As a consequence, UFS had started its own finance subsidiary, the UFS Acceptance Corporation, to assist customers in the financing of their purchases.

UFS Corporation was also associated with three other companies. It held an 80 percent interest in Scrub-All, a company that made automatic dishwashers. UFS had purchased this interest in Scrub-All because the company's product line complemented its own, and the products were of a quality that UFS would have had difficulty duplicating. Further, to ensure a steady supply of chrome parts for its appliances, UFS had obtained a 10 percent interest in the common stock of Acme Chrome Company. Well over 50 percent of Acme's sales were attributed to purchases by UFS and Scrub-All. Also, in order to compete in the low-end market for various appliances, UFS Corporation formed a joint venture with Whitwind Products Co. for the production of such appliances.

**UFS ACCEPTANCE CORPORATION**

Created nearly five years ago, the UFS Acceptance Corporation was a wholly owned subsidiary that purchased consumer notes from its parent, the UFS Corporation. UFS Acceptance borrowed funds from several banking institutions on a medium- and long-term basis, and used the margins between the short-term interest rates on the consumer notes and the rates on its medium- and long-term liabilities to cover its overhead costs. The parent company guaranteed all of the borrowings of UFS Acceptance Corporation.

**SCRUB-ALL COMPANY**

With an ownership interest of 80 percent of the common stock of Scrub-All, UFS Corporation controlled the tactical and strategic policies of the Scrub-All Company through an interlocking board of directors. Scrub-All, like UFS, sold its consumer notes to UFS Acceptance Corporation. The family that originally started Scrub-All still holds a 20 percent ownership interest in the common stock of the company.

**ACME CHROME COMPANY**

In order to guarantee a steady supply of chrome parts and that a company would work with the engineers of UFS in the design of new parts, UFS had purchased a 10 percent interest in Acme Chrome Company. Over the years, a strong relationship had developed between UFS and Acme. For example, Acme scheduled the production runs of its other customers around the production needs of UFS and Scrub-All.

**SPOTLESS APPLIANCE CO.**

Both UFS Corporation and Whitwind Products Co. contributed half of the funds necessary to start Spotless Appliance Co. Spotless Appliance Co. makes low-end priced appliance models, which are sold under the Spotless trade name or are labeled with various department store names. The board of directors of Spotless Appliance Co. consists of an equal number of members voted in by each of UFS Corporation and Whitwind Products Co. and three members from outside either of the respective companies. Any debt of Spotless is guaranteed by both UFS Corporation and Whitwind Products Co.

Mike Huxley, the loan officer responsible for UFS, provided Alan with the financial statements of the five companies (Exhibits 1-5) and asked him to answer some basic credit review questions concerning an expanding loan application that had been received from the parent company. Before Alan could complete the credit review, he identified the following questions that needed to be addressed in order to understand the relationship between the various companies.

**EXHIBIT 1**

**UFS CORPORATION  
Consolidated Balance Sheet  
December 31, 1988**

Assets	
Current assets:	
Notes receivable	\$ 87,500,000
Investment in stock of Spotless Appliance Co. (equity 100%)	82,000,000
Investment in stock of Acme Chrome Company (100%) at cost	1,750,000
Other assets	5,000,000
Goodwill	104,500,000
Total assets	3,839,000
Liabilities and Stockholders' Equity	
Current liabilities:	
Long-term liabilities	\$ 21,500,000
Accrued interest	202,100,000
Current stock	7,500,000
Retained earnings	15,500,000
Total liabilities and stockholders' equity	289,600,000

**EXHIBIT 2**

**UFS ACCEPTANCE CORPORATION  
Balance Sheet  
December 31, 1988**

Assets		Liabilities and Stockholders' Equity	
Current assets:			
Notes receivable	\$ 8,000,000		
Other assets	84,000,000		
Total assets	92,000,000		
		Current liabilities:	
		Long-term debt	\$ 5,000,000
		Common stock (\$1 par)	47,100,000
		Retained earnings	40,000,000
		Total liabilities and equity	92,000,000

\* \$1,000,000 of the current liability is a promissory note to UFS Corporation. UFS Corporation accounts for this as a long-term receivable in Other Assets.

EXHIBIT 3

SCRUB-ALL COMPANY  
Balance Sheet  
December 31, 1988

Assets	
Current assets	\$18,400,000
Other assets	\$2,600,000
<b>Total assets</b>	<b>\$21,000,000</b>
Liabilities and Stockholders' Equity	
Current liabilities	\$12,250,000
Long-term liabilities	18,150,000
Common stock	12,000,000
Retained earnings	28,500,000
<b>Total liabilities and stockholders' equity</b>	<b>\$69,000,000</b>

EXHIBIT 4

ACME CHROME COMPANY  
Balance Sheet  
December 31, 1988

Assets	
Current assets	\$14,750,000
Other assets	85,250,000
<b>Total assets</b>	<b>\$100,000,000</b>
Liabilities and Stockholders' Equity	
Current liabilities	\$5,000,000
Long-term liabilities	15,000,000
Capital stock	79,750,000
Retained earnings	12,250,000
<b>Total liabilities and stockholders' equity</b>	<b>\$112,000,000</b>

EXHIBIT 5

SPOTLESS APPLIANCE COMPANY  
Balance Sheet  
December 31, 1988

Assets	
Current assets	\$ 8,500,000
Other assets	16,000,000
<b>Total assets</b>	<b>\$24,500,000</b>
Liabilities and Stockholders' Equity	
Current liabilities	\$ 3,000,000
Long-term debt	19,000,000
Common stock (25 par)	6,000,000
Retained earnings	(2,500,000)
<b>Total liabilities and equities</b>	<b>\$24,500,000</b>

QUESTIONS

1. Why are investments in Acme Chrome and Spotless Appliance Co. shown on the balance sheet, while the investments in Scrub-All and UFS Appliance Corporation are omitted?
2. What is meant by the carrying value "at equity" for the investment in Spotless Appliance Co.?
3. Why is the investment in Acme Chrome Company shown "at cost"?
4. Explain the "goodwill" account. What other name is sometimes used instead of goodwill and to what company is this account related?
5. What is meant by "priority interest" and to what company is this account related? Is this a liability or an equity account?
6. What are UFS Corporation's current ratio, debt-to-equity ratio, and debt-to-asset ratio? Are these ratios at an acceptable level?
7. How would the balance sheet of UFS Corporation appear if Spotless Appliance Co. were consolidated? Would you recommend consolidation for Spotless? Can an argument be made for consolidating Acme-Chrome Company?
8. How does the balance sheet of the parent company appear without any of the subsidiaries consolidated? Would you use this statement to make your credit decision?

(25%)