## Topics in Chapter

- Common Size analysis and Ratio analysis
- DuPont system
- Effects of improving ratios
- Limitations of ratio analysis
- Qualitative factors


## Standardized Financial Statements

- Common-Size Balance Sheets
. Compute all accounts as a percent of total assets
- Common-Size Income Statements
. Compute all line items as a percent of sales
- Standardized statements make it easier to compare $\qquad$ financial information, particularly as the company grows
- They are also useful for comparing companies of different sizes, particularly within the same industry
- Methods presented here are being replaced by statistical methods

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


## Ratio Analysis

- Something/Something else
- Ratios allow for better comparison through time or between companies
- As we look at each ratio, ask yourself $\qquad$ what the ratio is trying to measure and why that information is important
- Ratios are used both internally and externally
$\qquad$
$\qquad$



## Categories of Financial Ratios

- Short-term solvency or liquidity ratios
- Long-term solvency or financial leverage ratios
- Asset management or turnover ratios
- Profitability ratios
- Market value ratios

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


## Contact Charles Hodges

- Email D2L Email or chodges@siu.edu
- Chat Sessions
- Skype (bufordshighway), LinkedIn and $\qquad$ Facebook (Charles Hodges).
- Office Phone (678)839-4816 and Cell $\qquad$ Phone (770)301-8648, target is under 24 hours


| Income Statement |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2013 | 2014E |
| Sales | \$5,834,400 | \$7,035,600 |
| COGS except depr. | 4,980,000 | 5,800,000 |
| Other expenses | 720,000 | 612,960 |
| Deprec. | 116,960 | 120,000 |
| Tot. op. costs | 5,816,960 | 6,532,960 |
| EBIT | 17,440 | 502,640 |
| Int. expense | 176,000 | 80,000 |
| EBT | $(158,560)$ | 422,640 |
| Taxes (40\%) | $(63,424)$ | 169,056 |
| Net income | (\$95,136) | \$ 253,584 |
|  |  | 边 10 |


| Balance Sheets: Assets |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underline{2013}$ | 2014E |
| Cash | \$ 7,282 | \$ 14,000 |
| S-T invest. | 20,000 | 71,632 |
| AR | 632,160 | 878,000 |
| Inventories | 1,287,360 | 1,716,480 |
| Total CA | 1,946,802 | 2,680,112 |
| Net FA | 939,790 | 836,840 |
| Total assets | \$2,886,592 | \$3,516,952 |
|  |  |  |


|  | ts: Liab |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2013 | $\underline{2014 E}$ |  |
| Accts. payable | \$ 324,000 |  | 359,800 |
| Notes payable | 720,000 |  | 300,000 |
| Accruals | 284,960 |  | 380,000 |
| Total CL | 1,328,960 |  | 1,039,800 |
| Long-term debt | 1,000,000 |  | 500,000 |
| Common stock | 460,000 |  | 1,680,936 |
| Ret. earnings | 97,632 |  | 296,216 |
| Total equity | 557,632 |  | 1,977,152 |
| Total L\&E | \$2,886,592 |  | 3,516,952 |
|  |  |  |  |


| Other Data |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underline{2013}$ | $\underline{2014 E}$ |
| Stock price | \$6.00 | \$12.17 |
| \# of shares | 100,000 | 250,000 |
| EPS | -\$0.95 | \$1.01 |
| DPS | \$0.11 | \$0.22 |
| Book val. per sh. | \$5.58 | \$7.91 |
| Lease payments | \$40,000 | \$40,000 |
| Tax rate | 0.4 | 0.4 |
|  |  | , mome |

## Liquidity Ratios

- Can the company meet its short-term obligations using the resources it currently has on hand?

Forecasted Current and Quick
Ratios for 2014.
$\mathrm{CR}_{14}=\frac{\mathrm{CA}}{\mathrm{CL}}=\frac{\$ 2,680}{\$ 1,040}=2.58$.
$\mathrm{QR}_{14}=\frac{\mathrm{CA}-\mathrm{Inv} .}{\mathrm{CL}}$
$=\frac{\$ 2,680-\$ 1,716}{\$ 1,040}=0.93$.



- Expected to improve but still below the industry average.
- Liquidity position is weak.



## Asset Management Ratios

- How efficiently does the firm use its assets?
- How much does the firm have tied up in assets for each dollar of sales?

Inventory Turnover Ratio vs. Industry Average

Inv. Turnover $=\frac{\text { COGS }}{\text { Inventories }}$

$$
=\frac{\$ 5,800+\$ 120}{\$ 1,716}=3.45 .
$$

|  |  |  | 2014 E | 2013 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Inv. T. | 3.45 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 6.1 |

## Comments on Inventory <br> Turnover

- Inventory turnover is below industry average. $\qquad$
- Firm might have old inventory, or its control might be poor.
- No improvement is currently forecasted.

DSO: average number of days from sale until cash received.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { DSO } & =\frac{\text { Receivables }}{\text { Average sales per day }} \\
& =\frac{\text { Receivables }}{\text { Sales } / 365}=\frac{\$ 878}{\$ 7,036 / 365} \\
& =45.5 \text { days. }
\end{aligned}
$$

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Appraisal of DSO

- Firm collects too slowly, and situation is getting worse.
- Poor credit policy.

|  | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 | Ind. |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| DSO | 45.5 | 39.5 | 37.4 | 32.0 |


Fixed Assets and Total Assets
Turnover Ratios

| Fixed assets <br> turnover | $=\frac{\text { Sales }}{\text { Net fixed assets }}$ |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | $=\frac{\$ 7,036}{\$ 837}=8.41$. |
| Total assets <br> turnover | $=\frac{\text { Sales }}{\text { Total assets }}$ |
|  | $=\frac{\$ 7,036}{\$ 3,517}=2.00$. |
| (More...) |  |

## Fixed Assets and Total Assets

Turnover Ratios

- FA turnover is expected to exceed industry average. Good.
- TA turnover not up to industry average. Caused by excessive current assets (A/R and inventory).

|  | 2014 E | 2013 | 2012 | Ind. |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| FA TO | 8.4 | 6.2 | 10.0 | 7.0 |
| TA TO | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 2.5 |


$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Contact Charles Hodges

- Email D2L Email or chodges@siu.edu
- Chat Sessions $\qquad$
- Skype (bufordshighway), LinkedIn and $\qquad$ Facebook (Charles Hodges).
$\qquad$ Phone (770)301-8648, target is under 24 hours


$\qquad$

Times Interest Earned Ratio

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{TIE} & =\frac{\mathrm{EBIT}}{\text { Int. expense }} \\
& =\frac{\$ 502.6}{\$ 80}=6.3 .
\end{aligned}
$$

(More...)


$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Debt Management Ratios vs. Industry Averages

|  | 2014E | 2013 | 2012 | Ind. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D/TA | $22.7 \%$ | $59.6 \%$ | $35.6 \%$ | $32.0 \%$ |
| TL/TA | $43.8 \%$ | $80.7 \%$ | $54.8 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ |
| TIE | 6.3 | 0.1 | 3.3 | 6.2 |
| EC | 5.5 | 0.8 | 2.6 | 8.0 |

Recapitalization improved situation, but lease payments drag down EC.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Profit Margins

Net profit margin (PM):
$\mathrm{PM}=\frac{\mathrm{NI}}{\text { Sales }}=\frac{\$ 253.6}{\$ 7,036}=3.6 \%$.
Operating profit margin (OM):
$O M=\frac{\text { EBIT }}{\text { Sales }}=\frac{\$ 503}{\$ 7,036}=7.1 \%$.
(More...)


## Profit Margins (Continued)

Gross profit margin (GPM):
GPM $=\frac{\text { Sales - COGS }}{\text { Sales }}=\$ 7,036-\$ 5,800$ \$7,036 $\qquad$
GPM $=\frac{\$ 1,236}{\$ 7,036}=17.6 \%$. $\qquad$
$\qquad$
Profit Margins vs. Industry Averages

|  | 2014 E | 2013 | 2012 | Ind. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PM | $3.6 \%$ | $-1.6 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ |
| OPM | 7.1 | 0.3 | 6.1 | 7.1 |
| GPM | 17.6 | 14.6 | 16.6 | 15.5 |

Very bad in 2013, but projected to meet or exceed industry average in 2014.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Basic Earning Power (BEP)

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { BEP } & =\frac{\text { EBIT }}{\text { Total assets }} \\
& =\frac{\$ 502.6}{\$ 3,517}=14.3 \%
\end{aligned}
$$

(More...)


## Basic Earning Power vs. Industry Average

- BEP removes effect of taxes and financial leverage. Useful for $\qquad$ comparison.
- Projected to be below average. $\qquad$
- Room for improvement.

|  | 2014 E | 2013 | 2012 | Ind. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEP | $14.3 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $14.2 \%$ | $17.8 \%$ |

$\qquad$
$\qquad$



## Return on Assets (ROA) and Return on Equity (ROE)

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { ROE } & =\frac{\text { NI }}{\text { Common Equity }} \\
& =\frac{\$ 253.6}{\$ 1,977}=12.8 \% .
\end{aligned}
$$

(More...)



- ROA is lowered by debt--interest expense lowers net income, which also lowers ROA.
- However, the use of debt lowers equity, and if equity is lowered more than net income, ROE would increase.



## Contact Charles Hodges

- Email D2L Email or chodges@siu.edu
- Chat Sessions
- Skype (bufordshighway), LinkedIn and Facebook (Charles Hodges).
- Office Phone (678)839-4816 and Cell Phone (770)301-8648, target is under 24 hours



## Market Value Ratios

- Market value ratios incorporate the:
- High current levels of earnings and cash flow increase market value ratios
- High expected growth in earnings and cash flow increases market value ratios
- High risk of expected growth in earnings and cash flow decreases market value ratios


## Calculate and appraise the $P / E, P / C F$, and $M / B$ ratios.

Price $=\$ 12.17$.
$\mathrm{EPS}=\frac{\mathrm{NI}}{\text { Shares out. }}=\frac{\$ 253.6}{250}=\$ 1.01$.
$\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{E}=\frac{\text { Price per share }}{\mathrm{EPS}}=\frac{\$ 12.17}{\$ 1.01}=12$.

43

## Market Based Ratios

CF per share $=\frac{\mathrm{NI}+\text { Depr. }}{\text { Shares out. }}$
$=\frac{\$ 253.6+\$ 120.0}{250}=\$ 1.49$.
$\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{CF}=\frac{\text { Price per share }}{\text { Cash flow per share }}$
$=\frac{\$ 12.17}{\$ 1.49}=8.2$.



## Interpreting Market Based

Ratios

- P/E: How much investors will pay for $\$ 1$ of earnings. Higher is better.
- M/B: How much paid for $\$ 1$ of book value. Higher is better.
- P/E and M/B are high if ROE is high, risk is low.


## Comparison with Industry Averages

|  | 2014E |  | 2013 | 2012 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P/E | 12.0 | -6.3 | 9.7 | Ind. |
| P/CF | 8.2 | 27.5 | 8.0 | 7.6 |
| M/B | 1.5 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 2.9 |

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

| P/CF | 8.2 | 27.5 | 8.0 | 7.6 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| M/B | 1.5 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 2.9 | $\qquad$

$\qquad$
$\qquad$

| Common Size Balance Sheets: Divide all items by Total Assets |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assets | 2012 | 2013 | 2014E | Ind. |
| Cash | 0.6\% | 0.3\% | 0.4\% | 0.3\% |
| ST Inv. | 3.3\% | 0.7\% | 2.0\% | 0.3\% |
| AR | 23.9\% | 21.9\% | 25.0\% | 22.4\% |
| Invent. | 48.7\% | 44.6\% | 48.8\% | 41.2\% |
| Total CA | 76.5\% | 67.4\% | 76.2\% | 64.1\% |
| Net FA | 23.5\% | 32.6\% | 23.8\% | 35.9\% |
| TA | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
| 䢒 |  |  |  |  |


| Divide all items by Total Liabilities \& Equity |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Liab. \& Eq. | $\underline{2012}$ | $\underline{2013}$ | 2014E |  |  |
| AP | 9.9\% | 11.2\% | 10.2\% |  |  |
| Notes pay. | 13.6\% | 24.9\% | 8.5\% |  |  |
| Accruals | 9.3\% | 9.9\% | 10.8\% |  |  |
| Total CL | 32.8\% | 46.0\% | 29.6\% |  |  |
| LT Debt | 22.0\% | 34.6\% | 14.2\% | 26. |  |
| Total eq. | 45.2\% | 19.3\% | 56.2\% |  |  |
| Total L\&E | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Analysis of Common Size Balance Sheets

- Computron has higher proportion of inventory and current assets than Industry.
- Computron now has more equity (which means LESS debt) than Industry.
- Computron has more short-term debt
$\qquad$ than industry, but less long-term debt than industry.


Common Size Income Statement: Divide all items by Sales

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\underline{2012}$ | $\underline{2013}$ | $\underline{2014 E}$ | $\underline{\underline{I n d}}$ |
| Sales | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| COGS | $83.4 \%$ | $85.4 \%$ | $82.4 \%$ | $84.5 \%$ |
| Depr. | $0.6 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ |
| Other exp. | $\underline{9.9 \%}$ | $\underline{12.3 \%}$ | $\underline{8.7 \%}$ | $\underline{4.4 \%}$ |
| $\quad$ EBIT | $6.1 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ |
| Int. Exp. | $\underline{1.8 \%}$ | $\underline{3.0 \%}$ | $\underline{1.1 \%}$ | $\underline{1.1 \%}$ |
| $\quad$ Pre-tax earn. | $4.3 \%$ | $-2.7 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ |
| Taxes | $\underline{1.7 \%}$ | $\underline{-1.1 \%}$ | $\underline{2.4 \%}$ | $\underline{2.4 \%}$ |
| NI | $2.6 \%$ | $-1.6 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |



| Percentage Change Analysis: \% Change from First Year (2012) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income St. | $\underline{2012}$ | 2013 | 2014E |
| Sales | 0.0\% | 70.0\% | 105.0\% |
| COGS | 0.0\% | 73.9\% | 102.5\% |
| Depr. | 0.0\% | 518.8\% | 534.9\% |
| Other exp. | 0.0\% | 111.8\% | 80.3\% |
| EBIT | 0.0\% | -91.7\% | 140.4\% |
| Int. Exp. | 0.0\% | 181.6\% | 28.0\% |
| EBT | 0.0\% | -208.2\% | 188.3\% |
| Taxes | 0.0\% | -208.2\% | 188.3\% |
| NI | 0.0\% | -208.2\% | 188.3\% |
|  |  |  |  |

## Analysis of Percent Change Income Statement

- We see that 2014 sales grew 105\% from 2012, and that NI grew 188\% $\qquad$ from 2012.
- So Computron has become more $\qquad$ profitable.

| Percentage Change Balance Sheets: Assets |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assets | 2012 | $\underline{2013}$ | $\underline{2014 E}$ |
| Cash | 0.0\% | -19.1\% | 55.6\% |
| ST Invest. | 0.0\% | -58.8\% | 47.4\% |
| AR | 0.0\% | 80.0\% | 150.0\% |
| Invent. | 0.0\% | 80.0\% | 140.0\% |
| Total CA | 0.0\% | 73.2\% | 138.4\% |
| Net FA | 0.0\% | 172.6\% | 142.7\% |
| TA | 0.0\% | 96.5\% | 139.4\% |
|  |  |  |  |


| Percentage Change Balance Sheets: Liabilities \& Equity |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Liab. \& Eq. | $\underline{2012}$ | $\underline{2013}$ | $\underline{2014 E}$ |
| AP | 0.0\% | 122.5\% | 147.1\% |
| Notes pay. | 0.0\% | 260.0\% | 50.0\% |
| Accruals | 0.0\% | 109.5\% | 179.4\% |
| Total CL | 0.0\% | 175.9\% | 115.9\% |
| LT Debt | 0.0\% | 209.2\% | 54.6\% |
| Total eq. | 0.0\% | -16.0\% | 197.9\% |
| Total L\&E | 0.0\% | 96.5\% | 139.4\% |
|  |  |  |  |

## Analysis of Percent Change Balance Sheets

- We see that total assets grew 139\%, while sales grew only $105 \%$. So asset utilization remains a problem.


## Contact Charles Hodges

- Email D2L Email or chodges@siu.edu
- Chat Sessions
- Skype (bufordshighway), LinkedIn and Facebook (Charles Hodges).
- Office Phone (678)839-4816 and Cell Phone (770)301-8648, target is under 24 hours



## Explain the DuPont System

- The DuPont system focuses on:
- Expense control (PM)
- Asset utilization (TATO)
- Debt utilization (EM)
- It shows how these factors combine to determine the ROE.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


## Potential Problems and Limitations of Ratio Analysis

- Comparison with industry averages is difficult if the firm operates many different divisions.
- Seasonal factors can distort ratios.
- Window dressing techniques can make statements and ratios look better.
- Different accounting and operating practices can distort comparisons.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ practices can distor comparisons. $\qquad$



## Qualitative Factors

- There is greater risk if:
- revenues tied to a single customer
- revenues tied to a single product
- reliance on a single supplier?
- High percentage of business is generated overseas?
- What is the competitive situation?
- What products are in the pipeline?
- What are the legal and regulatory issues? $\qquad$


| Contact Charles Hodges |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Email D2L Email or chodges＠siu．edu Chat Sessions |
|  | Skype（bufordshighway），LinkedIn and Facebook（Charles Hodges）． |
|  | Office Phone（678）839－4816 and Cell Phone（770）301－8648，target is under 24 hours |
|  | ， |


| 工 |
| :--- |
| 工 |
| 工 |

