# Pupil-Centered Funding Plan (PCFP) Reporting Framework

Background Information to Support Implementation of AB400/SB98

## Introduction

AB400/SB98 outlines a set of metrics for inclusion in a new **Pupil-Centered Funding Plan (PCFP) reporting framework**. The PCFP reporting framework is intended to support the Commission on School Funding (CSF) to:

> Review the academic progress made by pupils in each public school since the implementation of the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan, including, without limitation, any changes to the academic progress of such pupils as the result of any additional money provided to each such school by the Pupil-Centered (NRS 387.12463 (f)).

This document provides background information on each of the metrics included in AB400/SB98 to support the CSF's work to operationalize the new PCFP reporting framework.

## Timing and Format of New Reporting Framework

- **Frequency of reporting.** AB400/SB98 require districts and charter schools to submit a quarterly report to the CSF on how PCFP funding is being used to improve student and school performance. However, nearly all the metrics outlined in AB400/SB98 are only collected once per year.
    - **Consideration:** The CSF may want to consider annual reporting rather than quarterly, since data for most of the metrics are collected only once per year.
- **Timing of reporting by districts.** Most of the AB400/SB98 metrics that are currently collected are received by NDE in late winter/spring/summer and reported by NDE in the early fall.
    - **Consideration:** The CSF may want to consider public reporting of the data collected through the PCFP reporting framework in November to align with the timing of current data collection and to allow time for analysis of the data.
- **Level of reporting.** Data for nearly all the metrics is available at the school level.

    - **Consideration**: The CSF may want to consider requesting data at the school level, rather than at the district level, for a more detailed view on student and school progress.
- **Avoiding duplicative reporting.** Metrics outlined in AB400/SB98 come from a mix of sources and would likely involve multiple NDE offices. Some data are reported directly to NDE from a vendor (e.g., from NWEA), while others must be reported by school districts and charter schools to NDE to meet reporting requirements.
    - **Consideration:** To avoid any duplication in reporting, the CSF may want to consider having districts and charter schools report only data that NDE does not already have access to each year (i.e., NDE receives it directly from a vendor or it is reported as part of an alternate reporting requirement).
- **Trend analysis.** AB400/SB98 do not specify how many years of data should be collected, analyzed and reported to understand changes in student and school performance.
    - **Consideration:** For the initial report, the CSF may want to consider including data starting from 2020 to compare the old funding plan with the new funding plan and the additional investment. Reports for future years would only collect data for the current year.

# Available and Aligned Metrics for Fall 2024

The following AB400/SB98 metrics are aligned with existing reporting requirements [e.g., Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF) and/or Acing Accountability] and are available for inclusion in the Fall 2024 reporting cycle of the PCFP Reporting Framework.

- The rate of graduation of pupils from high school by type of diploma
    - Data source: These data are currently reported on the Nevada Report Card.
    - Data collection: School districts and charter schools report these data to NDE in the spring.
    - Reporting level: These data are available at the school level.
    - Timing of data reporting: These data are publicly available on September 15 of each year.

- **Consideration:** Graduation rate is included in the NSPF, although not by diploma type. Graduation rate is not included in Acing Accountability. Does the CSF want to include data related to graduation rates by type of diploma, such as standard, advanced, or specialized diplomas? Such graduation rates provide detailed insights into the academic achievements of students within a school system. This metric helps assess not just whether students are graduating, but the level of academic rigor they have engaged with. High rates of advanced or specialized diplomas can indicate a strong academic program, while variation among student groups may highlight inequities or areas for targeted improvement. Graduation rates are a crucial metric in school accountability systems, reflecting the goal of educational institutions to prepare students for successful completion of their studies. High graduation rates are often seen as indicators of effective teaching, supportive learning environments, and strong administrative policies. These rates are used not only to gauge school performance but also to identify areas needing improvement, and to influence policy and resource allocation decisions. Graduation rates are closely monitored by various stakeholders including educators, parents, and policymakers.
- **Related research:**
  - Harris, Douglas, N. (2020). Are America's rising high school graduation rates real - Or just an accountability-fueled mirage? Brookings Institution.
  - Hall, D. (2007). Graduation Matters: Improving accountability for high school graduation. The Education Trust.

- The performance of pupils on standardized examinations in math, reading and science
  - Data source: Office of Assessment, Data, and Accountability Management (ADAM) receives standardized test results in math and English for grades 3–8 and 11 and in science for grades 5–8 and high school (either 9th or 10th grade) from the assessment vendor.
  - Data collection: School districts do not need to report these data to NDE since NDE already has access to these data.
  - Reporting level: These data are available at the school level.
  - Timing of data reporting: These data are publicly available on September 15 of each year.

    - **Consideration:** No additional considerations to offer for this metric. Performance data on standardized tests is included in the NSPF and Acing Accountability report. These performance data are a core metric for assessing student achievement and school effectiveness. These scores are pivotal in identifying gaps in learning across grade levels and by student group. They can serve as a proxy to understand teacher effectiveness and can guide curriculum adjustments. The examination of test scores across subjects can provide a comprehensive view of educational outcomes, helping educators and policymakers to implement targeted interventions for improvement.
    - **Related research**: Laura S. Hamilton, Brian M. Stecher & Kun Yuan (2012) Standards-Based Accountability in the United States: Lessons Learned and Future Directions. Education Inquiry, 3:2, 149-170, DOI: 10.3402/edui.v3i2.22025

- The number of pupils who earn a passing score on an advanced placement (AP) examination
    - Data source: ADAM receives data on the number of students who pass the AP exam with a score of 3 or higher from school districts and the SPCSA as part of the Acing Accountability report. These data are also reported as part of the NSPF.
    - Data collection: School districts and charter schools must report these data to NDE.
    - Reporting level: These data are available at the school level, but NDE aggregates the data to the district level for reporting purposes.
    - Timing of data reporting: Data are final by October 15.
    - **Consideration:** No additional considerations to offer for this metric. Also included in the NSPF and Acing Accountability report.

- The number of pupils who earn a passing score on an international baccalaureate (IB) examination
    - Data source: ADAM receives data on the number of students who pass the IB exam with a score of 4 or higher from school districts and the SPCSA as part of the Acing Accountability report.

- Data collection: School districts and charter schools must report these data to NDE.
- Reporting level: These data are available at the school-level, but NDE aggregates the data to the district level for reporting purposes.
- Timing of data reporting: Data are final by October 15.
- **Consideration:** No additional considerations to offer for this metric. Also included in the NSPF and Acing Accountability report.

- The percentage of pupils in each school who drop out
  - Data source: ADAM collects these data.
  - Data collection: School districts and charter schools must report these data to NDE.
  - Reporting level: These data are available at the school level.
  - Timing of data reporting: Data are publicly available on September 15 of each year.
  - **Considerations:** These data are not collected as part of the NSPF. They are reported on the Report Card. Dropout rates are a significant metric in educational accountability, reflecting the percentage of students who do not complete their high school education within a given timeframe. High dropout rates may indicate issues such as inadequate academic support, low engagement, or socioeconomic challenges. Tracking and addressing dropout rates are essential for improving student success and ensuring equitable access to educational opportunities.
  - **Related research:**
    - Dynarski, M., Clarke, L., Cobb, B., Finn, J., Rumberger, R., & Smink, J. (2008). Dropout Prevention: IES Practice Guide. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.

        - Rumberger, R. W., & Lim, S. A. (2008). Why students drop out of school: A review of 25 years of research. California Dropout Research Project.
        - Allensworth, E., & Easton, J. Q. (2007). What Matters for Staying On-Track and Graduating in Chicago Public High Schools. Consortium on Chicago School Research.

- The number of violent acts by pupils and disciplinary actions against pupils
    - Data source: Detailed data on disciplinary acts are currently reported on the Report Card.
    - Data collection: School districts and charter schools report these data to NDE.
    - Reporting level: These data are collected at the school level.
    - Timing of data reporting: Data are reported on the Nevada Report Card on September 15.
    - **Considerations:** These data are not included in the NSPF or Acing Accountability. They are reported on the Report Card. Does the CSF want to include data related to disciplinary actions in schools, such as suspensions and expulsions? These incidents serve as important indicators of school climate, student behavior management, and school-level behavior response. Monitoring these metrics can help educational leaders understand patterns of behavior and the effectiveness of disciplinary policies. High rates of disciplinary actions may signal issues such as inadequate support systems or inequitable disciplinary practices, which can disproportionately affect certain student groups. Addressing these rates (and creating incentives to address these rates) can lead to improved educational outcomes and more supportive school environments.
    - **Related research:**
        - Noltemeyer, A., & Ward, R. M. (2015). Relationship between school suspension and student outcomes: A meta-analysis. *School Psychology Review*.

- The retention rate for teachers **(including mover, leaver, and stay rate)**
    - Data source: These data will be captured in the new data dashboard in the form of mover, leaver, and stay rate.

- Data collection: School districts and charter schools will report these data to NDE.
- Timing of data reporting: Data on mover, leaver, and stay rate will be refreshed daily and can be pulled at any time during the year.
- Reporting level: Data will be available at the school and district levels.
- **Considerations:** Does the CSF want to report on all three of these categories? See Hanita et al., 2021 for more considerations on measuring retention; for example, breaking retention down by teacher type (grade/subject area/race). Acing Accountability reports on the number of fully licensed and certified staff, vacancies, and long-term substitute teachers.

- **Related Research:**

  - Hanita, M., Bailey, J., Khanani, N., & Zhang, X. (2021). *Analyzing teacher mobility and retention: Guidance and considerations report 2.* REL 2021-081. Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast & Islands.

- The number of credentials or other certifications in fields of career and technical education (CTE) earned **for high school graduates who completed a CTE program of study (bolded text is a change to the metric description from AB 400/SB 98)**
  - Data source: Perkins V starting with 2024/25 federal reporting year.
  - Data collection and timing: These data are due by June 30, 2024, for the 2023–24 school year. Once NDE validates the data (which takes a couple of months), they will produce a report for the December State Board of Education meeting. Starting with the 2024–25 school year, districts will submit data to NDE by the end of September each year, and NDE will validate the data and submit them to the U.S. Department of Education (USED) by January 31 as part of the required Consolidated Annual Report (CAR). USED validates and approves the data in April or May. NDE does not publicly share data that are submitted for the CAR until the CAR is approved by USED. Data are reported only: 1) for high school graduates (i.e., data will not include credentials/certifications earned by non-graduates until they graduate high school), and 2) for those who completed a CTE program of study. If a student does not meet these criteria, NDE does not collect CTE credential/certification data.

- **Considerations**: According to NDE, if the CSF wants to include data on CTE certification/credentials in the framework beyond what is currently collected, NDE will need to submit a significant budget enhancement to do this work. These programs often provide hands-on learning experiences and can be powerful for reducing dropout rates and increasing student engagement (Stone & Morgan, 2012; Castellano, Sundell, Overman, Richardson, & Stone, 2014). Monitoring and reporting access to CTE programs can help schools enhance curriculum relevance, align training with labor market demands, and ensure equity in access to high-quality, meaningful training and experiences.
- **Related research**
  - Stone, James R. & Lewis, Morgan V. (2012). College and Career Ready in the 21st Century: Making High School Matter. Teachers College Press.
  - Castellano, Marisa; Sundell, Kirsten E.; Overman, Laura T.; Richardson, George B.; Stone, James R., III. (2014). Rigorous Tests of Student Outcomes in CTE Programs of Study: Final Report. National Research Center for Career and Technical Education

- Number of pupils who enroll in higher education upon graduation **(for NSHE institutions only)**

  - Data source: The data NDE has on the number of pupils who enroll in higher education upon graduation is **specific to NSHE institutions**. NDE does not collect data on higher education programs that are private or out-of-state institutions. These data are submitted on a timeline in alignment with all Perkins V accountability measures. Districts conduct surveys each year, and NDE validates the data and submits the information to USED by January 31 of each year as part of the required Consolidated Annual Report (CAR). USED validates and approves data in April or May. NDE does not publicly share data that is submitted for the CAR until the CAR is approved by USED.
  - **Considerations:** Does the CSF want to include data related to higher education participation and opportunities available to students after graduation? Enrollment in higher education is a critical metric for evaluating the success of high schools in preparing students for post-secondary education and in supporting students during the application process. This measure can provide insights into the effectiveness of a school's college readiness programs and guidance services.

Higher rates of college enrollment are often associated with a school's ability to provide rigorous academic programs, effective counseling, and resources that promote higher education aspirations among students.

- **Related research:**
  - Knight, David S. & Duncheon, Julia C. (2019). Broadening conceptions of a "college-going culture": The role of high school climate factors in college enrollment and persistence. Sage Journals.
  - Conley, David T. (2007). Redefining College Readiness. Educational Policy Improvement Center.

# Understanding the Use of Funds: Additional Metrics for Consideration

The CSF may want to consider including the following additional financial metrics as part of the new reporting framework to track PCFP funding and expenditures. If possible, data would be collected over a multi-year window to understand changes in how funds are allocated and spent.

- Per pupil total expenditures by LEA and school:
  - Per pupil total expenditures by school should be included as a metric to understand the change in overall funding available to students in each school.
  - Data Source: Total LEA-level per pupil expenditures is currently available in the 387.303 report on expenditures. Total school-level per pupil expenditures is currently collected in InSites/SchoolNomics reporting.
  - **Considerations:** No additional considerations, as data are already available.

- Per pupil revenues by PCFP fund category:
  - To track funding by PCFP funding source and the changes over time in PCFP funding, revenues per pupil by PCFP fund category—General Fund (adjusted base funding), Special Education, At-Risk, EL and GATE—should be included as a metric.
  - Data Source: LEA-level data are available from the PCFP formula allocations calculated by NDE (which are then reported in the 387.303 Statewide Annual

Report). For school-level data, this may require adjustments to the InSites/SchoolNomics reporting structure to ensure data are collected and reported by PCFP funding categories.
    - **Considerations:** Decisions will need to be made on which student count to use to create per pupil figures, especially for at-risk students at the LEA and school level. Likely, using the funded-student count in each category would be the best approach.

- Per pupil expenditures by PCFP fund category:
    - Expenditures per pupil by PCFP fund should also be included as a metric to track expenditures by student group and examine how resources have changed for these students over time.
    - Data Source: LEA-level data are available from the 387.303 report, which disaggregates total district-level spending by PCFP fund—General Fund (adjusted base funding), Special Education, At-Risk, EL and GATE. For school-level reporting, this may require adjustments to the InSites/SchoolNomics reporting structure to ensure data are collected and reported by PCFP funding categories.
    - **Considerations:** Decisions will need to be made on which student count to use to create per pupil figures, especially for at-risk students at the LEA and school level. Likely, using the funded-student count in each category would be the best approach.

- Per pupil expenditures and percentage of total expenditures by function (total and by PCFP fund category, if available):
    - Per pupil expenditures by function including instruction, instructional support, student support, and administration, should be included, both for total funding and then within each PCFP fund category, if available, to understand how resources are allocated to serve students and how those allocations have changed over time. Additionally, to allow for comparison across differently sized LEAs and schools, these by-function figures should also be expressed as a percentage of total expenditures.

- Data Source: Currently, LEA-level expenditures are available from two sources: the 387.303 report and InSites/SchoolNomics reporting. However, while the 387.303 does present expenditures by PCFP fund, it then primarily disaggregates expenditures by object, and not function (except within salaries). As such, the only detailed LEA-level expenditure data by function categories are InSites/SchoolNomics reporting, which are also available at the school-level; however, these data are not yet disaggregated by PCFP fund.
- **Considerations:** The reporting structure of InSites/SchoolNomics may need to be adjusted as the function categories within that reporting are not aligned with the common function categories used within Nevada's Chart of Accounts (guidelines for financial reporting used by Nevada districts) and to collect/report data by PCFP fund.

- Per pupil expenditures and percentage of total expenditures by object (total and by PCFP fund category, if available):
  - Per pupil expenditures by object should be included in the new reporting framework to understand how resources are allocated across objects like salaries, benefits, purchased services, and supplies and how those allocations have changed over time. Additionally, to allow for comparison across differently sized LEAs and schools, the percentage of total expenditures by object area should also be collected. These data should be for both total expenditures and for expenditures by PCFP fund category, if available.
  - Data Source: As noted above, LEA-level expenditures are available from both the 387.303 report, and InSites/SchoolNomics reporting, and both sources disaggregate expenditures by object. The 387.303 report also presents expenditures separately by PCFP fund category. InSites/SchoolNomics also has school-level data.
  - **Considerations:** If InSites/SchoolNomics reporting is used either at the LEA or school level, adjustments to its reporting structure to disaggregate by PCFP fund category would be beneficial.

- FTE counts and per student ratios by function (total and by PCFP fund category, if available):
    - To understand how staff are allocated between function areas and how that has changed over time, FTE counts by function area including instruction, instructional support, student support, and administration could be collected. Additionally, creating a per student ratio of these FTE by function area will allow for comparison between LEAs and schools. If possible, having these data by PCFP fund would also provide a more complete picture of how resources are being used.
    - Data Source: We do not believe information on FTE, disaggregated by function or by PCFP fund source in staffing, is currently available, including in the 387.12468 report and personnel data included as part of district report card submissions.
    - **Considerations:** Obtaining detailed FTE information would likely require new data collection.

# Metrics that Require Further Exploration

The PCFP reporting framework outlined in AB400/SB98 includes several metrics that are not readily available as described in legislation or are planned for collection in future years. This section provides details on those metrics for the CSF's consideration.

## Alternative Metrics Available for Inclusion

For some metrics, NDE currently collects similar but different data than what is outlined in AB400/SB98. These metrics are described in more detail for the CSF's consideration.

- The attendance rate for pupils
    - Data source: Data on student attendance for the first 100 days of school are currently collected by ADAM.
    - Data collection: School districts and charter schools report these data to NDE.
    - Reporting level: These data are collected at the school level.
    - Timing of data reporting: Data are reported on the Nevada Report Card on September 15.

- **Considerations:** Chronic absenteeism is included in the NSPF, but not the attendance rate. Attendance rate is reported on the Nevada Report Card. Acing Accountability does not include attendance or chronic absenteeism. Which measure of attendance will be used (e.g., attendance rate, chronic absenteeism)?
- **Related research:**
  - Bauer, L., Liu, P., Schanzenbach, D. W., & Shambaugh, J. (2018). *Reducing chronic absenteeism under the Every Student Succeeds Act.* Brookings Institution, 1-31.

- The percentage of pupils in each school who lack a sufficient number of credits to graduate by the end of their 12th grade year
  - Data source: Credit deficiency data are collected for grades 9–12.
  - Reporting level: These data are reported at the district and state level.
  - Timing of data reporting: Data are reported on the Nevada Report Card on September 15.
  - **Considerations:** 9th grade credit deficiency is included under the "student engagement" indicator for the NSPF as an early indicator of whether students are on track to graduate. The CSF may want to consider inclusion of 9th grade credit deficiency in the PCFP framework to align with the NSPF.

- The literacy rate for pupils in first, third, **and fifth grades**
  - Data source: NWEA provides MAP reports for the winter and spring for kindergarten and three times per year for grades 1-3.
  - Data collection: NDE receives reports directly from NWEA.
  - Reporting level: These data are collected at the school level.
  - **Considerations:**
    - Would need to define literacy rate (could be proficiency, growth?)
    - Students take NWEA MAP in grades K–3. Include kindergarten and 2nd grades also?
    - Students take the SBAC in 5th grade and these data would already be reported through the metric related to performance on standardized tests. However, ELA measures are more than just reading.

        - May want to consider whether diagnostic measures (e.g., NWEA MAP) are valid for use in school accountability. Public reporting of literacy rates is scarce across the nation (O'Keefe, 2017).
    - **Related research:**
        - O'Keefe, B. (2017). *The state of early learning in ESSA: Plans and opportunities for implementation. Policy Brief.* Center on Enhancing Early Learning Outcomes.

- The number of classes taught by substitute teachers for more than 25 percent of the school year
    - Data source: NDE does not currently collect these data. As part of the EDLiFE survey, NDE collects data on the number of short- and long-term substitutes. A short-term substitute is defined as less than 20 days and a long-term substitute is defined as 20 days or more.
    - Data collection: School districts report these data to NDE in the EDLiFE report.
    - Timing of data reporting: Data are usually received by NDE in early November based on the October 1 vacancy rate. Some districts take longer to report their data (as late as December or January).
    - **Considerations:** The CSF would need to work with NDE to determine how to collect data for this metric since it does not currently exist, and/or use existing data on the number of short- and long-term substitutes either temporarily or in lieu of this metric.

- The rate of vacancies in positions for teachers, **support staff** and administrators
    - Data source: NDE currently collects data on the vacancy rate for teachers and administrators but NOT for support staff as part of EDLiFE. The new dashboard only captures data on licensed employees and therefore will not include data on support staff either.
    - Data collection: School districts report the vacancy rates for teachers and administrators to NDE.
    - Timing of data reporting: Data are usually received by NDE in early November based on the October 1 vacancy rate. Some districts take longer to report their data (as late as December or January).

- Reporting level: Historically, data on vacancy rates were collected at the district level, not at the school level. ADAM began collecting these data at the school level starting in Spring 2024 to meet the reporting requirements for Acing Accountability. Data on the vacancy rate for teachers and administrators are collected to meet federal reporting requirements.
- **Considerations:** NDE currently collects data on the vacancy rate for teachers and administrators but NOT for support staff. If the CSF recommends including data on the vacancy rate for support staff, NDE would need to define "support staff." NDE mentioned that these data would be useful to have, particularly if the data were broken out by position type for support staff.

## Metrics for Further Discussion

- The attendance rate for teachers
  - Response from NDE: These data are not reported in Infinite Campus and will not be captured by the new educator dashboard.
  - **Considerations:** There tends to be limited variability in attendance rates for teachers across districts. There is also a lack of strong evidence in support of using teacher attendance for school accountability (Gershenson, 2015).
  - **Related research:**
    - Gershenson, S. (2015). Did No Child Left Behind affect teacher attendance?: Evidence from North Carolina. *Employment Research Newsletter, 22*(2), 2.
- The number of pupils in elementary school who were promoted to the next grade after testing below proficient in reading in the immediately preceding school year, separated by grade level and by level of performance on the relevant test
  - Data source: These data are not currently collected. A key use of the MAP data is to identify students who are struggling in reading or reading below grade level. Students who score at 40 percent or below students qualify for Read by Grade 3 intervention services (mandated services). It does not preclude students who score slightly above from receiving services.
  - **Consideration:** Does this metric provide substantive value about literacy not already discerned through the literacy rate metric described above?

- **Related research:**
  - Schwerdt, G., West, M. R., & Winters, M. A. (2017). The effects of test-based retention on student outcomes over time: Regression discontinuity evidence from Florida. *Journal of Public Economics, 152,* 154-169.

- The number of schools that employ a licensed teacher designated to serve as a literacy specialist pursuant to NRS 388.159 and the number of schools that fail to employ and designate such a licensed teacher
  - Data source: These data will be available once the dashboard goes live by downloading positions at each school and filtering by position. Once the dashboard is rolled out, it will provide NDE with better information on how districts and schools are identifying literary specialists so that the identification can become universal across all districts and schools.
  - **Considerations:** The CSF may want to consider how this new metric will help them assess student and school progress. Can reporting account for differences in how much of the staff member's day is dedicated to this role (i.e., the percent of FTE dedicated to being a literacy specialist)? Can failure to employ versus designate be discerned? According to NDE, some schools are not able to hire a literacy specialist because of staffing issues in the state.

- The number of pupils who enroll in a vocational or technical school or apprenticeship training program
  - Data source: According to NDE, no entity in the state collects this information. Survey data from students are inaccurate/unreliable and based on district return rate of surveys as part of Perkins V for high school graduates who completed a CTE program of study ONLY. It will not contain a significant number of graduates. The State Apprenticeship Council is working with GOWINN and NPWR to get their data into the state longitudinal data system.
  - **Considerations:** Does the CSF want to include data related to the participation, access to, and enrollment in vocational and technical schools? Student access to these schools and programs can serve as important metrics for evaluating the availability and effectiveness of specialized education that prepares students for specific careers. These programs are crucial for meeting the workforce needs of

industries and providing students with practical skills and certifications. Effective measurement of these metrics helps ensure that educational programs are aligned with job market demands and are accessible to all students, including those from diverse backgrounds. It is important to consider the degree to which communities, schools, and students across the state have access to such opportunities. However, NDE suggested that the Department SHOULD NOT be adding this as a data collection point. If that is what the CSF wants, NDE will need to submit a significant budget enhancement to do this work. The best way to get this data in the future is through NPWR, not NDE.

- The number of schools and classrooms within each school in which the number of pupils in attendance exceeds the designed capacity for the school or classroom
    - Data source: The NDE annual facilities report (NAC 387.501) tries to capture information on the number of classrooms that exceed designed capacity, but NDE has found that defining capacity is complicated. NDE does collect info regarding quality/issues with school buildings.
    - **Considerations:** Data for this metric may not be reliable. Does the CSF want to align with research related to the effects and importance of educational environments? The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) defines classroom overcrowding as “when the number of students enrolled in the school is larger than the number of students the school is designed to accommodate” and notes that a classroom is considered overcrowded when it exceeds 5% of the building’s designed capacity. Classroom overcrowding is a metric for assessing educational environments. Research regarding the effects of classroom size can be contradictory, with some studies finding small detrimental effects on learning (Hattie, 2009). Overcrowded classrooms can impact teaching effectiveness, student learning experiences, and overall academic achievement, and could be related to other variables that negatively affect student and teacher experiences (NCES, 1999). This metric helps identify schools that may require additional resources, infrastructure improvements, or policy adjustments to ensure optimal learning conditions. The metric of classroom size might be a good example of practical significance contrasted with statistical significance.
    - Related research:

        - Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. New York, NY: Routledge.
        - National Center for Education Statistics. (1999). Condition of America's Public School Facilities: 1999. National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC.

- Survey data on school satisfaction (The results of an annual survey of satisfaction of school employees; and the results of an annual survey of satisfaction of pupils, parents or legal guardians of pupils and graduates).
    - Data collection: NDE does not currently collect these data. NDE administers several different surveys, including for school employees, for students, and for parents/guardians, but none of them include questions regarding satisfaction.
    - **Considerations:** All districts must use the same survey. Statistical properties and response rates of existing surveys from past years should be analyzed to examine validity. See Schneider et al., 2021 for more information on use of climate surveys in accountability systems.
    - **Related research:**
        - Schneider, J., Noonan, J., White, R. S., Gagnon, D., & Carey, A. (2021). Adding "student voice" to the mix: Perception surveys and state accountability systems. *AERA Open, 7*, 23328584219907.

# Longer term and secondary considerations

Per **AB 400/SB 98,** part of the CSF's charge is also to:

> SB 98 10 (f) (7) Make recommendations to the Department, school districts and charter schools to improve the reporting, tracking, monitoring, analyzing and dissemination of data relating to pupil achievement and financial accountability, including, without limitation, revisions to the metrics identified in subparagraphs (1) to (4), inclusive.

Accordingly, the CSF may want to consider additional recommendations related to improving alignment. Examples of these considerations include the following.

- Creating a single, integrated reporting framework to measure progress in Nevada that incorporates the most meaningful elements of the NSPF, Acing Accountability, and AB 400/SB 98 reporting framework. This may require:
    - Sunsetting reporting requirements for Acing Accountability as a separate reporting framework
    - Adding AB 400/SB98 metrics to the Report Card
    - Adding all metrics from the NSPF to the Report Card
    - Moving away from separate reporting for AB400/SB98 (and all other reporting requirements) and building a statewide data portal and reporting system so school district data can be uploaded instead of entered manually
    - Reducing the burden on districts and charter schools by collecting data at the state level, when possible, rather than asking school districts to report data that NDE already has access to
    - Additional investments in NDE to make these changes
    - Disaggregating data to align with PCFP. Currently, data for the NSPF are disaggregated by race/ethnicity, special education, English learner status, and economically disadvantaged status, but they are not disaggregated by the "at-risk" category used to allocate funding in the PCFP. To align with the PCFP, Nevada may want to consider tracking performance and expenditures for students who meet the definition of "at-risk."
- The CSF may also want to consider having NDE evaluate and revise the NSPF to include more meaningful/holistic indicators and measures
    - NDE and the CSF may want to continue to identify key performance indicators that are the best harbingers of success and incorporate them into the new reporting framework. As part of this work, identify quality/performance measures for non-instructional services such as student support, staff support, school administration and other school-based services.
- The CSF may want to work with NDE to ensure public engagement around the new reporting framework.