

	Recommendation	Background	Included in LO1
	Auxiliary Services		
1	<p>CSF Recommendation: Auxiliary service allocations, consisting of food services and transportation costs, should be based on a four-year average of actual expenditures.</p> <p>Additionally, a hold harmless adjustment, similar to that used for payments based on quarterly Average Daily Enrollment data, should be applied in the event expenditures decrease compared to the previous fiscal year.</p>	<p>Background: The PCFP funds Auxiliary services, consisting of food services and transportation, in its own tier prior to funding the Statewide Base per pupil funding amount. Currently, the funding provided through the Auxiliary services tier is based on a district's four-year average of actual expenses with no inflationary adjustment. The Commission recommends a hold-harmless adjustment akin to the one used for payments based on quarterly average daily enrollment be applied to smooth the volatility of expenses that a district could occur from year to year.</p>	No
2	<p>CSF Recommendation: Charter schools and university schools for profoundly gifted pupils should be included in the Auxiliary services calculation of the Pupil-Centered Finding Plan (PCFP), using the same funding methodology established for school districts.</p>	<p>Charter schools and university schools for the profoundly gifted are currently not able to receive funding for Auxiliary services. The Commission made a series of recommendations aimed at treating charter schools and districts equitably in Auxiliary service funding. Accordingly, the Commission recommends that charter schools and university schools for the profoundly gifted be included in the Auxiliary services calculation. Additionally, since the initial expense for providing Auxiliary services can require a large capital investment, the Commission recommends that the allocations for charters and university schools offering Auxiliary services for the first time should still receive payment based on the number of years for which expenditure data is available. Charter and university schools planning to introduce Auxiliary services for the first time should submit a line-item budget to be submitted with an application to the Nevada Department of Education.</p>	No
3	<p>CSF Recommendation: If charter schools or university schools for profoundly gifted pupils have not incurred expenditures for Auxiliary services for a total of four years,</p>	<p>Additionally, it was noted that while charter schools and university schools should be allowed to begin providing Auxiliary services, there are some districts that are limited from providing the services or replacing necessary equipment</p>	No

	<p>the average should be based on the number of years for which expenditure data is available.</p>	<p>as they do not have the necessary initial capital or the ability to bond like the larger districts possess. The Commission concluded that these districts should have the same ability to received funding for Auxiliary services as the charter and university schools would receive as recommended by the Commission.</p>	
4	<p>CSF Recommendation: An inflation adjustment factor for Auxiliary services should be established that mirrors the inflationary factor for the PCFP.</p>		No
5	<p>CSF Recommendation: Allow charter schools offering Auxiliary services for the first time to develop a line-item budget based on projected needs that would be submitted with an application to the Nevada Department of Education.</p>		No
6	<p>CSF Recommendation: The 4-year average of transportation costs would exclude any capital cost. District capital costs would be initially funded on a per-pupil basis, which is based on the number of active buses in operation, a 15-year average life per bus, a cost of \$150,000 per bus, and total enrollment. The funding of a district's bus replacements and acquisition costs would be contingent on an equivalent increase in in the State Education Fund so that base funding is not negatively impacted. Charter schools without an existing fleet would indicate their desire to begin transportation operations to NDE. Each charter school should receive the same amount of per-pupil funding as the district they are located in. Any unspent monies would be returned to the State Education Fund at the end of the school year.</p>	<p>The Commission also recommends removing capital costs from the four-year average and funding acquisition and replacement of buses on a per-pupil bases using the number of active buses in operation, a 15-year average life per bus, a cost of \$150,000 per bus, and total enrollment. Charter schools looking to provide transportation services would receive the same amount of per-pupil funding as the district they are located in receives. The per-pupil capital cost funding is contingent upon an equivalent increase in the State Education Fund, so that the per-pupil base funding amounts are not reduced as a result of bus acquisitions and replacements.</p>	No

	Inflation		
7	CSF Recommendation: The Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all Urban Consumers, Western Region currently included in the Nevada Revised Statute should be replaced with a Nevada-specific CPI should a sufficient Nevada CPI become available.	Background: NRS 387.12455(6) defines the “rate of inflation” to be applied to the PCFP as the percentage of increase or decrease in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, West Region (All Items), as published by the United States Department of Labor. The Commission recommends applying a Nevada specific CPI, rather than using the western region index, if a Nevada CPI should become available and accessible.	N/A
	At-Risk		
8	CSF Recommendation: The Commission on School Funding affirmed its previous recommendation to utilize the alternative definition of “at-risk” defined by the State Board of Education to allocate weighted funding.	<p>Background: In July of 2020, the Commission recommended that the State Board review and adopt a new definition of at-risk that does not solely consist of eligibility for Free and Reduced-Price Lunch. In November of 2020, the State Board adopted a definition for “at-risk” for the PCFP: a pupil is at-risk of the pupil has an economic or academic disadvantage such that they require additional services and assistance to enable them to graduate with their cohorts. The term includes, without limitation, pupils who are members of economically disadvantaged families, pupils who are at risk of dropping out of high school, and pupils who do not meet minimum standards of academic proficiency.</p> <p>The Commission reviewed at-risk data using both Free and Reduced-Price Lunch and the State Board definition for allocating weighted funding in the PCFP. Districts receive the weighted funding through the PCFP and distribute funding to schools where at-risk pupils are anticipated to be enrolled.</p>	Yes

	Nevada Cost of Education Index		
9	CSF Recommendation: Set every district at 1.0 floor for the Nevada Cost of Education Index for the upcoming biennium.	Background: During the previous legislative session, a floor of 1.0 was placed on the Nevada Cost of Education Index to guarantee that school districts would not lose money via the adjustment. However, the Nevada Cost of Education Index is intended to show numerical relationships between all the districts, and it loses statistical integrity when a floor is artificially implemented. The Commission voted to remove the floor and allow the NCEI to function as originally intended; however, during the September meeting the Commission changed their recommendation to place all districts at 1.0, thus eliminating the effects of the adjustment for the next biennium.	Yes
	Virtual Schools		
10	CSF Recommendation: To fund online district and charter schools at the Statewide base per pupil amount.	Background: NRS 387.1214(2)(d)(1) states that fulltime online charters schools are funded at the Statewide base per pupil amount while fulltime online district schools are funded at the Adjusted base per pupil amount. The Commission reviewed statistics and responses received from district and charter virtual schools and recommended that both be funded at the Statewide base per pupil amount to ensure equitable funding.	No
	Dual Enrollment		
11	CSF Recommendation: Maintain funding at the adjusted base per pupil amount for students taking dual enrollment courses.	Background: The Letter of Intent received from the Legislature requested the Commission conduct a review of high school dual enrollment programs and make any recommendations for the funding provided to students who participate in those programs. Students who attend dual enrollment programs are currently funded at the Adjusted base per pupil amount. The Commission did not find any reason to alter funding for students that attend dual enrollment programs.	Yes