At-Risk Students: A conversation around defining options

Presentation to the Commission on School Funding
June 11, 2020



Agenda

- ✓ Review previous presentations on at-risk
- ✓ Opportunity Gap Methodology
- ✓ Alternative indicators
- ✓ Nevada Department of Education Recommendations



"At-Risk" in Nevada Revised Statutes

NRS 387.1211

- "At-risk pupil" means a pupil who is eligible for free or reduced-price lunches pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1751 et seq., or an alternative measure prescribed by the State Board.
- This definition becomes effective July 1, 2021.



Free and Reduced-Price Lunch:

Strengths

- Consistent with the definition used by a majority of states that provide additional at-risk funding providing an opportunity for Nevada to compare itself to those states.
- Definition implemented by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) to identify Economically Disadvantaged students and programmatic reporting on FRL students is already required under ESSA.
- Is currently the poverty measure for district allocations of Tile I funds.
- Past data is available making it easier to study the effects of the funding.

- Increases both the false positive and false negative identification of students that are at-risk, leaving less dollars for students that are at-risk.
- Does not consider any academic factors.
- Issues with tracking pupils without violating confidentiality.
- Increased identification problem for Schools that qualify for the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act (HHFKA), a federally-funded nutrition program that passed in 2010. Included in the Act is the Community Eligibility Provision (CEP), which states that every student in a school is eligible to receive free meals if social services or the school districts have identified 40 percent or more of the students are eligible through direct certification.



Free and Reduced Priced: Projected FY 20

Pupil Count: 202,306

Weighted Funding Per Pupil: \$296



Infinite Campus

- Machine learning to identify at-risk students.
- Daily inputs consisting of:
 - 14 academic risk factors
 - 6 attendance risk factors
 - 7 behavior risk factors
 - 24 home and enrollment stability factors
 - 24 other risk factors



Infinite Campus

Strengths

- Provides real time data synchronization.
 - Daily inputs and outputs
- Does not add reporting requirements.
- Reduces false positive and false negative identifications.
- Increases students qualifying as at-risk.

- Methodology lacks in transparency:
 - Difficult to explain
 - Difficult to understand
- Difficult to verify methodology



Infinite Campus: Projected FY 20

- Pupil Count: 214,758
- Weighted Funding Per Pupil: \$279



Opportunity Gap Methodology

- Select an opportunity gap, identify the source of the gap, and use evidenced-based strategies to lessen or remove the gap.
 - Examples:

Gap: Proficiency in math drops significantly between grades 4 and 5 **Evidence-Based Strategy**: Increase community engagement and parental involvement.

Re-evaluate each biennium.



Opportunity Gap

Strengths

- Identify an issue affecting education and solve or reduce its impact.
- Potential for wide impact on issues affecting many students.
- Issues can be identified and selected each biennium.

- Selected issue could have little historical data making the tracking of outcomes more difficult.
- Could add additional and potentially burdensome reporting requirements each biennium.
- Selected issue could re-occur if funding pulled for a newly selected issue.
- Issue could be difficult to align with per pupil funding plan.
- No other state has implemented an issue approach.
- Issue could result in reduced flexibility of use of funds at school level.



Opportunity Gap: Projected FY 20

Example:

• Pupil Count: 37,300

Weighted Funding Per Pupil: \$1,608.03



Alternative at-risk factors

- In the bottom quartile as measured by the statewide summative assessment.
- In Foster Care
- Family is living below the poverty line
- Repeated a grade



Alternative Factors

Strengths

- Includes educational and economic factors in determining at-risk.
- Funding follows identified students and is consistent with legislative intent of SB 543.
- Transparent: Easy to explain and understand.
- Removes confidentiality concerns.

- Potential for significant changes in qualifying enrollment.
- Significantly reduces FY20 projected at-risk enrollment, increasing the chance for a false negative.
 - Michigan example
- While a few states include educational factors in identifying at-risk, the use of economic and educational factors would be unique to Nevada and lose comparability with other states



Alternative at-risk factors: Projected FY 20

Pupil Count: 53,534

Weighted Funding Per Pupil: \$1,120.40



Measures of success

- Decreased percentage of truancy and disciplinary incidents
- Increased proficiency on statewide assessments
- Increased graduation rates
- Connect families to school and school activities
- Strengthen links to external mental health and behavioral services



References

- Education Commission of the States. (2019, August). 50-State Comparison: K-12 Funding. Education Commission of the States. https://www.ecs.org/50-state-comparison-k-12-funding/.
- Education Commission of the States. (2016, June). The importance of At-Risk Funding https://www.ecs.org/the-importance-of-at-risk -funding/.
- Every Child Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015, Public Law No. 114-95, S.1177, 114th Cong. (2015). Retrieved from https://www.congress.gov/114/plaws/publ95/PLAW-114publ95.pdf
- APA Consulting. (2015). Evaluation of the Use of Free and Reduced-Price Meal Eligibility as a Proxy for Identifying Economically Disadvantaged Students. Alternative Measures and Recommendations. http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/Documents/adequacystudy/EvaluationFRPMEligibilityProxyEconomicDisadvantage.pdf
- Nevada Department of Education Consolidated State Plan Under ESSA. (2017). Retrieved from http://www.doe.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/ndedoenvgov/content/Boards_Commissions_Councils/ESSA_A dv_Group/NevadaSubmittedConsolidatedPlanFinal.pdf.

