

Nevada School District Reporting Analysis

Completed by Public Works LLC

Submitted to:
The Nevada Education Service Center

June 2026

Study Overview

Public Works LLC conducted a comprehensive analysis of school district reporting requirements across 17 Nevada school districts and the State Public Charter School Authority.

Scope

- 17 county school districts
- State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA)(18th school district)
- 100% interview participation
- 50% supplemental written data

Methods

- Statewide interviews & focus groups
- 12 independent tracking lists merged
- WestEd/APA, Crocus, CSF analyses
- District-level inventory mapping

Deliverables

- NDE Reporting Inventory (400+ reports)
- Data Collections Inventory baseline
- Data dictionary framework
- 89 reports flagged for action

The Core Problem

Nevada's current reporting system is not sustainable in its present form.

No Single System of Record

Multiple variations of reporting lists exist across agencies — no authoritative statewide inventory.

Unsustainable Accumulation

New requirements are added each legislative session, but few are reviewed, consolidated, or eliminated.

Widespread Duplication

Districts submit the same data multiple times in different formats to different NDE offices.

Disproportionate Rural Burden

Small districts where one person covers payroll, HR, grants, and assessment bear outsized compliance costs.

Stakeholder Feedback

What Districts, Administrators, and Educators Told Us

Feedback gathered from district administrators, superintendents, and school staff across Nevada through surveys and interviews.

Top Concerns Raised



Redundant Data Collection

Same data requested by multiple agencies in different formats



Time Away from Students

Administrative burden displaces instructional planning time



Inconsistent Definitions

Data elements defined differently across agencies



No Clear Purpose

Many reports lack clear use or feedback loops



Lack of Coordination

Agencies operate in silos without shared data strategy

“

We submit the same data three different ways to three different agencies. It's exhausting and takes us away from what matters.

— Nevada District Administrator

“

Nobody ever tells us what happens with these reports. We file them and never hear back.

— School Principal

“

Simplifying reporting would free up significant staff time for direct student support services.

— District Superintendent

By the Numbers

400+

Reporting requirements
identified statewide

89

Reports recommended
for action (22%)

80+

New provisions added
by SB 460 alone

12

Independent tracking
lists consolidated

5,560

Staff hours in case
study compliance costs
based on 32 identified
reports

\$278K

Annual compliance cost
across 4 districts/SPCSA to
comply with 32 reports

8

Disconnected reporting
platforms in use

11

Cross-cutting themes
from district voices

11 Cross-Cutting Themes from District Voices

Themes emerged from interviews with all 17 districts and the Charter Authority, supported by supplemental data from 9 entities.

- 1 Proliferation & Accumulation of Reporting Requirements
- 2 Redundant & Duplicative Reporting Across Agencies
- 3 Infinite Campus Has Not Reduced Burden as Intended
- 4 Platform Proliferation & System Usability Problems
- 5 Unclear Guidance, Changing Expectations & Inconsistency
- 6 Limited or One-Sided Feedback on Submitted Reports
- 7 Disproportionate Burden on Small & Rural Districts
- 8 Deadline Clustering & Summer Reporting Conflicts
- 9 Unclear Value & Purpose of Certain Reports
- 10 Accountability Without Corresponding Support
- 11 Onboarding & Institutional Knowledge Gaps

89 Reports Recommended for Action

Of approximately 400 total reports, this study recommends action on 22%. Each is assigned one of three suggested disposition categories:

ELIMINATE

34

Reports

No identified statutory use, fully duplicative of another mechanism, stake holder recommendation, or statutory basis no longer applicable.

MODIFY

29

Reports

Retains value but can be reduced in frequency, simplified in format, or extracted directly from existing systems.

CONSOLIDATE

26

Reports

Data elements overlap with other collections and should be merged into a single submission.

Sources: Statewide interviews (Public Works), WestEd/APA analysis, Crocus study, Commission on School Funding tracker, District inventories (Clark, Washoe)

SB 460 (2025): Legislative Authority for Reform

Senate Bill 460 creates the legislative framework and institutional infrastructure to implement the study's recommendations.

Section 1.7

Authorizes the Superintendent of Public Instruction to modify, suspend, or eliminate redundant or duplicative reporting — effective July 1, 2026.

Section 5.5

Refers directly to the CIEE. Revises the duties of the commission as part of broader education reforms.

Sections 16–18

Changes class size variance reporting from quarterly to annual frequency — demonstrating legislative willingness to reduce reporting.

Section 56.5

Creates the Education Service Center (ESC) with a governing body to develop, manage, and provide services to local educational agencies — effective July 1, 2026.

Section 78.3

Allocates \$2.5M (FY 2026) and \$4M (FY 2027) to NDE for personnel and service delivery improvements.

Section 81

Directs the Commission on School Funding to conduct an interim study on reporting requirements with recommendations due November 15, 2026.

Five Priority Implementation Steps

1

Convene Statewide Governance Working Group

ESC to convene district reps, SPCSA, NDE, and legislative staff to provide oversight and management of reporting requirements.

2

Establish NDE Reporting Inventory as System of Record

Combine internal and external lists into a single inventory keyed by statutory citation — the authoritative baseline.

3

Stand Up Data Collections Inventory

Create a separate linked inventory that maps data collections to reports, exposing overlap and consolidation opportunities.

4

Adopt Single Data Request Standard

Implement a statewide data dictionary aligning definitions, business rules, and 'as-of' dates across all major collections.

5

Launch Periodic Sunset & Review Cycle

Formalize a 3-to-5 year reporting review requiring documentation of purpose, use, and workload for each statutory report.

The Education Service Center: Central Implementation Partner

Created by SB 460 Section 56.5 (effective July 1, 2026), the ESC is positioned to operationalize the study's recommendations — especially for small and rural districts.

Provide shared submission infrastructure and standardized templates

Monitor impending legislation for duplicative reporting requirements

Develop onboarding guides and a centralized repository of exemplary submissions

Convene statewide governance working group with district and NDE representation

Offer cross-district data validation support for rural and small systems

Pilot 'feedback clinics' for collaborative report review with districts

Serve as institutional home for the NDE Reporting Inventory and its governance

Advocate for state-funded Data Management System implementation

The Hidden Cost: Classroom Time Lost to Reporting

Case study of 4 entities based on 32 reports — Washoe, Carson City, Mineral, and SPCSA — representing large, medium, small rural, and charter contexts.

Entity	Hours	Cost	Teacher-Weeks
Washoe County	2,198	\$109,900	55.0
Mineral County	1,870	\$93,500	46.8
Carson City	959	\$47,950	24.0
SPCSA	533	\$26,650	13.3
TOTAL	5,560	\$278,000	139.0

What Could Nevada Recover?

10% reduction

556 hours · 14 teacher-weeks

25% reduction

1,390 hours · 35 teacher-weeks

50% reduction

2,780 hours · 70 teacher-weeks
= Time redirected to students, instruction, and school improvement

Peer State Context: Nevada Is Not Alone

Multiple states are undertaking parallel reporting reform efforts. Nevada can learn from their approaches.

Utah

State Board of Education voted April 2, 2026 to reduce reporting requirements from 91 to 70, with further reductions directed for May 2026. Annual assurances update process ensures ongoing accuracy.

Arizona

Charter School Board and Northern Arizona University supporting HB2828 to allow Innovation schools to pilot defined report sets and test eliminations.

Colorado

Education Data Advisory Committee (EDAC) reviews all PK-12 data collections and advises on duplication and obsolescence. Centralized Data Pipeline with district validation model.

CT, WA, KS, MI, NE

Using unified data architecture, SLDS-based centralized extracts with local validation, and 'collect once, use many times' models to reduce duplicate requests.

A Clear Foundation for Reform

Nevada's reporting system is not sustainable — but reform is achievable.

- ✓ SB 460 provides the legislative authority to act — effective July 1, 2026
- ✓ The Reporting Inventory and Data Collections Inventory provide the tools
- ✓ Voices across all 18 Districts / SPSCA confirm the urgency and direction
- ✓ Peer states demonstrate the path is proven and achievable
- ✓ The Education Service Center stands ready as the implementation partner

The goal: Preserve robust accountability while returning meaningful time and resources to classrooms — supporting students and improving educational outcomes statewide.