

# **Performance of Pupil Centered Funding Plan**

**Working Group Report – May 31, 2024**

## **Results of Listening Sessions on Performance of Pupil Centered Funding Plan:**

1. The general consensus is that the Pupil Centered Funding Plan is working well and as designed.
2. Review and update of the attendance area language and model as needed to ensure that the PCFP is following the prescribed definition in statute.
3. Consider a modification to the Hold Harmless provision regarding weighted sub-population adjustments.
4. Evaluate benefit of weights being calculated on the adjusted base versus the base.
5. Evaluate updated research to identify how equitable the PCFP funding is being distributed.

## **Process utilized by Working Group #1.**

The working group has held four listening sessions: The first one was with the Nevada School Superintendents (NASS), the second one was with the Nevada School District Chief Financial Officers, the third was with fiscal staff of the Nevada Department of Education, and the final one was with the staff of the Governor's Finance Office. Conversations with NASS centered on topic points as provided by WestEd in their Nevada LEA Focus Group Summary Report (November 2023). For the other three listening sessions, the conversations centered on the mechanics of the PCFP.

Issues of NCEI, hold harmless, reports, and at-risk definition were addressed, but not discussed, as they are being handled by the full Commission or a work group.

## **Comments/Observations:**

1. The previous categorical grants in the Nevada Plan were problematic. The Pupil Centered Funding Plan is easy to understand and explain.
2. School districts have focused on special populations (EL, at-risk, GATE) as served in the PCFP. It is hard to follow the money down to the student. GATE is run differently across districts.
3. An inconsistency on data points was expressed (e.g. net proceeds).
4. There is an issue in demonstrating "need" in special education.
5. Concern about what happens in recession years for funding for education.
6. So much money is spent in collective bargaining, that not much is left to provide for innovation.

7. School districts are dealing with years of underfunding.
8. Commission on School Funding must continue advocacy!
9. Clarification is needed on hospital billing.
10. Additional information is needed on attendance zones, with consideration of modifying alternative models.
11. Stacking of weight funding is needed, but hard to get to who those students are.
12. When districts have limited ES students, it becomes difficult to spend those dollars.
13. Further discussions are needed on adjusted base/base calculations.
14. Small districts do not have personnel to address EL and at-risk students, as they do not have the staff to do so.
15. Discussion occurred on the ending fund balance issue with the suggestion that the ending fund balance language remain as in statute.
16. District CFOs have requested that the quarterly and annual true-ups currently being used by NDE remain in place as structured.
17. As school districts add new CFOs to their staff, extensive training should be provided on the PCFP.
18. Appreciation for the Commission's evaluation of at-risk and implications on Districts.
19. Ensure uniformity in data collection for weighted programs.
20. Review of the process regarding Special Education funding and inclusion of the PCFP.
21. Review and consideration of Auxiliary Services, such as transportation and nutrition.