

NORTHERN NEVADA
LEGISLATIVE BUILDING
401 S. Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89701
(775) 684-6800



SOUTHERN NEVADA
LEGISLATIVE OFFICES
7120 Amigo Street
Las Vegas, NV 89119
(702) 486-2800

THE STATE OF NEVADA LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU

August 21, 2026

Members of the Legislative Commission
Legislative Building
Carson City, Nevada

Audit reports of the Legislative Auditor are submitted to the Audit Subcommittee before the reports are presented to the Legislative Commission, as provided for in Nevada Revised Statutes 218G.240 and 218G.615. On August 20, 2026, the Legislative Auditor presented the following reports to the Audit Subcommittee of the Legislative Commission:

- *Compliance with Procurement Standards – Clark County School District, Washoe County School District, and State Public Charter School Authority (LA26-12);*
- *Class-Size Reduction Strategies – Clark County School District and Washoe County School District (LA26-13);*
- *Recruitment and Retention Strategies – Clark County School District and Washoe County School District (LA26-14);*
- *Class Sizes and Recruitment and Retention – State Public Charter School Authority (LA26-15);*
- *Educational Strategies to Improve Student Outcomes – Clark County School District, Washoe County School District, and State Public Charter School Authority (LA26-16);*
- *Family and Community Engagement Strategies – Clark County School District, Washoe County School District, and State Public Charter School Authority (LA26-17); and*
- *State of Nevada Single Audit Report for Year Ended June 30, 2024.*

Summaries of these reports, when applicable, are enclosed for your review. The Audit Subcommittee recommends the Legislative Commission accept these seven reports.

Respectfully presented,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Shea Backus".

Assemblymember Shea Backus, Chair
Legislative Commission's Audit Subcommittee

Audit Highlights



Highlights of performance audit report on Compliance with Procurement Standards for Clark and Washoe County School Districts, and State Public Charter School Authority, issued on August 20, 2026.

Legislative Auditor report # LA26-12.

Background

The Clark County School District is the largest district in Nevada with a total of 377 schools and 301,697 students at the beginning of the 2024-25 school year.

The Washoe County School District is now the third largest school district in Nevada with 114 schools and 63,559 students at the beginning of the 2024-25 school year.

The State Public Charter School Authority is a state agency that was created through legislative action in 2011 to provide oversight of state-sponsored charter schools. The SPCSA had a total of 81 campuses and 63,609 students at the beginning of the 2024-25 school year.

Procurement standards for CCSD and WCSD are governed by Chapter 332 of the Nevada Revised Statutes, under the Local Government Purchasing Act. SPCSA is a state agency whose procurement standards are governed by Chapter 333 of the Nevada Revised Statutes, Chapter 333 of the Nevada Administrative Code, and the State Administrative Manual.

Purpose of Audit

The purpose of the audit was to determine whether CCSD, WCSD, and SPCSA complied with state laws, regulations, policies, and best practices related to the procurement of goods and services. Our audit included a review of contract procurements, contract payments, and procurement card purchases made during fiscal year 2023.

Audit Recommendations

This audit report contains 48 total recommendations to improve controls over procurement standards.

CCSD accepted the 20 applicable recommendations.

WCSD accepted 22 applicable recommendations and rejected 1.

SPCSA accepted the 5 applicable recommendations.

Recommendation Status

Each district's 60-day plan for corrective action is due on November 17, 2026. In addition, the 6-month report on the status of the audit recommendations is due on May 17, 2027.

Compliance with Procurement Standards

Clark County and Washoe County School Districts, and State Public Charter School Authority

Summary

While we found general compliance with statutes for procurement, CCSD, WCSD and SPCSA need to implement stronger controls over contracting practices and payments for goods and services. Our testing included 124 contracts with significant total contract values at CCSD, WCSD, and SPCSA. We found that CCSD and WCSD sometimes used noncompetitive procurement activities where competition should have been solicited. In addition, procurements frequently lacked documentation to support the procurement methods used, or to show proper approval was obtained. Competitive procurement methods are established and promoted to help ensure public funds are appropriately used and public entities receive the best value or price for services and items procured. Finally, we tested over \$36 million in contract payments and found areas for improvement in payment approval processes and compliance with contract terms.

SPCSA did not provide adequate oversight and guidance regarding charter school and Education Management Organizations' (EMO) contract provisions and payments. Although we observed EMO contracts included many appropriate contract provisions, we also found EMO contracts were missing important provisions and contained others that were unallowed or inappropriate. In addition, better oversight of the contracting practices and activities between charter schools and their EMOs is needed. These contract conditions leave charter schools at risk of noncompliance with state law, unfavorable contract terms, and misappropriation of state education funds. Furthermore, required contract and payment information between charter schools and their EMOs was not always properly reported. When contract payment information is not properly reported, it undermines public confidence in charter schools use of state education funds.

CCSD and WCSD need stronger procurement card controls to limit misuse, ensure accountability, and realize cost saving opportunities. After testing over \$1 million in general funded procurement card transactions, we found over \$189,000 (19%) to be inappropriate or in violation of district policies. In addition, we observed a lack of proper administrative controls, including inadequate documentation and review of transactions. Finally, we observed opportunities for cost savings to help ensure better use of state education funds when using procurement cards. Without stronger procurement card controls, there is risk for inappropriate purchases. In addition, a lack of proper administrative controls may lead to reduced accountability, increased financial risk, and missed opportunities for cost savings. At SPCSA, our testing found general funded procurement card purchases complied with law and policy. However, we identified some internal control weaknesses.

Key Findings

- Procurement activities at CCSD and WCSD sometimes included processes that limited competition and did not provide evidence the best value was received. Specifically, we observed noncompetitive solicitations and contract lengths exceeding standards, which also resulted in situations of noncompetitive procurement. Competitive procurement practices help ensure fair competition and favorable contract terms at the best value. (pages 9-15)
- Goods and services were procured without appropriate supporting documentation to justify the approval of a noncompetitive procurement for 28 of 41 (68%) contracts tested at CCSD and WCSD. Some additional contracts did not have required approval or were operating without a formal executed agreement. This included contracts regularly being allowed to expire through lapses in contract agreements and using a purchase order in place of a contract despite the cost and complexity in deliverables. (pages 15-23)
- Agreements between charter schools and EMOs had missing or inappropriate contractual provisions for all 5 schools tested. Schools also did not properly report required EMO contract and financial information, including payments made to affiliated entities of the EMO. (pages 30-40)
- Procurement card purchases were identified as being inappropriate or in violation of district policy for 177 of 600 (30%) general funded procurement card transactions that were judgmentally selected. There was also a lack of proper administrative controls and missed cost saving opportunities. (pages 41-55)

Audit Highlights



Highlights of performance audit report on Class-Size Reduction Strategies for Clark County and Washoe County School Districts issued on August 20, 2026.

Legislative Auditor report # LA26-13.

Background

The Nevada Legislature enacted legislation to establish class-size reduction processes, which were codified in Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS). The Legislature established class-size ratios for kindergarten through grade 3 (K-3) and provided funding to districts to support hiring teachers to help reach these class-size ratios. If schools do not meet required ratios, districts need to submit variance requests. In 2021, the Legislature ceased categorically funding class-size reduction, giving the districts more autonomy in their budgetary decisions.

The Legislature has established multiple district reports relating to class-size reduction, including a report of school K-3 class-size ratios and variances, an annual class-size reduction plan, and reporting on achieving nonbinding class-size ratios for all grades. In variance requests and class-size reduction plans, districts report on their plans and strategies to reduce class-size ratios.

The Nevada Department of Education (NDE) receives and compiles district class-size reduction reporting and variance requests, submitting reporting to the Nevada State Board of Education (Board). The Board has the authority to review and grant variances and approve class-size reduction plans. The Board utilizes district class-size ratio and variance data to measure the effectiveness of the district class-size reduction strategies.

Purpose of Audit

The purpose of the audit was to evaluate the efficacy of strategies or programs implemented by a school district to reduce class sizes.

The scope of our audit included a review of the district's activities from July 1, 2019, through June 30, 2024, with prior years for funding analysis purposes.

Audit Recommendations

This audit report contains five recommendations for CCSD and four recommendations for WCSD to improve district oversight of class-size reduction efforts and reporting.

CCSD accepted the five recommendations.

WCSD accepted the four recommendations.

Recommendation Status

Each district's 60-day plan for corrective action is due on November 17, 2026. In addition, the 6-month report on the status of audit recommendations is due on May 17, 2027.

Class-Size Reduction Strategies

Clark County and Washoe County School Districts

Summary

For multiple years assessed, districts' class-size reduction strategies did not reduce class-size ratios to those defined in statutes, but districts' strategies supported maintenance of reasonable class-size ratios. We assessed the effectiveness of district class-size reduction strategies through analyzing if districts achieved class-size ratios prescribed in statutes, and we reviewed annual changes in district class-size ratios and variance requests. Conclusions related to class-size reduction are based on the assessment of aggregate district class-size ratios and do not reflect an individual analysis at the school or classroom level.

The districts' class-size ratios were not comparable due to differences in how districts counted teachers. For Clark County School District (CCSD), the district's methodology resulted in inflated class-size ratios that did not reflect actual class sizes in schools. Although districts were substantially compliant in submitting K-3 class-size ratio reporting and planning, schools were not involved in reviewing certain reports. Some class-size reduction reporting was not compliant with requirements, and other reporting was not submitted by each district. Consistent class-size reduction reporting promotes transparency and accountability by ensuring stakeholders have access to comparable information across schools and districts.

Class-size ratios defined in statutes may have reduced significance as the Legislature and districts have not completely funded the base ratios for over a decade. Additionally, certain statutory class-size reduction processes do not align with current funding practices, are duplicative, and result in ratios that do not reflect actual class sizes. In statutes, the Board and NDE are assigned an integral oversight role in class-size reduction processes, but their supervision and feedback were limited. Improving the requirements, oversight, and reporting will help increase the relevance and usefulness of the class-size reduction processes.

Key Findings

- CCSD did not reduce class-size ratios to those required by statutes for school years 2019-20 to 2023-24, but it maintained reasonable ratios. (page 6)
- Washoe County School District (WCSD) reduced certain class-size ratios to the values prescribed in statutes, but not for all years assessed. (page 7)
- Even though class-size ratios exceeded those prescribed in statutes, average district-level K-3 class-size ratios for school years 2019-20 through 2023-24 for CCSD and WCSD were on average about 20 or less students per teacher. (page 7)
- District class-size variances increased from school years 2019-20 through 2023-24, and changes in statutory class-size ratio requirements contributed to this increase. (page 8)
- CCSD and WCSD implemented strategies that maintained class-size ratios at reasonable levels although these strategies did not always result in the districts meeting ratios prescribed in statutes. (page 9)
- Districts had significant differences in how they counted teachers for class-size ratios, and with CCSD, this resulted in inflated class-size ratios that did not reflect the reality of class sizes. (page 12)
- Inconsistent class-size ratio calculation methodologies resulted in CCSD and WCSD having ratios that could not be directly compared. (page 12)
- Districts submitted most class-size reduction reporting but can improve compliance with certain reporting requirements. (page 15)
- The districts can improve class-size reduction reporting, including variance requests, by involving schools more in report preparation. (page 16)
- The statutory class-size ratios for K-3 may have reduced significance as the Legislature did not categorically fund, and the districts did not allocate sufficient funding, to reach all the base ratios for over a decade. (page 20)
- Certain class-size reduction statutory processes create challenges for the districts to fulfill the requirements and produce class-size ratios that closely reflect school class sizes. (page 21)
- There are duplicate K-3 class-size reduction reporting and planning requirements. (page 22)
- Board and NDE oversight and feedback of class-size reduction processes were limited. (page 25)

Audit Highlights



Highlights of performance audit report on the Recruitment and Retention Strategies, Clark County and Washoe County School Districts issued on August 20, 2026.

Legislative Auditor report # LA26-14.

Background

The Clark County School District (CCSD) is the largest school district in Nevada with a total of 377 schools and 301,697 students at the beginning of the 2024-25 school year. CCSD's mission is to have all students progress in school and graduate prepared to succeed and contribute to a diverse global economy. In addition, CCSD teaching professionals numbered 17,737.

The Washoe County School District (WCSD) was the second largest school district prior to the 2024-25 school year. The total number of schools for WCSD was 114 with 63,559 students and employed 3,624 teaching professionals. WCSD's promise to students is to know every student by name, strength and need so they graduate prepared for the future they choose, and will deliver on this promise in partnership with its families and community.

Purpose of Audit

The purpose of the audit was to evaluate the efficacy of CCSD and WCSD strategies and programs of recruitment and retention designed to ensure the availability of qualified teachers.

Audit Recommendations

This audit report contains 15 total recommendations to improve the efficacy of CCSD and WCSD strategies and programs of recruitment and retention designed to ensure the availability of qualified teachers and other support staff.

CCSD accepted the nine recommendations.

WCSD accepted the six recommendations.

Recommendation Status

Each district's 60-day plan for corrective action is due on November 17, 2026. In addition, the 6-month report on the status of the audit recommendations is due on May 17, 2027.

Recruitment and Retention Strategies

Clark County and Washoe County School Districts

Summary

Clark County School District and Washoe County School District (Districts) implement various strategies for the purpose of recruiting and retaining qualified staff. However, programs could be strengthened through strategic planning, collecting and analyzing data, and documenting expectations for the outcomes of these programs. Recruitment strategies include tuition assistance, assistance with access to Alternative Route to Licensure (ARL) programs, relocation assistance, and internship programs. Retention efforts include teacher and leadership mentoring, training, retention bonuses, satisfaction and exit surveys, and tuition assistance for advanced degrees or endorsements.

CCSD had weak controls to enforce program expectations and ensure effective use of public funds. Specifically, the district invested millions of dollars in programs intended to recruit and retain highly qualified teaching staff but did not consistently enforce program expectations or evaluate program outcomes to determine their success. In addition, CCSD spent more than \$50,000 on recruitment trips and the outcomes of the events led to minimal returns in recruitment of qualified staff. Considering education resources are limited, ensuring funds are spent wisely is critical.

Key Findings

- Districts implemented various strategies for the purpose of recruitment and retention of qualified staff, but improvement is needed in planning and evaluating recruitment and retention efforts. With inconsistent tracking of performance indicators, unreliable data, and limited analysis of strategies, CCSD and WCSD do not have the tools necessary to ensure that strategies are cost effective and achieve decreased vacancy rates. (page 5)
- Districts did not have a recruitment and retention plan in place during our audit scope. Establishing a recruitment and retention plan is essential to ensure stability in recruitment and retention efforts and should include key performance indicators to assess outcomes of recruitment and retention strategies. (pages 5-6)
- District policies and procedures for WCSD related to recruitment and retention were generally found to be outdated with 3 of 8 (38%) last being updated in 1998. Additionally, WCSD staff indicated there were no policies, procedures, desk manuals, or performance metrics in place for the ARL program, student internships, and recruitment trips. (page 6-7)
- Districts did not complete required statutory reports required in NRS 391.135(3), which includes information on data related to the ARL program participants. (page 7)
- CCSD spent approximately \$14.6 million on recruiting programs, and \$393 million on retention programs during our audit scope. However, the district failed to regularly analyze data to assess the efficiency of these recruitment and retention strategies, with 5 of 10 (50%) tested not having analyses completed. (page 7-8)
- CCSD did not consistently track key performance metrics for recruitment and retention programs. For example, CCSD collected data for only 233 of 461 (51%) in-person and virtual recruiting events. (page 8)
- WCSD did not always track key metrics for recruitment and retention programs. For example, staff attended recruitment events during the audit scope and 105 of 135 (78%) did not have a sign-up sheet to identify participant attendance. Additionally, WCSD could not identify which staff attended 26 of 135 (19%) recruitment events. (page 10)
- CCSD had weak controls over contractual obligations and did not always measure performance outcomes and incentives, including recruitment events. CCSD staff did not have processes in place to ensure recruitment incentive recipients met contractual obligations. Additionally, CCSD spent more than \$50,000 sending 25 staff on two recruitment trips and the outcomes of the events led to minimal returns in recruitment of qualified staff. (page 12)

Audit Highlights



Highlights of performance audit report on Class Sizes and Recruitment and Retention for State Public Charter School Authority issued on August 20, 2026.

Legislative Auditor report # LA26-15.

Background

In the 1997 Legislative Session, the first Nevada public charter school laws were ratified with the intent of serving at-risk children. This allowed local school boards, the Nevada Department of Education, and the Nevada System of Higher Education to serve as sponsors of charter schools. In 2011, State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA), a governmental agency, was created by Nevada Senate Bill 212 to be a statewide charter school sponsor.

At the start of the 2024-25 school year, SPCSA served 63,609 students at 81 schools. SPCSA sponsors schools with a variety of models to choose from, including alternative high schools serving under-credited students, art integration, Montessori, sports leadership and management, dual enrollment, online or blended learning, classical education, as well as Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics.

As of June 2026, SPCSA had 45 filled positions and was approved for 52 positions, including the 9 board members. SPCSA is funded by a 1.25% administrative fee on its sponsored schools' per-pupil funding. For 2024, administrative fees received totaled approximately \$7 million. Additional funding comes from federal and state grants. As a local education agency for the schools it sponsors, SPCSA must serve as a pass-through entity for state and federal grant funds. SPCSA has offices in Reno, Carson City, and Las Vegas.

Purpose of Audit

This audit was required by Assembly Bill 517 (Chapter 454, Statutes of Nevada, 2023). The purpose of the audit was to evaluate the efficacy of any strategy or program for recruitment or retention of qualified staff and class-size reduction.

Audit Recommendations

This audit report contains 12 total recommendations to improve SPCSA's oversight of class sizes and recruitment and retention at charter schools.

SPCSA accepted the 12 recommendations.

Recommendation Status

SPCSA's 60-day plan for corrective action is due on November 17, 2026. In addition, the 6-month report on the status of audit recommendations is due on May 17, 2027.

Class Sizes and Recruitment and Retention

State Public Charter School Authority

Summary

Although the State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) has an extensive process for evaluating charter applications, some improvements are needed to enhance its effectiveness as authorizer. Specifically, SPCSA needs to improve its review of charter schools' applications related to proposed class sizes, recruitment and retention plans, and staffing plans. Current SPCSA practices do not always align with best practices. Using best practices when available and documenting the rationale used for application evaluations can help to avoid inconsistent treatment between applicants and ensure schools are equipped with the most comprehensive and well-designed plans possible. The purpose of a charter school application is to present the applicant's academic and operational plans and to demonstrate the applicant's ability to execute those plans.

SPCSA has developed an extensive process, as required by statutes, for evaluating a charter school's academic, financial, and operational performance. However, our audit revealed enhancements are needed within the organizational performance framework relative to monitoring class sizes, total enrollment, and staffing activities. Enhancements are necessary to ensure the charter contract and state laws and regulations are more closely followed. The requirements of the organizational performance framework are derived from state and federal laws and the operating terms proposed in the charter application. One of SPCSA's core responsibilities as an authorizer of charter schools is to protect the public interest. According to SPCSA, their organizational performance framework is their primary mechanism for carrying out this responsibility.

SPCSA needs to provide additional oversight of charter schools' teacher qualifications. We found noncompliance with laws and regulations that require teachers to hold specific licenses to provide instruction to students with disabilities and students learning English as a second language. We also found charter schools relied heavily on personnel only meeting minimal Nevada Department of Education (NDE) licensing requirements when filling their teaching positions. State statutes currently require 80% of all teachers and 100% of teachers providing instruction on core content subjects to have a license issued by NDE pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) Chapter 391. In addition, our testing revealed that, on average, 30% of the teaching staff in charter schools held a substitute license in school year 2023-24. A substitute license requires less education and proof of competency than most other licenses issued by NDE.

Key Findings

SPCSA approves proposed class sizes in applications without any documented methodology for how they determined the reasonableness. Best practices require authorizers to establish documented criteria for evaluating charter applications. Class sizes outside the established best practices can affect the fidelity of the proposed instructional model. (page 6)

Application guidance and evaluation rubrics provided by SPCSA to evaluators of charter applications did not include specific criteria or guidance regarding an effective recruitment plan, including those contained in national best practices. Approving applications without a viable plan may result in the school having to underfill positions and rely on staff meeting minimal licensing requirements. (page 7)

Our testing of nine school applications revealed two failed to disclose the minimum qualifications and licensure requirements for employment as a general education/core content teacher at their school, but this was not identified by SPCSA evaluators. (page 9)

Many charter schools sponsored by SPCSA we tested did not adhere to the class sizes specified in their initial application. Our testing of 15 schools revealed 9 of 15 (60%) had classes exceeding the class size indicated in their application and 4 of 15 (27%) schools had classrooms exceeding the class sizes proposed in the application by 10% or more. (page 11)

SPCSA did not have an effective monitoring process to identify charter schools whose actual enrollment is outside the thresholds established in their charter contracts. As a result, SPCSA did not identify all schools that were out of compliance and did not receive required notifications from noncompliant schools. Schools enrolling students above the contracted maximum threshold can increase revenues without necessarily increasing the services provided, such as increasing class sizes without adding teachers. (page 13)

In our testing of 15 charter schools, we found 12 of 47 (26%) special education classrooms had teachers lacking the licensure required by state law. Additionally, we found 3 of 7 (43%) ESL-specified classrooms had teachers that lacked the licensure required by state law and 38% of the core content classroom teachers, in all grades, lacked licensure specific to the course taught. (page 19)

Audit Highlights



Highlights of performance audit report on Educational Strategies to Improve Student Outcomes for Clark County School District, Washoe County School District, and State Public Charter School Authority, issued on August 20, 2026.

Legislative Auditor report # LA26-16.

Background

Clark County School District (CCSD) is the largest district in Nevada with a total of 377 schools and 301,697 students at the beginning of the 2024-25 school year.

Washoe County School District (WCSD) had 114 schools and 63,559 students at the beginning of the 2024-25 school year.

State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) is a state agency that was created through legislative action in 2011 to provide oversight of state-sponsored charter schools. SPCSA had oversight over a total of 81 charter schools and 63,609 students at the beginning of the 2024-25 school year.

Purpose of Audit

The purpose of the audit was to evaluate CCSD's and WCSD's processes for selecting, implementing, and evaluating strategies to improve student proficiency in math, English language arts (reading and writing), and science; and the educational outcomes of students who are English learners, at-risk pupils, students receiving special education, and students enrolled in Title I schools. The purpose was also to evaluate SPCSA's processes for approving, monitoring, and evaluating school-selected strategies at charter schools to improve student proficiency in core subjects and educational outcomes for certain targeted populations. Our audit focused on activities during school years 2023-24 and 2024-25. We also reviewed certain related activities that occurred in prior years.

Audit Recommendations

This audit report contains seven total recommendations that improve processes related to educational strategies to improve student outcomes.

CCSD accepted the three applicable recommendations.

WCSD accepted the two applicable recommendations.

SPCSA accepted the two applicable recommendations.

Recommendation Status

CCSD's, WCSD's, and SPCSA's 60-day plans for corrective action are due on November 17, 2026. In addition, the 6-month reports on the status of audit recommendations are due on May 17, 2027.

Educational Strategies to Improve Student Outcomes

Clark County and Washoe County School Districts

Summary

Clark County School District (CCSD) and Washoe County School District (WCSD) generally had effective processes for selecting, implementing, and evaluating educational strategies aimed at improving student outcomes. Our testing included 10 strategies to improve student proficiency in math, English language arts (reading and writing), and science. In addition, we tested 16 strategies to improve educational outcomes for targeted student populations, including English learners, at-risk pupils, students receiving special education, and students enrolled in Title I schools. Although processes were generally effective, we identified opportunities to strengthen some of these processes to help ensure strategies at both districts were selected appropriately, implemented as intended, and evaluated effectively.

Because student outcomes are influenced by multiple strategies in effect at the same time, the impact of any individual strategy cannot be isolated without rigorous research or studies. For purposes of our audit, CCSD and WCSD leadership identified the strategies they considered significant from among hundreds of strategies reported to be in use during the audit scope period. Therefore, this report does not assess outcomes because we considered association between a specific strategy and student outcomes to be correlational rather than causal.

Key Findings

- CCSD did not document certain parts of the selection process for five strategies we tested. In addition, CCSD did not obtain school input when selecting three strategies. (page 11)
- WCSD did not fully complete the required selection process for the three supplemental material strategies we reviewed. WCSD policy requires a needs assessment, scoring guides, and a review committee. (page 12)
- WCSD can strengthen its process for monitoring the implementation of a strategy related to improving classroom interactions between teachers and students. WCSD indicated some informal walkthroughs were completed; however, no documentation was available to verify that they occurred. (page 13)
- CCSD did not have pre-established criteria to evaluate a strategy that addresses student academics and behavior before implementation took place. Without having pre-established evaluation criteria, CCSD cannot demonstrate that strategy evaluations are objective, consistently applied, and free from selection bias. (page 14)

State Public Charter School Authority

Summary

State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) had generally effective processes to approve, monitor, and evaluate school-selected strategies aimed at improving student outcomes. We performed testing of SPCSA's activities related to seven charter holders. Although processes were generally effective, we identified one area for improvement where SPCSA could expand its oversight efforts to ensure that school-selected strategies are implemented as intended.

Key Findings

- SPCSA does not monitor to ensure that schools are using the educational strategies listed in their charter applications. We also found that schools can change these strategies without notifying SPCSA. This prevents SPCSA from confirming that schools are operating consistently with the strategies approved in their charter applications and contracts. (page 16)
- SPCSA's strategy approval process complied with applicable policies, considered evidence for school-selected strategies, included proper oversight, and was documented. Specifically, we reviewed the educational strategy approval process for two of the four new charter contracts approved during school years 2023-24 and 2024-25. (page 18)
- SPCSA's strategy evaluation process was data driven, documented, included proper oversight and follow-up, and was properly communicated to appropriate stakeholders. We reviewed the strategy evaluation process performed as part of the renewal of five charter contracts. (page 18)

Audit Highlights



Highlights of performance audit report on Family and Community Engagement Strategies for Clark County School District, Washoe County School District, and State Public Charter School Authority issued on August 20, 2026.

Legislative Auditor report # LA26-17.

Background

Family engagement is a shared responsibility between schools, families, and communities where all receive equitable access to tools and support needed to successfully work together toward the development of children and youth for college, career, and lifelong learning.

Parental involvement focuses on activities initiated by the school, often with limited two-way interaction. Family engagement emphasizes a collaborative approach where educators, families, and the community work together as equal partners.

Research shows that family engagement positively impacts academic achievement, social and emotional development, attendance, behavior, and school-community collaboration, making it a critical factor in education.

Purpose of Audit

The purpose of the audit was to determine the efficacy of CCSD's and WCSD's efforts for selecting, implementing, and evaluating strategies to increase family and community engagement in public schools; and to determine if SPCSA has an adequate process for approving and monitoring the implementation of family engagement efforts at charter schools.

The scope of our audit included a review of activities and oversight related to family and community engagement in public schools for the 2024-25 school year.

Audit Recommendations

This audit report contains four recommendations to CCSD to improve planning and evaluation, CCSD accepted the four recommendations.

This audit report contains one recommendation to WCSD to improve planning and evaluation, WCSD accepted the one recommendation.

This audit report contains four recommendations to SPCSA to improve monitoring efforts and ensure compliance with Title I family engagement requirements. SPCSA accepted the four recommendations.

Recommendation Status

Each district's 60-day plan for corrective action is due on November 17, 2026. In addition, the 6-month report on the status of the audit recommendations is due on May 17, 2027.

Family and Community Engagement Strategies

Clark County and Washoe County School Districts, and State Public Charter School Authority

Summary

Clark County School District (CCSD) and Washoe County School District (WCSD) selected and implemented strategies to provide family and community engagement. Although the rationale, criteria, or processes used to select these strategies were not documented, the strategies reflect recognized best practices. While districts implemented various strategies, additional planning can help guide strategy selection and implementation. Furthermore, a systematic approach to evaluating strategies would help improve their effectiveness. With limited resources, it is important that districts ensure selected strategies are appropriately aligned to their needs and implementation efforts are achieving intended outcomes.

The State Public Charter School Authority (SPCSA) can improve its oversight of charter schools' family and community engagement efforts. SPCSA did not consistently evaluate schools' engagement efforts as part of the monitoring and recertification processes. Although SPCSA does not control charter schools' engagement activities, as the Local Education Agency (LEA) it has responsibilities to ensure compliance with federal laws and charter schools' contract provisions. Without setting clear expectations and monitoring performance, family and community engagement may not be prioritized by schools and may fall short of approved plans. In addition, noncompliance with federal requirements may put federal funding at risk.

Schools within CCSD, WCSD, and SPCSA implemented family and community engagement strategies to address the unique needs of their families and communities. Our survey of principals also indicated there are areas in which district and school engagement activities can be strengthened. Therefore, the districts have opportunities to enhance their engagement activities through additional coordination with schools.

Key Findings

- The districts implemented widely recognized family and community engagement strategies. Each of the strategies reviewed reflects identified best practices. Since many of the strategies were initiated more than 10 years ago, documentation of strategy selection was limited. (page 6)
- Overall, the districts performed effective planning and evaluation related to their engagement strategies. However, additional planning and evaluation could strengthen strategy implementation at CCSD. Specifically, CCSD's objectives did not clearly align with its strategic plan and its evaluation processes did not seek to correlate success in achieving intermediate or long-term outcomes. Identifying intermediate and long-term outcomes supports strategy implementation and evaluation, and helps staff focus resources appropriately. (page 9)
- SPCSA could improve its recertification and transfer approval processes to monitor and encourage ongoing family engagement activities. While the initial application review process includes an evaluation with standards for family engagement, the renewal, transfer, and site evaluation processes do not. Without setting clear expectations and monitoring performance, family engagement may not be properly addressed by schools. (page 13)
- SPCSA did not always follow Title I family and community engagement requirements. Title I funds were not allocated in accordance with federal requirements and SPCSA did not adopt a family and community engagement policy. Confusion occurred because SPCSA directed schools to assume the role as the LEA, despite Nevada Revised Statutes assigning this responsibility to SPCSA. (page 15)
- Schools implemented many strategies to engage families and the community. For CCSD and WCSD schools, 75% indicated they implemented additional strategies beyond what their districts offer. The primary motivation for implementing school specific strategies came about by a desire to address unique needs of the schools' communities. In addition, schools experience barriers to engagement, with a lack of family time cited most often. (page 17)
- For CCSD and WCSD, survey results indicated there are opportunities to strengthen district and school engagement efforts. Specifically, some schools reported not having family and community engagement plans and a lack of familiarity with district engagement strategies and guidance. In addition, most schools were not sure as to the success of their family engagement strategies. Strengthening family and community engagement efforts at the school level will help ensure district engagement efforts are effectively implemented and can help improve district and school level planning and engagement. (page 19)