

STEVE SISOLAK
Governor
JHONE EBERT
Superintendent
of Public Instruction

STATE OF NEVADA



SOUTHERN NEVADA OFFICE
9890 S. Maryland Parkway, Suite
221
Las Vegas, Nevada 89183
(702) 486-6458
Fax: (702) 486-6450

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Northern Nevada Office
700 E. Fifth Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701-5096
(775) 687 - 9200
Fax: (775) 687 – 9101
www.doe.nv.gov

To: Elaine Wynn, President, State Board of Education

From: Jonathan Moore, Deputy Superintendent
Nevada Department of Education

Date: May 2, 2019

RE: Report to the Interim Finance Committee: Class Size Reduction Variances and Justifications, FY-2019 Q2 CSR for the period Jan 1- March 31, 2019

Introduction

Pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 388.700(4), the State Board of Education is required to submit a quarterly Class-Size Reduction (CSR) report to the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) on each variance requested by a school district during the preceding quarter; charter schools are exempt. The report must include an identification of the elementary school for which a variance was granted, as well as the specific justification for the variance.

➤ There are two types of CSR programs funded in Nevada:

1. Regular CSR: Pupil-teacher ratio; Kindergarten – 16:1; Grades 1 and 2 – 17:1; and Grade 3 – 20:1. This program is currently funded through sections 15 and 16 of S.B. 544
2. Alternative CSR: School districts which are located in a county whose population is less than 100,000 may select the Alternative CSR program which provides flexibility in implementing pupil-teacher ratios in grades 1 through 6 (as applicable, grade 5 and 6 must be included in the elementary school to be counted) for - Kindergarten – 16:1; Grades 1 through 3 – 22:1 and Grades 4 through 6 (as applicable, grade 5 and 6 must be included in the elementary school to be counted) – 25:1. This program is authorized through NRS 388.720

In fiscal year (FY) 2019, Section 13 of S.B. 544 provides that funding for CSR shall pay for the salaries and benefits of not less than 1,968 teachers to meet the required ratios. CSR provides sufficient funds for school districts to meet required ratios at a district level. Remaining funds are allocated to the lowest performing schools with variances.

Executive Summary

For the second quarter of FY19, there were no material changes to kindergarten variances compared to first quarter FY19. As a result of the discontinuation of the kindergarten class size reduction (KCSR) in FY18, the prescribed ratio decreased from 21 to 1 to 16 to 1 per NRS 388.700. Thus, the number of kindergarten class size variances increased dramatically. However, kindergarten class sizes themselves have remained relatively the same at 21.63 compared to 20.92 in Q1 FY19. Grades 1-3 however, experienced an average decrease in aggregate class sizes of less than 0.5 compared to Q1. Grades 4-6 decreased an average of 2 students, most likely related to overall decreases seen in district level enrollment.

Scope of Report

Attached is the report of variances for the second quarter of FY19. The report provides a summary of variance requests by school district and includes the specific variance justification by school. For each variance request, the following information is presented:

- Class size ratios by school and grade.
- Star rating pursuant to the Nevada School Performance Framework (FY19).
- Demographic data such as, percent that is low income (FRL) and percent who are English Language Learners (EL). Figures below 10% are suppressed for student protection.

Statewide Summary of Variances & Justifications

Variance requests are categorized into four standard potential justifications, and include funding limitations, difficulty hiring teachers, facility limitations, and other. Any or all of these justifications are accepted. Funding limitations tied with difficulty hiring as justifications for variances, and were a factor in 36.1% of the justifications listed. Facility limitations were cited 27.8% of the time.

The districts were broken into their grouping type, Large, Centralized, Rural, Small, and Very Small, according the DSA equity allocation model definitions and were analyzed for commonalities. Clark and Washoe are grouped in the large category; Carson City, Churchill, Douglas, and Lyon are grouped in the centralized category. While Elko, Humboldt, Lander, Nye, and White Pine are grouped in the rural category, and Lincoln, Mineral, Pershing, and Storey are grouped in the small category. Esmeralda and Eureka are grouped in the very small category.

Eleven of the districts reported funding limitations as a justification for variances. In rural and small districts, they reported that funding levels did not meet the level needed to provide enough incentive to hire teachers in such remote locations. In centralized and large districts they reported not being able to offer competitive salaries to compete with neighboring states. The funding limitation is a factor in the second most common justification of hiring difficulty, which was reported most in large, small, and rural districts. Six districts reported all three justifications; this includes all districts in the large grouping, two in the rural grouping, and one each in the centralized and small.

District Grouping Variance Justification

District Grouping	District	Facility	Hiring	Funding	Other
<hr/>					
<i>Large</i>	Clark	X	X	X	-
	Washoe	X	X	X	-
<hr/>					
<i>Centralized</i>	Carson City	X	X	-	-
	Churchill	-	-	X	-
	Douglas	-	-	X	-
	Lyon	X	X	X	-
<hr/>					
<i>Rural</i>	Elko	X	X	-	-
	Humboldt	-	-	X	-
	Lander	X	X	X	-
	Nye	X	X	X	-
	White Pine	-	X	X	-
<hr/>					
<i>Small</i>	Lincoln	X	X	X	-
	Mineral	-	X	-	-
	Pershing	-	-	X	-
	Storey	-	X	X	-
<hr/>					
<i>Very Small</i>	Esmeralda	-	-	-	-
	Eureka	-	-	-	-

District Level Analysis of Variances

The cited issue for the two most common justifications is a miss match between funding and actual salaries and an inability to hire qualified teachers. Districts cite a lack of funding to provide enough incentives to hire in rural districts and to be able to recruit qualified teachers from competing states.

Carson City is experiencing facility limitations in grades K, 1, 3, and 5. In addition, the district is experiencing difficulty hiring in in grades K-5. There is a shortage of qualified teachers, and recruitment has been difficult, but ongoing. In regards to funding, Carson City is dependent on DSA and CSR dollars to fund teachers to comply with NRS 388.720. If the ratios are one or two students above the prescribed ratios, it is not fiscally neutral to hire an additional teacher to meet the ratios.

Bordewich Bray 1st and 5th grade variance has two Special Education teachers and one English as a Second Language teacher assigned to support inclusion. In addition, two self-contained Special Education classrooms reduce teacher-student ratios for grades 1 and 2. A Literacy coach and Math coach along with Music, Technology, and Physical Education teachers support classroom instruction. These licensed full time equivalents (FTE) assigned to Bordewich Bray are not accounted for in the teacher-student chart at the top of the form.

Fritsch Elementary School has the additional systems in place to support academic achievement for the 2018-19 school years: Homeroom teachers teach core content areas; music, P.E. technology teachers, and the librarian provide support systems & teachers outside of core content. Two Special education teachers and their paraprofessionals provide support to students in core & non-core content areas. One ESL teacher, plus a para professional provides support to EL students above regular classroom instruction.

Churchill sent recruiters to job fairs and despite increasing the number of Kindergarten through 5 grade teachers by 5 for the 2018-2019 school year, have seen a slight increase in overall growth in pre-k through 12. They are continuing to provide an EL specialist and para-educators to support classrooms using an inclusion and pull-out model.

Clark is experiencing all three categories of variance justifications. Elementary schools do not have an adequate number of classrooms to hire additional teachers. Additionally, many schools do not have sufficient physical space to allow for the additional of portable units without impacting playground and parking space.

In regards to difficulty hiring, there is a national shortage of teachers. Teacher education enrollment has dropped 35% between 2009 and 2014. Nevada's higher education teacher candidate programs reported 768 program completers in 2014-2015, a decrease from 950 completers in 2010-2011. The district relies heavily on recruitment from California to fill the shortage created within the state. California's program completion has decline by approximately 21% from 2010-2011 to 2014-2015.

Lastly, if Clark County was able to hire the number of teachers needed to meet the prescribed class size ratios, CSR funding would not cover the salaries and benefits at current levels. Nor would there be sufficient funding to cover the related costs and requirements to supply the additional classrooms.

Douglas is experiencing funding limitations. When the funding shifted from a district-wide average class size reporting to a school-level approach, no new allocations were added to the CSR funding formula to assist with assuring that ratios are met at every grade level. When KCSR was discontinued, it now costs the district an estimated \$77,000-\$80,000 to hire an additional teacher to maintain the 16:1 ratios now prescribed. The district has provided a 4-hour aide to assist in kindergarten classrooms.

Elko is experiencing facility limitations in grades K, 2, and 5. Additionally, they are having difficulty hiring due to being in a rural location and do not have enough funding to provide hiring incentives. Despite SB511 and other grant funding allowing the district to offer \$10,000 signing bonuses in FY16, the district still has 4 positions being filled by long-term substitutes. Lastly, facility limitations in grades K, 2, and 5 do not support hiring an additional teacher.

Esmeralda does not qualify for CSR funding as their baseline ratios are lower than the ratios prescribed by law. For example, Esmeralda's third grade baseline ratio is 15 to 1. Since a district must maintain baseline ratios with non-CSR funded teachers in order to qualify for funds, the baseline ratio of 15:1 is lower the ratio prescribed in law, the district would not require additional funding needed to meet the prescribed ratio of 20 to 1 on the regular plan.

Eureka experienced no class sizes above the prescribed ratios and did not need to request variances.

Humboldt is experiencing funding limitations in grades K, 3, 5, and 6. Current available revenue prevents HCSD from hiring positions in instances in which class size reduction ratios are missed by less than 1 student. Given limited funds, adding personnel, would negatively impact other identified needs. With Kindergarten no longer falling under CSR, expected ratios should be aligned with prior 21:1 expectations.

Lander reported that there are no additional/empty rooms or buildings available, and that they need to be able to offer more incentives to work in a rural location and the budget does not provide for this.

Lincoln is experiencing difficulty hiring due to being a rural location. The district is unable to provide enough financial incentives to recruit qualified teachers. Lincoln is also experiencing facility limitations in grades K,1,and 3, as the district does not have enough classrooms to be able to hire an additional teacher. Schools were not built to house more than one class per grade.

Lyon is experiencing facility limitations in grades all grades K-6. With the all-day kindergarten and pre-k expansion, the facilities are limited; this limits the ability to hire additional teachers to reduce classes above the prescribed ratios. Additionally, it is not fiscally neutral to hire an additional teacher when the district is one or two students above the prescribed ratio. This is largest contributing factor as it costs \$80,000 to hire an additional teacher.

Mineral reported that due to being a very rural location, it is difficult to recruit and hire new teachers.

Nye stated that due to being a rural location, they have difficulty hiring teachers. Many of their teachers do not live locally and commute, which is a burden. This makes it difficult to offer incentives, as the budget does not allow for this. Additionally, class sizes are often only a little over the target ratio, and therefore, it does not make sense to split a classroom of 20 into 2 with 10 students each. Instead, they will monitor enrollment and provide para-professionals to support where needed.

Pershing has experienced a decline in enrollment, with no growth projected. As the district's enrollment decreases, so does DSA funding. Thus, it is not fiscally neutral to hire additional teachers when ratios are only slightly above the prescribed ratios. The district will continue to monitor class sizes and utilizes para-professionals to provide support.

Storey County asserts that hiring an additional teacher would cost an average of \$60,000, which would cause a financial hardship on their district. With only a slight increase in class size, they are unable to justify hiring a new teacher.

Washoe County cited facility limitations and stated that they are in the process of building 2 new middle schools and 1 new elementary school, which will open in the 2019-2020 school and will allow 6th graders to move from the elementary school to the middle school and will relieve the overcrowding. They also stated that they face a lack of teacher candidates that meet the high quality instruction needed for the students. Additionally, WCSD continues to face an annual structural budget deficit as costs continue to exceed revenues. When the student enrollment by grade for a site slightly exceeds the prescribed ratio, lack of available financial support specifically for the reduction of pupil-teacher ratios prohibits the District from hiring another teacher. However, the District as a whole, typically meets the required ratios.

White Pine cited difficulty hiring, stating that there are no available licensed teachers in the community. They hired one ARL teacher in August after an exhaustive search for a qualified candidate.

School Level Analysis of Variances

Eleven school districts have variances in 1 and 2 star schools based on the most recent information published December 2018. There are 171 1 and 2 star schools reported schools in the second quarter of FY19. Out of the 171 total 1 and 2 star schools, 158 of those schools have variances with a total of 422 school and grade level variances in grades kindergarten through 6th grade as applicable. This is a decrease of 15 variances compared to first quarter.

There were 366 total schools (1-5 star schools, including unrated schools) of which 341 had variances in the second quarter compared to 435 in first quarter. Within these schools, there were 723 variances in first through sixth grade compared to 709 in the first quarter of fiscal year 2019. Including kindergarten, there were 1,040 variances statewide. This is an increase of 17 variances compared to first quarter. Kindergarten variances increased less than 1% from 314 in first quarter to 317 in second quarter.

In addition, it is important to note, that due to a methodology change in calculating class size ratios, the class size ratios also slightly increased. The Department is now utilizing average daily enrollment (ADE) instead of average daily attendance (ADA) when calculating the student to teacher ratio in order to align with current reporting procedures. This results in a slightly higher class size ratio due to evaluating total enrollment instead of attendance. Additionally, beginning in FY18, after an audit finding, the Department began evaluating class size ratios to the second decimal place, ie 17 is now reported as 17.32. Since 17.32 is above 17, this would constitute a variance, whereas previously, this would not have registered as a variance. Class size ratios remained relatively flat, with a slight decrease in the number of variances requested of 7 for grades 4-6. First grade experienced moderate increases in the of variances of 26 (13.6%). While second and third grade experience small increase of 6 each (or 2.7% and 2.8% respectively).

Count of Variances by District in 1 and 2 Star Schools

School District	Total Number of Schools (All Star Ratings, Grades K-6)	Total Number of 1 and 2 Star Elementary Schools	Number of 1 and 2 Star Schools with Variances	% of 1 and 2 Star schools with Variances	Total Number of Variances in 1 and 2 Star Schools (K Only)	Total Number of Variances in 1 and 2 Star Schools (K-6)
Carson	6	4	4	100%	4	10
Churchill	3	0	0	0%	0	0
Clark	223	103	100	97 %	95	309
Douglas	7	2	2	100%	2	7
Elko	12	7	5	71%	4	8
Esmeralda	3	1	0	0%	0	0
Eureka	2	0	0	0%	0	0
Humboldt	9	4	3	75%	2	6
Lander	2	0	0	0%	0	0
Lincoln	4	1	1	100%	1	2
Lyon	12	9	8	89%	7	24
Mineral	2	2	2	100%	1	3
Nye	11	4	3	75%	2	7
Pershing	2	2	2	100%	0	4
Storey	2	1	1	100%	0	1
Washoe	62	29	26	90%	24	39
White Pine	4	3	2	67%	2	2
Total	366	171	159	93%	144	422

District Grade Variances

Plan Type	District	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Grand Total
Alternative	Carson	6	3		1		4		14
	Churchill	1							1
	Douglas	7	2	3	3	3	3		21
	Elko	8	1	1	3		3	2	18
	Esmeralda								
	Eureka								
	Humboldt	5	1	1	1		1	1	10
	Lyon	8	3	4	4	4	2	2	27
	Mineral	1	1		1				3
	Nye	7	1	2	5	2	3		20
	Storey	1	1		2	1	1		6
	White Pine	2							2
Alternative Total		46	13	11	20	10	17	5	122
Regular	Clark	214	183	194	177				768
	Lander	1	1	1					3
	Lincoln	2	2						4
	Pershing	1	1	2	2				6
	Washoe	53	28	32	24				137
Regular Total		271	215	229	203				918
Grand Total		317	228	240	223	10	17	5	1040

District Level Analysis of Variances

There were 136,043.69 students in grades kindergarten through 6th grade in the second quarter. This is an increase of 1,230.86 students. For which, there were 1,907.34 CSR funded teachers and 4,638.10 non-CSR funded teachers for 6,545.43 total teachers. The total aggregate class size ratio is 20.79. The district level class size ratios for the second quarter are listed below by grade. Bolded values exceed the prescribed ratio. All but two districts exceed the prescribed ratios, Eureka and Esmeralda. The grade with the most variances is kindergarten, with 12 of the 17 districts exceeding the prescribed ratio of 16 to 1 student to teacher ratio. The grade with the second most variances is second grade, with 6 out of 17 districts exceeding the prescribed ratio (17 to 1 for the regular plan, and 22 to 1 for those on the alternative program).

District Level Class Size Ratios

District	K	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 th
Churchill-A	20.20	21.25	21.09	21.46	23.06	24.50	N/A
Clark-R	22.43	20.35	21.22	23.28	N/A	N/A	N/A
Douglas-A	24.07	20.55	20.58	22.20	22.99	25.20	24.41
Elko-A	19.04	20.35	18.93	19.71	22.25	22.51	20.17
Esmeralda-*	9.33	9.33	12.00	10.67	13.94	14.03	5.33
Eureka-A	11.73	9.84	13.01	14.94	18.70	20.60	17.49
Humboldt-A	17.26	17.72	16.48	13.61	14.23	13.18	8.55
Lander-R	22.66	12.79	13.15	19.27	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lincoln-R	17.52	16.49	12.50	15.75	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lyon-A	20.15	19.74	20.81	20.40	23.19	22.56	22.56
Mineral-A	14.50	22.33	12.42	20.50	11.75	11.50	15.75
Nye-A	16.05	16.61	17.01	16.73	18.94	19.39	N/A
Carson City-A	20.72	21.15	20.06	20.72	20.84	25.28	N/A
Pershing-R	18.61	19.79	20.54	21.78	N/A	N/A	N/A
Storey-A	16.48	18.62	13.56	23.67	26.27	28.12	N/A
Washoe-R	19.16	16.18	16.75	19.21	N/A	N/A	N/A
White Pine-A	17.61	16.36	17.54	17.31	18.68	14.82	17.00
Total Ave. (State)	21.01	19.19	19.73	21.58	20.10	20.76	16.22

* Esmeralda does not qualify for CSR funds due to their baseline ratios being less than the prescribed ratios. The provided figures are purely informational. Alternative plan participants are identified with an "A", while regular plan participants are identified with an "R".

Concluding Remarks

In the second quarter of FY19, there was a minor increase of 1.6%, or 17 variances requested compared to first quarter. Again, kindergarten experience an even more minor increase in variances of less than 1%. Grade 2 experience the highest increase of 10 variance requests, which was seen predominantly in Clark County. Grades 1 and 3 increased by 5 variances and 3 variances respectively compared to first quarter. The attached variance request report is sorted by CSR plan type, school district, and then by school alphabetically. For example, alternative plan participants are grouped first, then alphabetically by district and school. Bolded values identify classrooms over the prescribed ratio; the number listed indicates the actual class size ratio. Each bolded value represents a variance requested by the district. Individual variance requests are available upon request.

The Department is committed to working with the State Board and school districts to decrease the number of variance requests, particularly in high need schools. I hope this information is useful to you. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via email at mhanke@doe.nv.gov or via phone at 775-687-9236.

Class Size Ratios Q2 FY19

Plan Type	District	School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
Alt.	Carson	Bordewich Bray Elementary	2	43%	14%	20.23	22.31	19.93	19.98	21.09	25.97	
		Empire Elementary	2	100%	44%	22.47	17.31	17.53	21.59	17.18	25.23	
		Fremont Elementary	2	52%	28%	19.95	19.13	20.84	22.18	18.95	24.69	
		Fritsch Elementary	3	34%	16%	16.74	23.13	21.35	20.93	24.65	22.95	
		Mark Twain Elementary	2	100%	31%	26.06	23.88	20.60	19.73	20.96	25.19	
		Seeliger Elementary	3	36%	17%	18.88	21.11	20.14	19.91	22.21	27.63	
	Churchill	EC Best Elementary School	Not Rated	54%	11%			21.09	21.46			
		Lahontan Elementary School	Not Rated	53%	*	20.20	21.25					
		Numa Elementary School	3	51%	12%					23.06	24.50	
	Douglas	C.C. Meneley Elementary	3	51%	*	25.76	22.62	22.76	20.98	23.37	26.39	
		Gardnerville Elementary	4	35%	12%	26.28	20.17	14.52	21.50	18.79	24.35	
		Gene Scarselli Elementary	2	34%	*	26.14	23.97	21.86	24.33	21.78	23.91	
		Jacks Valley Elementary	2	45%	14%	22.38	19.34	22.31	25.76	18.32	25.11	
		Minden Elementary	3	29%	*	24.01	18.76	17.12	22.48	26.02	31.66	
		Pinon Elementary	5	19%	*	26.95	21.46	25.40	21.00	25.84	24.00	
	Elko	Zephyr Cove Elementary	5	38%	14%	16.98	17.53	20.12	19.35	26.82	21.00	24.41
		Carlin Elementary	2	47%	*	17.25	20.63	17.20	17.75	22.32	17.47	26.07
		Elko Grammar #2	3	42%	*	19.10	21.01	16.46	20.47	21.32		
		Flagview Intermediate	2	43%	16%						29.08	27.03
		Jackpot Elementary	2	79%	32%	19.17	18.97	16.52	15.91	23.44	23.08	15.00
		Mountain View Elementary	5	21%	11%	23.24	21.94	22.57	22.85	24.25		
		Northside Elementary	2	44%	16%	24.55	18.43	19.40	22.38	22.63		
		Owyhee Elementary	1	100%	*	13.13	14.82	17.68	14.84	15.48	14.00	10.00
		Sage Elementary	2	35%	*	19.38	19.16	20.73	20.50	20.03	23.87	
		Southside Elementary	3	63%	26%	21.61	20.82	20.14	19.28	23.88		
		Spring Creek Elementary	3	16%	*	21.96	21.29	21.12	23.63	24.91	25.53	
		Wells Elementary	4	49%	17%	14.51	28.02	17.72	19.44	21.62	26.43	23.57
		West Wendover Elementary	2	78%	32%	15.50	18.72	18.70	19.73	24.86	20.64	19.34
		Esmeralda	Dyer Elementary	1	52%	30%	14.00	14.00	14.00	22.00	22.00	22.00
	Goldfield Elementary		Not Rated	62%	*	10.00	10.00	10.00	6.00	5.88	6.06	6.00
	Silver Peak Elementary		Not Rated	*	*	4.00	4.00		4.00			4.00
	Eureka	Crescent Valley Elementary	3	41%	*	11.22	9.29	9.93	13.89	16.41	21.88	22.22

Plan Type	District	School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
		Eureka Elementary School	5	22%	*	12.25	10.40	16.09	16.00	21.00	19.33	12.77
	Humboldt	Denio Elementary School	Not Rated	*	*			4.00	4.00	3.92		4.00
		French Ford Middle School	1	#N/A	#N/A						25.03	25.31
		Grass Valley Elementary School	2	48%	*	22.41	20.05	19.98	17.66	18.35		
		Kings River Elementary School	Not Rated	*	*	8.00	7.69		8.07		8.00	8.00
		McDermitt Combined School	1	99%	*	14.71	15.90	10.98	15.20	8.00	15.00	4.00
		Orovada Elementary School	Not Rated	63%	31%	17.02	16.67	16.84		16.67	6.98	7.02
		Paradise Valley Elementary School	Not Rated	56%	*	21.28	20.88	20.83	11.11	11.11	10.89	3.00
		Sonoma Heights Elementary School	2	51%	16%	20.45	20.06	22.51	22.42	20.47		
		Winnemucca Grammar School	4	59%	21%	16.95	22.77	20.25	16.84	21.12		
	Lyon	Cottonwood Elementary	2	65%	*	19.56	21.85	23.46	23.32	25.40		
		Dayton Elementary	2	60%	11%	23.65	20.64	21.84	20.67	23.08	22.18	28.12
		East Valley Elementary	2	56%	*	24.47	23.75	18.99	22.47	26.45		
		Fernley Elementary	3	71%	*	23.55	22.96	20.07	18.03	21.44		
		Fernley Intermediate	3	#N/A	#N/A						25.95	24.73
		Riverview Elementary	2	52%	*	18.16	17.59	22.40	22.80	27.40	22.06	21.50
		Silver Stage Elementary	1	100%	*	22.30	20.08	19.15	17.21	27.28		
		Silver Stage Middle	2	#N/A	#N/A						28.30	25.42
		Smith Valley	3	31%	*	6.00	6.85	14.36	15.27	11.00	16.36	13.82
		Sutro Elementary	2	63%	*	19.44	20.14	23.44	17.00	23.13	19.95	23.60
		Yerington Elementary	2	73%	17%	24.18	23.84	23.57	26.85	23.57		
		Yerington Intermediate	2	65%	*						23.13	20.77
	Mineral	Hawthorne Elementary	1	51%	*	18.00	16.67	19.50	17.00	17.50	11.00	19.50
		Schurz Elementary	1	100%	66%	11.00	28.00	5.33	24.00	6.00	12.00	12.00
	Nye	Amargosa Valley Elementary School	2	100%	41%	11.79	16.05	13.14	22.11	16.95	11.95	
		Beatty Elementary School	4	100%	21%	21.18	20.88	16.95	17.07	16.98	17.02	
		Duckwater Elementary School	Not Rated	*	*	9.09	0.00	9.09	0.00	9.09	9.09	
		Floyd Elementary School	3	100%	*	23.11	25.24	20.71	22.58	24.65	28.54	
		Gabbs Elementary School	Not Rated	100%	*	18.75	18.18	18.94	18.26	18.18	18.71	
		Hafen Elementary School	4	100%	*	18.38	19.58	21.43	23.39	24.55	24.78	
		JG Johnson Elementary School	1	100%	*	17.43	16.76	24.86	16.61	25.71	25.67	
		Manse Elementary	4	100%	10%	19.31	20.16	23.40	25.96	25.92	30.09	

Plan Type	District	School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
		School										
		Round Mountain Elementary School	1	14%	*	11.65	20.24	17.00	12.00	23.26	23.59	
		Tonopah Elementary School	1	40%	*	19.93	19.77	15.50	26.07	17.21	18.00	
		Warm Springs Elementary School	Not Rated	*	*	5.88	5.88	6.06	0.00	5.88	5.88	
	Storey	Hillside Elementary School	1	45%	*	11.26	10.91	11.11	24.00	24.90	23.81	
		Hugh Gallagher Elementary School	3	35%	*	21.70	26.34	16.00	23.34	27.64	32.44	
	White Pine	Baker Elementary	Not Rated	*	*				17.00	17.00		17.00
		D.E. Norman Elementary	1	47%	*	18.88	20.39	20.85	20.03	22.67	18.41	
		Lund Elementary	2	*	*	15.00	15.00	13.16	13.16	12.00	12.00	
		McGill Elementary	2	48%	*	18.96	13.69	18.60	19.04	23.04	14.07	
	Clark	Adams ES	2	64%	32%	21.77	20.38	19.18	25.31			
Regular		Adcock ES	2	100%	35%	18.45	19.84	16.77	18.60			
		Alamo ES	4	47%	16%	20.24	21.56	21.37	25.41			
		Allen ES	3	27%	*	22.51	25.36	36.64	20.89			
		Antonello ES	3	65%	15%	22.42	23.12	24.69	24.75			
		Bailey ES	1	100%	23%	22.69	18.97	16.09	19.36			
		Barber ES	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	27.26	21.46	19.04	27.86			
		Bartlett ES	3	29%	*	19.28	24.01	19.20	26.99			
		Bass ES	3	51%	11%	25.52	23.34	21.66	22.66			
		Batterman ES	5	33%	11%	29.36	23.03	19.15	21.03			
		Beatty ES	3	100%	10%	19.08	20.91	23.54	24.45			
		Beckley ES	2	100%	46%	18.86	20.21	19.45	22.49			
		Bell ES	1	100%	41%	21.66	16.98	19.55	23.48			
		Bendorf ES	4	53%	19%	22.45	23.20	20.12	30.26			
		Bennett ES	2	100%	*	19.94	17.96	17.31	16.73			
		Berkley ES	3	50%	*	23.48	21.87	21.77	25.74			
		Bilbray ES	4	100%	*	26.54	24.41	31.96	19.51			
		Blackhurst ES	5	28%	*	21.41	23.74	25.46	22.15			
		Bonner ES	5	22%	12%	18.22	22.18	22.03	29.82			
		Booker ES	2	100%	32%	24.95	15.02	18.38	16.90			
		Bowler, Grant ES	3	19%	*		18.84					
			#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	19.83		20.50	23.82			
		Bowler, Joseph ES	1	75%	30%	20.85	21.46	18.96	14.43			
		Bozarth ES	5	17%	*	23.65	23.51	22.62	23.94			
		Bracken ES	5	59%	35%	20.09	21.17	19.80	24.00			
		Brookman ES	4	61%	24%	20.71	20.98	27.24	29.04			
		Bruner ES	1	100%	25%	26.92	16.99	15.08	27.43			
		Bryan, Richard ES	4	48%	11%	25.30	22.99	27.68	26.75			

Plan Type	District	School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
		Bryan, Roger ES	2	56%	20%	28.27	18.35	18.99	22.48			
		Bunker ES	2	100%	25%	23.88	14.78	24.19	16.51			
		Cahlan ES	4	100%	54%	19.06	20.97	24.14	22.25			
		Cambeiro ES	3	100%	53%	16.72	19.18	18.33	21.60			
		Carl ES	2	100%	*	23.29	18.58	17.23	19.38			
		Carson ES	2	100%	24%	24.35	16.94	20.61	20.36			
		Cartwright ES	3	52%	10%	22.75	21.70	21.88	31.30			
		Christensen ES	4	51%	14%	20.02	21.41	27.87	22.49			
		Connors ES	4	52%	*	20.87	24.60	19.91	22.43			
		Cortez ES	2	100%	51%	20.74	29.52	24.91	25.08			
		Cox, Clyde ES	2	100%	39%	22.00	23.96	19.75	22.27			
		Cox, David ES	3	100%	*	22.85	20.82	22.31	24.42			
		Cozine ES	3	100%	16%	23.91	24.02	24.10	21.05			
		Craig ES	2	100%	40%	25.72	28.00	22.24	16.44			
		Crestwood ES	4	81%	55%	21.68	21.60	23.16	23.81			
		Culley ES	1	100%	41%	21.75	16.86	17.11	21.47			
		Cunningham ES	1	100%	20%	19.96	18.64	18.75	18.77			
		Dailey ES	3	100%	49%	19.99	28.81	20.10	22.03			
		Darnell ES	3	100%	*	19.87	15.92	15.99	22.47			
		Dearing ES	3	100%	35%	25.22	17.90	18.67	17.82			
		Decker ES	2	100%	30%	28.76	21.81	18.26	29.73			
		Derfelt ES	3	57%	18%	20.62	24.75	19.86	20.87			
		Deskin ES	3	100%	18%	20.04	20.74	21.07	23.29			
		Detwiler ES	2	100%	32%	24.75	16.51	13.34	22.56			
		Diaz ES	4	100%	48%	19.83	26.56	21.25	25.45			
		Dickens ES	3	74%	13%	22.23	19.29	21.45	25.70			
		Diskin ES	4	100%	36%	21.21	20.01	18.05	24.71			
		Divich ES	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	22.61	23.36	22.76	21.79			
		Dondero ES	3	100%	43%	21.40	20.88	23.15	24.56			
		Dooley ES	3	100%	*	20.55	24.54	24.39	20.30			
		Duncan ES	1	68%	*	24.71	15.43	15.51	22.91			
		Earl, Ira ES	2	100%	62%	24.63	18.52	17.54	26.19			
		Earl, Marion ES	3	63%	20%	22.19	18.38	19.38	18.97			
		Edwards ES	3	100%	45%	20.53	15.77	22.81	23.93			
		Eisenberg ES	3	100%	12%	22.71	21.48	21.36	24.98			
		Elizondo ES	3	100%	21%	22.19	19.88	22.37	27.71			
		Ellis ES	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	28.40	22.48	23.65	13.89			
		Ferron ES	3	100%	29%	21.81	17.16	19.45	19.71			
		Fine ES	4	46%	15%	22.42	20.39	24.47	25.39			
		Fitzgerald ES	2	100%	31%	18.44	12.73	11.09	18.49			
		Fong ES	3	100%	26%	19.52	20.78	20.52	23.44			
		Forbuss ES	4	40%	*	21.11	28.43	22.25	25.68			
		French ES	4	100%	23%	22.38	35.12	22.50	21.72			

Plan Type	District	School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
		Frias ES	5	31%	*	23.79	19.55	22.70	22.43			
		Galloway ES	2	44%	*	21.48	21.07	22.97	26.33			
		Garehime ES	2	42%	*	24.53	20.41	23.18	26.23			
		Gehring ES	5	55%	*		21.40	22.62	24.75			
		Gibson ES	4	100%	*	22.62	18.28	24.58	28.68			
		Gilbert ES	4	61%	15%	18.67	17.03	16.74	19.97			
		Givens ES	5	14%	*	21.70	22.92	32.41	23.43			
		Goldfarb ES	2	100%	36%	19.73	25.32	22.73	20.07			
		Goolsby ES	4	23%	10%	23.59	28.20	23.86	21.77			
		Goynes ES	4	39%	*	22.20	20.84	22.70	25.11			
		Gragson ES	2	100%	46%	22.89	19.75	24.99	19.67			
		Gray ES	2	100%	30%	27.22	17.56	23.53	26.62			
		Griffith ES	1	100%	38%	25.95	16.19	16.96	18.82			
		Guy ES	4	100%	16%	25.17	15.51	17.83	21.48			
		Hancock ES	1	100%	28%	18.68	13.74	14.66	21.63			
		Harmon ES	2	80%	39%	21.70	19.31	20.19	15.63			
		Harris ES	1	100%	28%	21.67	15.53	21.80	39.35			
		Hayden ES	2	66%	12%	19.91	23.93	25.54	26.40			
		Hayes ES	3	100%	12%	23.96	24.21	28.43	25.80			
		Heard ES	2	100%	33%		22.67	22.66	25.71			
		Heckethorn ES	4	29%	*	24.74	19.98	24.07	23.35			
		Herr ES	1	78%	32%	23.32	18.37	19.41	29.65			
		Herron ES	5	100%	57%	23.15	18.78	24.43	22.31			
		Hewetson ES	2	100%	58%	24.88	17.66	17.43	19.68			
		Hickey ES	2	100%	31%	19.91	22.08	28.20	25.80			
		Hill ES	2	100%	13%	18.90	26.05	24.17	23.39			
		Hinman ES	2	100%	19%	18.37	12.07	21.20	15.97			
		Hoggard ES	5	100%	30%	19.56	21.15	23.51	24.33			
		Hollingsworth ES	1	100%	50%	26.67	15.99	19.99	19.64			
		Hummel ES	2	100%	13%	23.37	20.71	23.55	29.35			
		Indian Springs ES	2	100%	*	15.35	14.91	10.35	12.00			
		Iverson ES	3	100%	25%	21.32	21.94	22.10	27.17			
		Jacobson ES	2	58%	18%	23.47	13.91	18.03	16.61			
		Jeffers ES	2	100%	55%	30.85	18.54	18.24	25.43			
		Jydstrup ES	3	100%	24%	22.61	23.06	23.18	25.77			
		Kahre ES	2	100%	*	22.20	16.12	16.37	21.45			
		Katz ES	2	100%	17%	15.94	18.23	20.62	23.64			
		Keller ES	1	100%	47%	21.20	20.71	17.75	19.93			
		Kelly ES	2	100%	10%	30.35	17.15	19.07	24.56			
		Kesterson ES	4	47%	*	27.84	24.22	25.09	22.65			
		Kim ES	2	69%	22%	17.82	27.86	21.86	30.88			
		King, Martha ES	4	100%	*				24.22			
		King, Martin ES	1	100%	40%	24.32	25.03	20.96	29.54			

Plan Type	District	School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
		Lake ES	3	100%	47%	21.18	13.51	17.51	23.11			
		Lamping ES	5	17%	*	25.78	20.28	22.20	21.94			
		Lincoln ES	2	100%	60%	25.48	18.62	20.01	21.60			
		Long ES	1	100%	44%	22.75	16.37	15.15	19.95			
		Lowman ES	1	100%	16%	21.04	16.99	15.80	17.46			
		Lummis ES	5	22%	*	22.54	22.20	20.82	21.51			
		Lunt ES	2	100%	55%	21.12	18.98	22.17	28.28			
		Lynch ES	1	100%	48%	24.32	16.17	24.91	18.21			
		Mack ES	3	47%	*	17.58	21.00	24.73	22.02			
		Mackey ES	5	70%	19%	22.22	24.85	21.21	23.66			
		Manch ES	1	100%	20%	20.68	18.54	20.83	25.72			
		Martinez ES	3	100%	39%	22.30	22.91	23.64	24.70			
		Mathis ES	5	52%	15%	23.07	20.78	20.29	23.09			
		May ES	5	50%	*	19.88	32.15	21.38	27.01			
		Mc Call ES	1	100%	51%	15.32	18.14	28.74	25.79			
		Mc Caw ES	5	58%	*	16.45	19.46	23.65	23.40			
		McDoniel ES	5	100%	*	24.22	23.16	22.10	26.45			
		McMillan ES	3	100%	21%	25.39	22.94	24.45	37.46			
		McWilliams ES	2	100%	48%	24.05	17.01	22.45	22.63			
		Mendoza ES	2	77%	44%	25.35	17.95	16.17	26.08			
		Miller, Sandy ES	3	70%	34%		15.72	19.49	19.54			
		Mitchell ES	Not Rated	100%	*	19.87	20.10	17.12				
		Moore ES	1	100%	45%	21.53	16.59	18.73	20.06			
		Morrow ES	4	42%	*	23.69	18.24	23.90	24.66			
		Mountain View ES	1	82%	30%	21.20	17.45	26.41	20.31			
		Neal ES	2	100%	*	20.56	25.22	25.40	22.85			
		Newton ES	3	100%	*	23.04	18.73	19.98	22.83			
		Northwest CTA ES	#N/A	*	*	20.00						
		Ober ES	3	33%	13%	24.07	22.81	30.60	24.53			
		ORoarke ES	5	26%	*	20.81	21.20	22.05	23.33			
		Ortwein ES	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	18.57	29.32	22.63	21.48			
		Paradise ES	2	100%	39%	22.80	24.23	22.68	23.29			
		Park ES	2	100%	40%	20.91	16.12	15.11	17.58			
		Parson ES	1	100%	26%	20.92	17.96	15.47	17.72			
		Perkins, Dr Claude G ES	2	100%	25%	24.65	23.61	21.34	21.50			
		Perkins, Ute ES	2	100%	*	22.49	17.96	19.51	21.96			
		Petersen ES	1	100%	44%	21.10	19.03	19.51	22.01			
		Piggott ES	3	31%	11%	21.65	20.00	24.13	22.02			
		Pittman ES	3	100%	37%	23.02	22.25	20.54	23.90			
		Priest ES	2	100%	20%	28.47	17.99	15.69	21.24			
		Red Rock ES	1	100%	34%	21.74	15.61	18.50	20.54			
		Reed ES	5	100%	*	23.79	15.50	16.71	22.77			

Plan Type	District	School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
		Reedom ES	2	32%	*	25.16	23.95	21.97	28.48			
		Rhodes ES	4	38%	*	22.60	22.51	20.32	23.41			
		Ries ES	2	42%	11%	23.53	20.46	23.21	20.69			
		Roberts ES	1	100%	11%	19.72	20.44	23.13	26.80			
		Rogers ES	4	45%	12%	24.61	20.73	21.94	30.00			
		Ronnow ES	2	100%	50%	19.80	25.23	20.80	20.00			
		Ronzone ES	2	100%	38%	24.71	17.26	19.02	22.60			
		Roundy ES	3	100%	55%	22.48	25.51	21.34	30.78			
		Rowe ES	4	100%	32%	19.49	18.06	23.62	20.59			
		Rundle ES	1	100%	39%	25.67	16.86	21.75	16.83			
		Sandy Valley ES	1	100%	19%	15.22	16.93	18.00	11.63			
		Scherkenbach ES	3	100%	*	23.66	20.49	22.61	22.33			
		Schorr ES	3	45%	*	20.05	27.18	27.49	22.94			
		Scott ES	1	76%	17%	20.79	15.41	18.63	17.33			
		Sewell ES	3	100%	*	18.76	18.19	18.17	26.65			
		Simmons ES	3	60%	13%	22.81	22.52	24.91	23.10			
		Smalley ES	5	12%	*	22.33	23.44	23.78	25.12			
		Smith, Hal ES	1	100%	24%	28.54	17.20	15.61	24.05			
		Smith, Helen M ES	5	100%	17%	21.07	19.08	25.78	35.18			
		Snyder, Don & Dee ES	3	42%	*	23.33	23.27	21.52	26.81			
		Snyder, William E ES	3	100%	42%	22.71	17.69	21.55	16.87			
		Squires ES	3	100%	63%	23.43	19.22	18.97	20.68			
		Stanford ES	2	100%	42%	23.91	21.40	23.45	18.00			
		Staton ES	4	20%	*	19.51	24.85	20.58	24.51			
		Steele ES	4	32%	12%	24.59	21.44	17.05	25.47			
		Stevens ES	4	57%	11%	23.04	22.82	23.95	25.12			
		Stuckey ES	4	32%	*	24.45	21.53	25.73	23.01			
		Sunrise Acres ES	3	100%	53%	20.93	18.12	20.83	20.58			
		Tanaka ES	2	50%	*	26.42	23.16	28.84	19.53			
		Tarr ES	3	40%	*	21.48	19.93	23.85	23.57			
		Tartan ES	1	100%	13%	30.62	14.88	19.73	20.29			
		Tate ES	3	100%	43%	22.32	17.38	17.41	24.30			
		Taylor, Glen ES	5	22%	*	20.46	20.21	20.86	29.48			
		Taylor, Robert ES	1	100%	*	16.88	17.10	17.35	31.62			
		Thiriot ES	4	100%	32%	25.02	21.03	21.26	28.29			
		Thomas ES	2	100%	46%	29.95	22.16	15.89	20.12			
		Thompson ES	4	40%	*	26.98	18.67	20.96	37.33			
		Thorpe ES	2	69%	17%	27.06	15.34	15.32	34.75			
		Tobler ES	3	100%	19%	17.20	18.66	17.77	22.13			
		Tomiyasu ES	2	58%	20%	24.57	19.55	14.25	20.62			
		Treem ES	2	100%	14%	19.34	16.46	20.05	28.49			
		Triggs ES	2	100%	*	20.97	22.32	22.51	26.75			
		Twin Lakes ES	2	100%	58%	19.53	17.80	18.40	20.57			

Plan Type	District	School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
		Twitchell ES	5	20%	*	26.31	21.36	25.34	22.58			
		Ullom ES	2	100%	36%	27.45	20.60	19.65	22.21			
		Vanderburg ES	5	10%	*	24.04	19.73	30.96	23.34			
		Vassiliadis ES	5	*	*	25.40	23.18	26.14	27.55			
		Vegas Verdes ES	2	100%	42%	22.11	19.35	21.62	24.18			
		Virgin Valley ES	4	62%	22%	23.79	22.39	20.70	22.08			
		Walker ES	4	26%	*	26.20	19.97	21.97	25.77			
		Wallin ES	4	10%	*	24.51	17.87	20.92	25.37			
		Ward, Gene ES	2	100%	41%	24.19	19.24	18.08	18.47			
		Ward, Kitty ES	4	33%	*	25.17	20.31	20.65	26.62			
		Warren ES	2	100%	50%	18.91	19.15	17.53	19.48			
		Wasden ES	2	100%	23%	23.45	19.87	19.85	23.45			
		Watson ES	1	71%	18%	21.42	16.24	16.66	17.82			
		Wengert ES	3	100%	43%	21.04	20.33	30.28	21.72			
		West Prep ES	3	86%	53%	19.73	16.61	15.78	23.50			
		Whitney ES	1	100%	23%	17.98	14.07	18.89	23.36			
		Wiener ES	4	100%	13%	18.05	26.24	26.84	30.50			
		Wilhelm ES	2	100%	18%	21.47	18.93	35.22	23.11			
		Williams, Tom ES	3	100%	61%	21.30	17.97	17.46	19.35			
		Williams, Wendell ES	1	100%	17%	15.85	17.75	15.27	15.45			
		Wolfe ES	1	100%	17%	22.23	18.41	21.90	19.17			
		Wolff, Elise ES	3	15%	*	24.65	21.30	21.99	24.40			
		Woolley ES	2	100%	38%	24.38	19.77	12.05	25.55			
		Wright ES	4	34%	*	22.48	22.08	22.41	24.53			
		Wynn ES	1	100%	53%	26.76	22.10	25.19	25.96			
	Lander	Austin Combined Schools	Not Rated	*	*		4.53	4.55				
		Battle Mountain Elementary School	4	34%	10%	22.66	21.05	21.76	19.27			
	Lincoln	Caliente Elem	4	64%	*	14.00	10.00	14.00	15.00			
		Panaca Elem	5	46%	*	19.00	20.08	16.00	17.00			
		Pioche Elem	3	51%	*	14.06	13.89	8.00	14.00			
		PVES	2	42%	*	23.00	22.00	12.00	17.00			
	Pershing	Imlay Elementary	Not Rated	100%	*	23.08		22.22	23.08			
		Imlay Elementary	Not Rated	100%	*		23.08					
		Lovelock Elemenary	2	55%	*		16.50					
		Lovelock Elementary	2	55%	*	14.15						
		Lovelock Elementary	2	55%	*			18.85	20.49			
	Washoe	Alice Smith Elementary	2	60%	23%	18.39	17.30	19.29	18.35			
		Allen Elementary	2	100%	38%	17.20	14.99	15.38	19.12			
		Anderson Elementary	1	100%	43%	18.89	15.15	19.01	23.61			
		Beasley Elementary	3	20%	*	17.60	16.29	17.21	20.98			

Plan Type	District	School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
		Beck Elementary	5	24%	11%	19.93	19.47	20.32	21.12			
		Bennett Elementary	2	70%	30%	21.24	11.05	13.35	20.34			
		Booth Elementary	1	100%	33%	15.86	12.60	17.86	19.60			
		Brown Elementary	5	10%	*	21.73	17.01	17.27	19.40			
		Cannan Elementary	1	100%	39%	14.09	14.39	15.33	16.14			
		Caughlin Ranch Elementary	5	*	*	24.02	20.26	20.20	24.74			
		Corbett Elementary	2	100%	57%	14.97	17.84	13.52	17.80			
		Desert Heights Elementary	1	100%	24%	19.07	14.02	15.17	16.99			
		Diedrichsen Elementary	4	39%	*	19.06	18.86	17.01	21.40			
		Dodson Elementary	2	61%	28%	19.79	14.70	14.31	16.10			
		Donner Springs Elementary	2	53%	21%	21.80	15.76	20.41	15.86			
		Double Diamond Elementary	4	22%	10%	23.15	16.97	15.86	17.17			
		Drake Elementary	2	67%	28%	18.45	14.30	12.73	17.15			
		Duncan Elementary	1	100%	51%	19.71	14.67	19.32	18.10			
		Dunn Elementary	3	53%	22%	19.00	17.26	20.53	23.89			
		Elmcrest Elementary	2	63%	18%	15.73	14.96	14.82	14.52			
		Gomes Elementary	2	39%	*	21.27	16.50	15.71	19.58			
		Gomm Elementary	5	*	*	19.44	19.11	15.52	23.94			
		Greenbrae Elementary	2	100%	45%	17.80	13.74	16.23	15.39			
		Hall Elementary	3	27%	*	21.21	17.88	16.31	20.12			
		Hidden Valley Elementary	3	46%	12%	20.96	20.03	18.52	18.00			
		Huffaker Elementary	3	25%	*	12.26	17.94	16.86	17.95			
		Hunsberger Elementary	5	*	*	21.75	16.40	17.37	24.16			
		Hunter Lake Elementary	5	42%	*	17.45	17.50	14.98	17.70			
		Incline Elementary	2	32%	38%	21.44	11.39	14.59	14.27			
		Juniper Elementary	4	45%	18%	18.91	18.40	16.78	18.45			
		Kate Smith Elementary	2	100%	55%	20.52	14.02	16.35	17.20			
		Lemelson Elementary	3	100%	38%	16.32	11.27	17.71	15.44			
		Lemmon Valley Elementary	3	54%	26%	21.56	17.51	15.32	19.00			
		Lenz Elementary	5	*	*	19.64	18.08	17.06	19.10			
		Lincoln Park Elementary	2	100%	38%	22.01	10.30	15.14	17.43			
		Loder Elementary	1	100%	60%	18.31	19.24	17.06	17.22			
		Mathews Elementary	1	100%	49%	20.73	15.52	14.02	16.46			
		Maxwell Elementary	3	100%	32%	16.61	16.85	20.98	22.78			
		Melton Elementary	5	*	*	21.33	17.23	18.42	21.86			
		Mitchell Elementary	2	100%	38%	18.94	14.32	14.68	16.64			
		Moss Elementary	3	37%	16%	18.52	16.83	18.06	19.34			
		Mount Rose	4	37%	*	24.12	18.85	17.33	22.56			

Plan Type	District	School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
		Elementary										
		Natchez Elementary	1	100%	*	14.39	10.44	10.00	9.62			
		Palmer Elementary	2	67%	33%	16.07	14.94	14.69	16.46			
		Peavine Elementary	3	43%	12%	17.34	17.71	21.99	19.36			
		Pleasant Valley Elementary	3	#N/A	#N/A	20.16	18.09	18.10	24.08			
		Risley Elementary	3	100%	48%	17.37	17.71	20.05	21.05			
		Sepulveda Elementary	3	25%	12%	22.87	18.01	17.53	24.78			
		Silver Lake Elementary	3	43%	19%	15.27	18.19	17.42	20.35			
		Smithridge Elementary	2	100%	51%	18.55	15.46	17.12	18.40			
		Spanish Springs Elementary	2	12%	*	18.40	16.20	15.41	20.01			
		Stead Elementary	1	65%	27%	22.50	16.01	17.40	21.40			
		Sun Valley Elementary	2	100%	52%	20.61	15.60	15.39	18.28			
		Taylor Elementary	5	18%	*	20.11	21.70	18.23	19.29			
		Towles Elementary	3	43%	*	15.79	17.02	19.14	22.06			
		Van Gorder Elementary	5	*	*	21.54	15.56	18.43	22.20			
		Verdi Elementary	4	16%	*	19.79	18.07	14.06	17.71			
		Veterans Elementary	2	100%	43%	19.38	12.06	15.11	17.04			
		Warner Elementary	2	65%	17%	20.92	12.75	13.07	16.06			
		Westergard Elementary	4	16%	*	15.99	18.02	17.11	22.75			
		Whitehead Elementary	3	26%	*	19.41	14.65	15.97	22.73			
		Winnemucca Elementary	3	35%	10%	20.72	18.28	18.59	20.66			

CSR School Variance Justifications Q2 FY19

District	District	School Name	Facility Limitation	Difficulty Hiring	Funding Limitation	Other	
Alt.	Carson	Bordewich Bray Elementary	X	X			
		Empire Elementary	X	X			
		Fremont Elementary	X	X			
		Fritsch Elementary	X	X			
		Mark Twain Elementary	X	X			
		Seeliger Elementary	X	X			
	Churchill	EC Best Elementary School					
		Lahontan Elementary School				X	
		Numa Elementary School					
	Douglas	C.C. Meneley Elementary				X	
		Gardnerville Elementary				X	
		Gene Scarselli Elementary				X	
		Jacks Valley Elementary				X	
		Minden Elementary				X	
		Pinon Elementary				X	
		Zephyr Cove Elementary				X	
	Elko	Carlin Elementary			X		
		Elko Grammar #2	X	X			
		Flagview Intermediate	X	X			
		Jackpot Elementary			X		
		Mountain View Elementary			X		
		Northside Elementary			X		
		Owyhee Elementary					
		Sage Elementary	X	X			
		Southside Elementary			X		
		Spring Creek Elementary	X	X			
		Wells Elementary			X		
		West Wendover Elementary					
		Esmeralda	Dyer Elementary				
	Goldfield Elementary						
	Silver Peak						
	Eureka	Crescent Valley Elementary					
		Eureka Elementary School					

District	District	School Name	Facility Limitation	Difficulty Hiring	Funding Limitation	Other
	Humboldt	Denio Elementary School			X	
		French Ford Middle School			X	
		Grass Valley Elementary School			X	
		Kings River Elementary School				
		McDermitt Combined School				
		Orovada Elementary School			X	
		Paradise Valley Elementary School			X	
		Sonoma Heights Elementary School			X	
		Winnemucca Grammar School			X	
	Lyon	Cottonwood Elementary	X	X	X	
		Dayton Elementary	X	X	X	
		East Valley Elementary	X	X	X	
		Fernley Elementary	X	X	X	
		Fernley Intermediate	X	X	X	
		Riverview Elementary	X	X	X	
		Silver Stage Elementary	X	X	X	
		Silver Stage Middle	X	X	X	
		Smith Valley				
		Sutro Elementary	X	X	X	
		Yerington Elementary	X	X	X	
		Yerington Intermediate				
	Mineral	Hawthorne Elementary		X		
		Schurz Elementary		X		
	Nye	Amargosa Valley Elementary School		X	X	
		Beatty Elementary School		X	X	
		Duckwater Elementary School				
		Floyd Elementary School	X	X	X	
		Gabbs Elementary School		X	X	
		Hafen Elementary School		X	X	
		JG Johnson Elementary School	X	X	X	
		Manse Elementary School		X	X	
		Round Mountain		X	X	

District	District	School Name	Facility Limitation	Difficulty Hiring	Funding Limitation	Other
		Elementary School				
		Tonopah Elementary School		X	X	
		Warm Springs Elementary School				
	Storey	Hillside Elementary School			X	
		Hugh Gallagher Elementary School		X		
	White Pine	Baker Elementary				
		D.E. Norman Elementary		X	X	
		Lund Elementary				
		McGill Elementary				
Regular	Clark	Adams ES	X	X	X	
		Adcock ES	X	X	X	
		Alamo ES	X	X	X	
		Allen ES	X	X	X	
		Antonello ES	X	X	X	
		Bailey ES	X	X	X	
		Barber ES	X	X	X	
		Bartlett ES	X	X	X	
		Bass ES	X	X	X	
		Batterman ES	X	X	X	
		Beatty ES	X	X	X	
		Beckley ES	X	X	X	
		Bell ES	X	X	X	
		Bendorf ES	X	X	X	
		Bennett ES	X	X	X	
		Berkley ES	X	X	X	
		Bilbray ES	X	X	X	
		Blackhurst ES	X	X	X	
		Bonner ES	X	X	X	
		Booker ES	X	X	X	
		Bowler, Grant ES	X	X	X	
		Bowler, Joseph ES	X	X	X	
		Bozarth ES	X	X	X	
		Bracken ES	X	X	X	
		Brookman ES	X	X	X	
		Bruner ES	X	X	X	
		Bryan, Richard ES	X	X	X	
		Bryan, Roger ES	X	X	X	
		Bunker ES	X	X	X	
		Cahlan ES	X	X	X	
		Cambeiro ES	X	X	X	

District	District	School Name	Facility Limitation	Difficulty Hiring	Funding Limitation	Other
		Carl ES	X	X	X	
		Carson ES	X	X	X	
		Cartwright ES	X	X	X	
		Christensen ES	X	X	X	
		Conners ES	X	X	X	
		Cortez ES	X	X	X	
		Cox, Clyde ES	X	X	X	
		Cox, David ES	X	X	X	
		Cozine ES	X	X	X	
		Craig ES	X	X	X	
		Crestwood ES	X	X	X	
		Culley ES	X	X	X	
		Cunningham ES	X	X	X	
		Dailey ES	X	X	X	
		Darnell ES	X	X	X	
		Dearing ES	X	X	X	
		Decker ES	X	X	X	
		Derfelt ES	X	X	X	
		Deskin ES	X	X	X	
		Detwiler ES	X	X	X	
		Diaz ES	X	X	X	
		Dickens ES	X	X	X	
		Diskin ES	X	X	X	
		Divich ES	X	X	X	
		Dondero ES	X	X	X	
		Dooley ES	X	X	X	
		Duncan ES	X	X	X	
		Earl, Ira ES	X	X	X	
		Earl, Marion ES	X	X	X	
		Edwards ES	X	X	X	
		Eisenberg ES	X	X	X	
		Elizondo ES	X	X	X	
		Ellis ES	X	X	X	
		Ferron ES	X	X	X	
		Fine ES	X	X	X	
		Fitzgerald ES	X	X	X	
		Fong ES	X	X	X	
		Forbuss ES	X	X	X	
		French ES	X	X	X	
		Frias ES	X	X	X	
		Galloway ES	X	X	X	
		Garehime ES	X	X	X	
		Gehring ES	X	X	X	

District	District	School Name	Facility Limitation	Difficulty Hiring	Funding Limitation	Other
		Gibson ES	X	X	X	
		Gilbert ES	X	X	X	
		Givens ES	X	X	X	
		Goldfarb ES	X	X	X	
		Goolsby ES	X	X	X	
		Goynes ES	X	X	X	
		Gragson ES	X	X	X	
		Gray ES	X	X	X	
		Griffith ES	X	X	X	
		Guy ES	X	X	X	
		Hancock ES	X	X	X	
		Harmon ES	X	X	X	
		Harris ES	X	X	X	
		Hayden ES	X	X	X	
		Hayes ES	X	X	X	
		Heard ES	X	X	X	
		Heckethorn ES	X	X	X	
		Herr ES	X	X	X	
		Herron ES	X	X	X	
		Hewetson ES	X	X	X	
		Hickey ES	X	X	X	
		Hill ES	X	X	X	
		Hinman ES	X	X	X	
		Hoggard ES	X	X	X	
		Hollingsworth ES	X	X	X	
		Hummel ES	X	X	X	
		Indian Springs ES				
		Iverson ES	X	X	X	
		Jacobson ES	X	X	X	
		Jeffers ES	X	X	X	
		Jydstrup ES	X	X	X	
		Kahre ES	X	X	X	
		Katz ES	X	X	X	
		Keller ES	X	X	X	
		Kelly ES	X	X	X	
		Kesterson ES	X	X	X	
		Kim ES	X	X	X	
		King, Martha ES	X	X	X	
		King, Martin ES	X	X	X	
		Lake ES	X	X	X	
		Lamping ES	X	X	X	
		Lincoln ES	X	X	X	
		Long ES	X	X	X	

District	District	School Name	Facility Limitation	Difficulty Hiring	Funding Limitation	Other
		Lowman ES	X	X	X	
		Lummis ES	X	X	X	
		Lunt ES	X	X	X	
		Lynch ES	X	X	X	
		Mack ES	X	X	X	
		Mackey ES	X	X	X	
		Manch ES	X	X	X	
		Martinez ES	X	X	X	
		Mathis ES	X	X	X	
		May ES	X	X	X	
		Mc Call ES	X	X	X	
		Mc Caw ES	X	X	X	
		McDoniel ES	X	X	X	
		McMillan ES	X	X	X	
		McWilliams ES	X	X	X	
		Mendoza ES	X	X	X	
		Miller, Sandy ES	X	X	X	
		Mitchell ES	X	X	X	
		Moore ES	X	X	X	
		Morrow ES	X	X	X	
		Mountain View ES	X	X	X	
		Neal ES	X	X	X	
		Newton ES	X	X	X	
		Northwest CTA ES	X	X	X	
		Ober ES	X	X	X	
		ORoarke ES	X	X	X	
		Ortwein ES	X	X	X	
		Paradise ES	X	X	X	
		Park ES	X	X	X	
		Parson ES	X	X	X	
		Perkins, Dr Claude G ES	X	X	X	
		Perkins, Ute ES	X	X	X	
		Petersen ES	X	X	X	
		Piggott ES	X	X	X	
		Pittman ES	X	X	X	
		Priest ES	X	X	X	
		Red Rock ES	X	X	X	
		Reed ES	X	X	X	
		Reedom ES	X	X	X	
		Rhodes ES	X	X	X	
		Ries ES	X	X	X	
		Roberts ES	X	X	X	
		Rogers ES	X	X	X	

District	District	School Name	Facility Limitation	Difficulty Hiring	Funding Limitation	Other
		Ronnow ES	X	X	X	
		Ronzone ES	X	X	X	
		Roundy ES	X	X	X	
		Rowe ES	X	X	X	
		Rundle ES	X	X	X	
		Scherkenbach ES	X	X	X	
		Schorr ES	X	X	X	
		Scott ES	X	X	X	
		Sewell ES	X	X	X	
		Simmons ES	X	X	X	
		Smalley ES	X	X	X	
		Smith, Hal ES	X	X	X	
		Smith, Helen M ES	X	X	X	
		Snyder, Don & Dee ES	X	X	X	
		Snyder, William E ES	X	X	X	
		Squires ES	X	X	X	
		Stanford ES	X	X	X	
		Staton ES	X	X	X	
		Steele ES	X	X	X	
		Stevens ES	X	X	X	
		Stuckey ES	X	X	X	
		Sunrise Acres ES	X	X	X	
		Tanaka ES	X	X	X	
		Tarr ES	X	X	X	
		Tartan ES	X	X	X	
		Tate ES	X	X	X	
		Taylor, Glen ES	X	X	X	
		Taylor, Robert ES	X	X	X	
		Thiriot ES	X	X	X	
		Thomas ES	X	X	X	
		Thompson ES	X	X	X	
		Thorpe ES	X	X	X	
		Tobler ES	X	X	X	
		Tomiyasu ES	X	X	X	
		Treem ES	X	X	X	
		Triggs ES	X	X	X	
		Twin Lakes ES	X	X	X	
		Twitchell ES	X	X	X	
		Ullom ES	X	X	X	
		Vanderburg ES	X	X	X	
		Vassiliadis ES	X	X	X	
		Vegas Verdes ES	X	X	X	
		Virgin Valley ES	X	X	X	

District	District	School Name	Facility Limitation	Difficulty Hiring	Funding Limitation	Other
		Walker ES	X	X	X	
		Wallin ES	X	X	X	
		Ward, Gene ES	X	X	X	
		Ward, Kitty ES	X	X	X	
		Warren ES	X	X	X	
		Wasden ES	X	X	X	
		Watson ES	X	X	X	
		Wengert ES	X	X	X	
		West Prep ES	X	X	X	
		Whitney ES	X	X	X	
		Wiener ES	X	X	X	
		Wilhelm ES	X	X	X	
		Williams, Tom ES	X	X	X	
		Williams, Wendell ES	X	X	X	
		Wolfe ES	X	X	X	
		Wolff, Elise ES	X	X	X	
		Woolley ES	X	X	X	
		Wright ES	X	X	X	
		Wynn ES	X	X	X	
		Sandy Valley Elementary				
	Lander	Austin Combined Schools				
		Battle Mountain Elementary School	X	X	X	
	Lincoln	Caliente Elem				
		Panaca Elem	X	X	X	
		Pioche Elem				
		PVES	X	X	X	
	Pershing	Imlay Elementary			X	
		Lovelock Elementary			X	
	Washoe	Alice Smith Elementary		X	X	
		Allen Elementary		X	X	
		Anderson Elementary		X	X	
		Beasley Elementary		X	X	
		Beck Elementary		X	X	
		Bennett Elementary		X	X	
		Booth Elementary				
		Brown Elementary		X	X	
		Cannan Elementary		X	X	
		Caughlin Ranch Elementary		X	X	
		Corbett Elementary		X	X	
		Desert Heights Elementary		X	X	

District	District	School Name	Facility Limitation	Difficulty Hiring	Funding Limitation	Other
		Diedrichsen Elementary		X	X	
		Dodson Elementary		X	X	
		Donner Springs Elementary		X	X	
		Double Diamond Elementary		X	X	
		Drake Elementary		X	X	
		Duncan Elementary		X	X	
		Dunn Elementary		X	X	
		Elmcrest Elementary		X	X	
		Gomes Elementary	X	X	X	
		Gomm Elementary		X	X	
		Greenbrae Elementary		X	X	
		Hall Elementary		X	X	
		Hidden Valley Elementary		X	X	
		Huffaker Elementary		X	X	
		Hunsberger Elementary		X	X	
		Hunter Lake Elementary		X	X	
		Incline Elementary		X	X	
		Juniper Elementary		X	X	
		Kate Smith Elementary		X	X	
		Lemelson Elementary		X	X	
		Lemmon Valley Elementary		X	X	
		Lenz Elementary		X	X	
		Lincoln Park Elementary		X	X	
		Loder Elementary		X	X	
		Mathews Elementary		X	X	
		Maxwell Elementary		X	X	
		Melton Elementary		X	X	
		Mitchell Elementary		X	X	
		Moss Elementary		X	X	
		Mount Rose Elementary		X	X	
		Natchez Elementary				
		Palmer Elementary		X	X	
		Peavine Elementary	X	X	X	
		Pleasant Valley Elementary		X	X	
		Risley Elementary		X	X	
		Sepulveda Elementary	X	X	X	
		Silver Lake Elementary		X	X	

District	District	School Name	Facility Limitation	Difficulty Hiring	Funding Limitation	Other
		Smithridge Elementary		X	X	
		Spanish Springs Elementary	X	X	X	
		Stead Elementary		X	X	
		Sun Valley Elementary		X	X	
		Taylor Elementary	X	X	X	
		Towles Elementary		X	X	
		Van Gorder Elementary	X	X	X	
		Verdi Elementary		X	X	
		Veterans Elementary		X	X	
		Warner Elementary		X	X	
		Westergard Elementary		X	X	
		Whitehead Elementary		X	X	
		Winnemucca Elementary		X	X	