

Steve Sisolak
Governor

Jhone M. Ebert
*Superintendent
of Public
Instruction*



Southern Nevada Office
2080 East Flamingo Rd,
Suite 210
Las Vegas, Nevada
89119-0811
(702) 486-6458
Fax: (702) 486-6450

STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
700 E. Fifth Street | Carson City, Nevada 89701-5096
Phone: (775) 687-9200 | www.doe.nv.gov | Fax: (775) 687-9101

To: Elaine Wynn, President, State Board of Education

From: Heidi Haartz, Deputy Superintendent, Business Support Services

Date: November 14, 2019

RE: Report to the State Board of Education: Class Size Reduction Variances and Justifications, 4th Quarter Fiscal Year 2019 CSR for the period April 1- June 30, 2019

Introduction

Pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 388.700(4), the State Board of Education is required to submit a quarterly report on class size ratios and each variance requested by a school district during the preceding quarter to the Interim Finance Committee (IFC); charter schools are exempt. For the purposes of evaluating the effectiveness of the class-size reduction (CSR) program, the report must include an identification for each 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 during the 2017-2019 biennium:
 - Regular: 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
 - Alternative: 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

For the fiscal year (FY) 2019, SB 544 section 13, subsection 2 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. Additionally, SB544 provides that remaining funds may be allocated to the lowest performing schools with variances.

Executive Summary

In the fourth quarter, there were 1,024 variances in grades kindergarten through sixth as applicable, compared to 1,019 variances in third quarter. As a result of the discontinuation of the kindergarten class size reduction (KCSR) in FY17, 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, despite class size ratios remaining relatively unchanged. The number of kindergarten variances for the fourth quarter of FY19 remained relatively flat at 316 variances and remaining steady at approximately 21.04. Grades first through third, however, experienced an average increase of five variances, or 0.49%, in the number of variances compared to last quarter. Much of this increase is attributed to increases in enrollment in grade 1-3 in Clark County School District.

Scope of Report

This report provides a summary of variance requests by district and school and includes the specific variance justification by the 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 (FY18).
- Demographic data such as, percent that is low income (FRL) and percent who are English Language Learners (ELL).
 - Please note figures below 10% are suppressed for student protection.

Statewide Summary of Variances & Justifications

The districts were broken into their grouping type according to the DSA equity allocation model categories, Large, Centralized, Rural, Small, and Very Small, and were analyzed for commonalities. Clark and Washoe are grouped in the large category, while 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.

Class size ratio variance request justifications are grouped into the following four standardized categories, funding limitations, difficulty hiring teachers, facility limitations, and other. Any or all of these justifications are accepted. Difficulty hiring and funding limitations were the most common variance justifications, which were a factor in 36% of variances requested by the districts respectively, followed by facility limitations at 28%, other was not cited.

In rural and small districts, they reported that available funding 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. Funding limitations were the second most common justification, which was reported both in large districts and in most small and rural districts.

Facility limitations tended to represent a school’s lack of available physical space to create smaller class sizes. Nearly a third of the justifications provided included this justification. In many rural locations, schools were built to support class size ratios of 22-to-1. Thus many schools do not have the physical capacity to create smaller classes. The table below identifies the justifications provided by district.

District Grouping Variance Justification

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

District Reported Justification for Variances

The variance justifications listed below were provided by the districts with their quarterly class size ratio reports. Individual variance requests are available upon request.

Carson City is experiencing facility limitations in grades K, 1, 3, and 5. In addition, the district is experiencing difficulty hiring 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 paraprofessional 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 declined 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. Currently, available revenue prevents HCS D 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 the 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 as it is not fiscally neutral.

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

Thirteen school districts have variances in 1- and 2-star schools based on the most recent information published in September 2018. Of the 169 total 1- and 2-star elementary schools reported for CSR, 162 of those schools have variances with a total of 420 grade level variances in grades kindergarten through 6th grade as applicable.

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	102	101	99 %	99	317
Douglas	7	2	2	100%	2	6
Elko	12	6	6	100%	4	9
Esmeralda	3	1	1	100%	0	0
Eureka	2	0	0	0%	0	0
Humboldt	9	4	4	100%	3	6
Lander	2	0	0	0%	0	0
Lincoln	4	1	1	100%	1	2
Lyon	12	9	8	89%	7	26
Mineral	2	2	2	100%	1	2
Nye	11	4	2	50%	2	6
Pershing	2	1	1	100%	0	2
Storey	2	1	1	100%	0	1
Washoe	62	29	26	90%	24	30
White Pine	4	3	3	100%	3	3
Total	366	169	162	96%	150	420

There were 366 total schools (1-5 star schools, including unrated schools) of which 342 schools had variances in the fourth quarter. Within these schools, there were 708 variances in first through sixth grade compared to 701 in the third quarter and 723 variances in the second quarter of FY19.

Including kindergarten, there were 1,024 variances statewide as opposed to 1,019 last quarter, in aggregate this is a five variance increase, or +0.49%. Kindergarten variances remained relatively flat at 316 in Q4 compared to 318 in Q3.

In addition, it is important to note, that due to a methodology change in calculating class size ratios, the ratios may potentially increase as a result of the Department now utilizing average daily enrollment (ADE) instead of average daily attendance (ADA) when calculating the student to teacher ratio. This is the result of aligning practice with updates to statute. This can result in a slightly higher class size ratio due to evaluating total number of students enrolled instead of evaluating physical student attendance, which is often lower.

Additionally, beginning in FY18, as the result of an audit finding, the Department began evaluating class size ratios to the second decimal place instead of the whole integer. Previously a ratio of 17.32 would have been reported as 17, and would not constitute as a variance. However, rounding to two

decimal places, would put 17.32 above 17.00, and thus would constitute a variance. As a result this leads to an increase in the number of variances requested despite experiencing no actual change in the class size ratios.

District Grade Variances

Plan Type	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Grand Total
Alternative								
Carson	6	2	1	2		2		13
Churchill	1		1					2
Douglas	6	2	3	3	3	3		20
Elko	8	3	1	2	1	3	2	20
Esmeralda								0
Humboldt	4	1	1			1	1	8
Lyon	8	3	5	4	4	2	2	28
Mineral	1	1						2
Nye	7	1	3	4	2	4		21
Storey	1	1		2	1	1		6
White Pine	3							3
	45	14	15	17	11	16	5	123
Regular								
Clark	215	180	191	180				766
Lander	1	1	1					3
Lincoln	2	2						4
Pershing	1	1	1	1				4
Washoe	52	29	22	21				124
	271	213	215	202				901
Grand Total	316	227	230	219	11	16	5	1,024

District Level Analysis of Variances

There were 136,408.47 students in grades kindergarten through sixth, in the fourth quarter. For which, there were 1,906.51 CSR funded teachers and 4,651.55 non-CSR funded teachers for 6,558.06 total teachers. The total aggregate class size ratio is 20.80. The district-level class size ratios for the fourth quarter are listed below, by grade. Bolded values represent ratios which exceed the prescribed ratio at the district-level. All but four districts exceed the prescribed ratios in at least one grade level, Eureka, Esmeralda, Mineral, and Lander. The grade with the most variances is kindergarten, with 13 of the 17 districts exceeding the prescribed ratio of 16-to-1 student to teacher ratio. Second and third grade had the most number of districts with a variance, with 4 out of 17 districts exceeding the prescribed ratio.

District Level Class Size Ratios

District	K	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 th
Churchill-A	20.42	21.37	22.39	20.88	23.52	24.63	N/A
Clark-R	22.57	20.52	20.95	23.33	N/A	N/A	N/A
Douglas-A	22.58	20.49	22.17	22.20	23.42	25.03	21.89
Elko-A	18.90	20.32	19.00	19.64	22.06	22.76	19.89
Esmeralda-*	8.74	8.74	8.08	11.77	7.07	9.09	11.77
Eureka-A	11.15	12.39	14.13	14.29	18.85	20.50	16.25
Humboldt-A	16.66	15.48	15.96	14.08	16.34	13.82	9.41
Lander-R	12.82	11.90	21.85	16.95	N/A	3.03	N/A
Lincoln-R	17.27	17.08	12.75	16.00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lyon-A	20.26	19.79	21.11	20.64	23.07	22.66	22.43
Mineral-A	15.00	22.00	11.59	19.00	11.25	11.34	15.25
Nye-A	16.75	19.05	17.77	21.00	19.21	20.14	N/A
Carson City-A	20.79	20.74	20.35	21.65	20.64	25.21	N/A
Pershing-R	16.02	19.95	17.39	18.69	N/A	N/A	N/A
Storey-A	17.00	19.94	14.19	25.50	27.50	29.00	N/A
Washoe-R	19.33	16.38	16.43	19.29	N/A	N/A	N/A
White Pine-A	18.06	16.82	16.31	17.29	18.42	11.57	17.00
Total Ave. (State)	21.04	19.36	19.53	21.78	20.02	20.01	16.67

* 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 fourth quarter of FY19, there was an increase of five variances, or a 0.5% increase, in the overall number of class size ratio variances requested compared to third quarter of FY19. Kindergarten variances remained relatively flat with 316 variances compared to 318 in Q3. This was the second year since the discontinuation of the kindergarten class size reduction program; as a result, kindergarten class size ratio is now 16-to-1 as prescribed in NRS 388.700(1) compared to 21-to-1 in FY17. However, despite the reduction in the target ratio, there were limited changes in kindergarten

class size ratios compared to FY18 and as of fourth quarter FY19. First through third grade saw minor upticks in the number of variances reported, while fourth and fifth grade variances remained the same, and sixth grade increased slightly by three variances.

The attached variance request report is sorted by CSR plan type, school district, and followed by school names alphabetically. Bolded values identify class size ratios 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 contact Megan Peterson via email at meganp@doe.nv.gov or via phone at 775-687-9236.

Variance Requests Q4 FY19
Alternative Plan Districts:

Carson City School District

Plan Type	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5
Bordewich Bray Elementary	2	43%	14%	21.80	22.54	20.43	20.36	20.56	27.38
Empire Elementary	2	100%	44%	22.08	16.22	17.01	21.51	16.92	24.49
Fremont Elementary	2	52%	28%	18.81	18.20	22.41	22.15	19.23	24.00
Fritsch Elementary	3	34%	16%	16.93	21.68	21.42	20.39	24.47	23.65
Mark Twain Elementary	2	100%	31%	25.23	24.19	20.91	25.08	20.44	24.32
Seeliger Elementary	3	36%	17%	19.90	21.60	19.94	20.39	22.20	27.43

Churchill County School District

Plan Type	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5
EC Best Elementary School	Not Rated	54%	11%			22.39	20.88		
Lahontan Elementary School	Not Rated	53%	*	20.42	21.37				
Numa Elementary School	3	51%	12%					23.52	24.63

Douglas County School District

Plan Type	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
C.C. Meneley Elementary	3	51%	*	26.46	21.37	28.04	21.03	23.66	26.34	
Gardnerville Elementary	4	35%	12%	16.44	20.33	20.00	20.88	19.06	25.25	
Gene Scarselli Elementary	2	34%	*	25.65	23.02	21.67	23.88	21.78	23.61	
Jacks Valley Elementary	2	45%	14%	22.75	19.69	23.63	25.42	18.34	24.45	
Minden Elementary	3	29%	*	24.60	19.91	17.00	24.26	26.67	32.50	
Pinon Elementary	5	19%	*	27.00	22.50	24.98	20.97	26.74	24.65	
Zephyr Cove Elementary	5	38%	14%	15.14	16.60	19.87	19.00	27.66	18.42	21.89

Elko School District

School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
Carlin Elementary	2	47%	*	19.99	22.64	19.36	18.95	21.92	16.03	26.59
Elko Grammar #2	3	42%	*	18.84	21.11	17.36	21.67	21.29		
Flagview Intermediate	2	43%	16%						29.26	26.98
Jackpot Elementary	2	79%	32%	16.67	17.50	15.54	12.91	23.72	25.00	14.00
Mountain View Elementary	5	21%	11%	23.00	22.18	22.33	22.40	24.37		
Northside Elementary	2	44%	16%	22.82	18.50	18.97	21.00	21.85		
Owyhee Elementary	1	100%	*	13.50	15.93	18.00	15.00	15.52	13.00	9.00
Sage Elementary	2	35%	*	19.55	18.64	20.35	20.77	20.90	24.87	
Southside Elementary	3	63%	26%	21.87	20.34	20.08	19.37	23.44		
Spring Creek Elementary	3	16%	*	22.43	21.50	20.36	23.59	24.24	25.05	
Wells Elementary	4	49%	17%	14.00	27.67	18.24	20.71	20.19	27.67	22.89
West Wendover Elementary	2	78%	32%	15.28	17.56	18.44	19.66	25.26	21.16	

Esmeralda School District

School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
Dyer Elementary	1	52%	30%	12.12	18.18	9.09	21.21	21.21	24.24	18.18
Goldfield Elementary	Not Rated	62%	*	9.09	3.03	15.15	9.09	0.00	3.03	12.12
Silver Peak Elementary	Not Rated	*	*	5.00	5.00	0.00	5.00	0.00	0.00	5.00

Eureka School District

School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
Crescent Valley Elementary	3	41%	*	10.00	14.29	10.26	12.08	15.70	20.00	20.00
Eureka Elementary School	5	22%	*	12.29	10.50	18.00	16.50	22.00	21.00	12.50

Humboldt County School District

School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
Denio Elementary School	Not Rated	*	*		6.25	5.88	4.12			5.80
French Ford Middle School	1	#N/A	#N/A						25.24	25.67
Grass Valley Elementary School	2	48%	*	21.48	19.25	18.77	17.71	18.02		
Kings River Elementary School	Not Rated	*	*	7.63	10.00		10.00		10.00	10.00
McDermitt Combined School	1	99%	*	18.18	16.60	11.12	16.00	9.00	15.00	5.00
Orovada Elementary School	Not Rated	63%	31%	15.79	15.56	16.28		15.38	6.98	7.02
Paradise Valley Elementary School	Not Rated	56%	*	13.89	13.95	14.29	11.90	12.50	11.90	3.00
Sonoma Heights Elementary School	2	51%	16%	20.72	19.60	23.40	21.36	21.22		
Winnemucca Grammar School	4	59%	21%	18.93	22.66	21.97	17.45	21.93		

Lyon County School District

School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
Cottonwood Elementary	2	65%	*	20.93	23.75	23.70	24.56	25.99		
Dayton Elementary	2	60%	11%	22.78	21.65	22.66	20.00	21.94	22.25	27.20
East Valley Elementary	2	56%	*	24.27	22.73	19.13	23.30	25.19		
Fernley Elementary	3	71%	*	23.49	21.99	20.19	19.17	22.08		
Fernley Intermediate	3	#N/A	#N/A						25.82	24.79
Riverview Elementary	2	52%	*	18.21	16.72	22.68	22.71	27.06	22.07	21.66
Silver Stage Elementary	1	100%	*	24.42	18.76	19.53	17.04	26.85		
Silver Stage Middle	2	#N/A	#N/A						26.76	25.64
Smith Valley	3	31%	*	5.71	8.00	16.00	15.00	11.00	18.00	13.00
Sutro Elementary	2	63%	*	19.55	20.67	22.59	17.28	24.43	20.61	24.31
Yerington Elementary	2	73%	17%	22.95	23.82	23.55	26.66	23.10		
Yerington Intermediate	2	65%	*						23.09	20.40

Mineral County School District

School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
Hawthorne Elementary	1	51%	*	18.00	16.00	18.50	18.00	16.50	10.67	18.50
Schurz Elementary	1	100%	66%	12.00	28.00	4.67	20.00	6.00	12.00	12.00

Nye County School District

School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5
Amargosa Valley Elementary School	2	100%	41%	11.11	16.22	15.00	21.11	15.43	11.00
Beatty Elementary School	4	100%	21%	21.05	20.93	16.13	16.16	15.96	15.67
Duckwater Elementary School	Not Rated	*	*	11.11		10.59		10.59	10.81
Floyd Elementary School	3	100%	*	25.76	25.41	22.25	23.44	24.23	30.73
Gabbs Elementary School	Not Rated	100%	*	21.43	20.00	20.53	20.71	20.00	20.83
Hafen Elementary School	4	100%	*	18.77	20.15	21.08	23.38	23.98	25.13
JG Johnson Elementary School	1	100%	*	17.46	16.97	25.90	16.12	25.37	25.23
Manse Elementary School	4	100%	10%	19.73	21.05	25.13	28.63	27.97	31.57
Round Mountain Elementary School	1	14%	*	11.50	22.00	16.00	12.47	23.55	24.90
Tonopah Elementary School	1	40%	*	18.29	20.10	15.01	27.00	16.50	18.00
Warm Springs Elementary School	Not Rated	*	*	8.00	7.69	7.89		7.69	7.69

Storey County School District

School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5
Hillside Elementary School	1	45%	*	11.00	10.87	12.38	25.00	25.00	25.00
Hugh Gallagher Elementary School	3	35%	*	23.00	29.00	16.00	26.00	30.00	33.00

White Pine County School District

School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
Baker Elementary	Not Rated	*	*				17.00	17.00	0.00	17.00
D.E. Norman Elementary	1	47%	*	17.58	19.60	19.45	18.65	22.28	18.27	
Lund Elementary	2	*	*	17.38	17.38	13.47	13.47	10.00	10.00	
McGill Elementary	2	48%	*	19.21	13.47	16.00	20.03	24.41	18.00	

Variance Requests Q4 FY19
Regular Plan Districts

Clark County School District

School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3
Adams, Kirk ES	2	64%	32%	22.39	21.75	19.31	23.81
Adcock, O K ES	2	100%	35%	19.00	20.20	16.54	18.82
Alamo, Tony ES	4	47%	16%	19.51	22.38	21.55	25.96
Allen, Dean LaMar ES	3	27%	*	22.39	26.00	23.12	25.35
Antonello, Lee ES	3	65%	15%	24.33	24.59	25.68	28.00
Bailey, Sister Robert Joseph ES	1	100%	23%	22.85	18.18	16.31	20.68
Barber, Shirley A ES	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	28.92	21.55	19.85	27.65
Bartlett, Selma F ES	3	29%	*	19.35	23.12	19.44	26.23
Bass, John C ES	3	51%	11%	33.96	23.13	22.32	22.37
Batterman, Kathy L ES	5	33%	11%	28.74	24.41	18.11	20.65
Beatty, John R ES	3	100%	10%	25.71	19.99	24.24	24.30
Beckley, Will ES	2	100%	46%	18.88	17.18	17.80	23.13
Bell, Rex ES	1	100%	41%	21.84	18.78	20.57	19.51
Bendorf, Patricia A ES	4	53%	19%	24.28	22.85	21.03	31.34
Bennett, William G ES	2	100%	*	20.85	20.20	17.84	15.80
Berkley, Shelley ES	3	50%	*	23.68	21.49	21.67	26.54
Bilbray, James ES	4	100%	*	25.40	23.57	33.00	19.83
Bonner, John W ES	5	22%	12%	17.52	23.74	23.11	30.31
Booker, Kermit R Sr ES	2	100%	32%	25.77	13.77	18.06	17.25
Bowler, Grant ES	3	19%	*	20.26	19.15	17.82	24.79
Bowler, Joseph L ES	1	75%	30%	19.10	21.75	17.91	18.74
Bozarth, Henry & Evelyn ES	5	17%	*	23.01	23.39	22.19	23.80
Bracken, Walter ES	5	59%	35%	19.82	20.60	19.28	24.00
Brookman, Eileen B ES	4	61%	24%	20.93	20.76	22.32	28.43
Bruner, Lucile ES	1	100%	25%	19.94	21.34	15.93	38.32
Bryan, Richard H ES	4	48%	11%	27.14	24.09	27.45	26.67
Bryan, Roger M ES	2	56%	20%	28.53	18.87	18.80	21.86
Bunker, Berkeley L ES	2	100%	25%	29.96	14.85	23.88	16.91
Cahlan, Marion ES	4	100%	54%	22.62	19.96	19.48	21.47
Cambeiro, Arturo ES	3	100%	53%	17.25	20.55	17.52	20.94
Carl, Kay ES	2	100%	*	25.74	18.63	18.00	20.79
Carson, Kit ES	2	100%	24%	23.69	16.00	19.67	19.00
Cartwright, Roberta C ES	3	52%	10%	22.08	21.66	20.21	31.53
Christensen, M J ES	4	51%	14%	20.50	22.99	25.96	22.57
Connors, Eileen ES	4	52%	*	20.46	23.43	19.98	22.60

School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3
Cortez, Manuel J ES	2	100%	51%	21.21	24.77	26.62	24.32
Cox, Clyde C ES	2	100%	39%	24.94	22.85	19.44	23.56
Cox, David M ES	3	100%	*	23.74	21.54	22.47	25.38
Cozine, Steve and Linda ES	3	100%	16%	22.16	23.87	24.48	22.11
Craig, Lois ES	2	100%	40%	26.89	26.81	27.25	17.36
Crestwood ES	4	81%	55%	21.44	23.09	22.20	23.73
Culley, Paul E ES	1	100%	41%	20.72	16.88	17.60	20.60
Cunningham, Cynthia ES	1	100%	20%	19.96	17.67	22.57	20.97
Dailey, Jack ES	3	100%	49%	21.25	27.38	18.82	22.18
Darnell, Marshall C ES	3	100%	*	21.32	15.67	15.27	23.46
Dearing, Laura ES	3	100%	35%	24.47	19.50	20.25	17.26
Decker, C H ES	2	100%	30%	23.20	21.76	18.63	28.62
Derfelt, Herbert A ES	3	57%	18%	25.90	25.18	19.85	21.72
Deskin, Ruthe ES	3	100%	18%	19.14	20.68	19.27	30.99
Detwiler, Ollie ES	2	100%	32%	23.52	16.21	12.88	21.51
Diaz, Ruben P ES	4	100%	48%	19.63	27.70	22.84	26.67
Dickens, D L Dusty ES	3	74%	13%	22.22	15.48	17.61	21.28
Diskin, P A ES	4	100%	36%	20.35	19.94	18.44	24.36
Divich, Kenneth ES	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	22.89	23.96	23.66	22.87
Dondero, Harvey N ES	3	100%	43%	22.33	22.03	23.20	25.52
Dooley, John ES	3	100%	*	20.33	23.73	24.20	21.34
Duncan, Ruby ES	1	68%	*	25.26	15.28	15.67	23.55
Earl, Ira J ES	2	100%	62%	23.06	18.14	17.26	25.28
Earl, Marion B ES	3	63%	20%	22.19	18.36	18.50	18.60
Edwards, Elbert ES	3	100%	45%	21.28	16.47	24.75	24.70
Eisenberg, Dorothy ES	3	100%	12%	22.49	22.79	21.16	25.25
Elizondo, Raul P ES	3	100%	21%	23.24	19.84	21.95	26.50
Ellis, Robert & Sandy ES	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	28.45	24.04	25.00	15.36
Ferron, William E ES	3	100%	29%	22.65	16.17	18.54	21.18
Fine, Mark L ES	4	46%	15%	22.64	20.71	24.36	26.28
Fitzgerald, H P ES	2	100%	31%	20.02	12.60	11.88	18.69
Fong, Wing and Lilly ES	3	100%	26%	19.70	22.24	19.47	23.68
Forbuss, Robert L ES	4	40%	*	21.31	28.82	22.28	25.68
French, Doris ES	4	100%	23%	24.87	32.89	23.99	23.09
Frias, Charles & Phyllis ES	5	31%	*	24.25	20.33	24.00	23.29
Galloway, Fay ES	2	44%	*	21.85	21.82	23.38	26.10
Garehime, Edith ES	2	42%	*	23.91	21.40	23.75	26.78
Gehring, Roger D Acad of Science & Technology ES	5	55%	*		20.80	22.20	23.75
Gibson, James ES	4	100%	*	23.84	25.00	23.59	29.25

School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3
Gilbert, CVT ES	4	61%	15%	18.00	16.40	16.40	19.25
Givens, Linda Rankin ES	5	14%	*	21.80	22.92	32.46	23.40
Goldfarb, Daniel ES	2	100%	36%	20.83	24.96	22.88	17.44
Goolsby, Judy & John L ES	4	23%	10%	24.48	27.71	21.09	22.00
Goynes, Theron H & Naomi D ES	4	39%	*	21.81	20.38	22.49	24.01
Gragson, Oran K ES	2	100%	46%	24.21	16.97	25.35	18.94
Gray, R Guild ES	2	100%	30%	26.81	17.58	23.50	30.67
Griffith, E W ES	1	100%	38%	20.20	16.82	15.81	19.06
Guy, Addeliar D III ES	4	100%	16%	24.75	15.00	15.95	21.38
Hancock, Doris ES	1	100%	28%	19.51	13.35	14.47	22.53
Harmon, Harley ES	2	80%	39%	20.75	19.03	19.99	15.50
Harris, George E ES	1	100%	28%	19.84	15.12	20.72	29.22
Hayden, Don E ES	2	66%	12%	19.96	23.68	25.74	25.51
Hayes, Keith C & Karen W ES	3	100%	12%	23.46	28.03	27.63	25.81
Heard, Lomie G ES, A Marzano Academy	2	100%	33%		22.00	21.96	24.60
Heckethorn, Howard E ES	4	29%	*	24.79	20.75	23.62	22.85
Herr, Helen ES	1	78%	32%	22.32	18.02	19.39	28.97
Herron, Fay ES	5	100%	57%	23.32	19.32	24.80	21.74
Hewetson, Halle ES	2	100%	58%	25.27	18.00	17.05	20.24
Hickey, Liliam Lujan ES	2	100%	31%	20.31	18.58	29.38	26.28
Hill, Charlotte ES	2	100%	13%	20.14	25.70	24.21	23.20
Hinman, Edna F ES	2	100%	19%	17.83	12.48	20.04	17.26
Hoggard, Mabel ES	5	100%	30%	20.22	21.00	23.33	24.33
Hollingsworth, Howard ES	1	100%	50%	25.29	15.91	16.46	19.26
Hummel, John R ES	2	100%	13%	24.29	22.02	25.57	29.24
Indian Springs ES	2	100%	*	16.00	16.00	14.00	14.00
Iverson, Mervin ES	3	100%	25%	22.11	22.52	22.02	27.68
Jacobson, Walter ES	2	58%	18%	24.76	16.85	17.77	16.41
Jeffers, Jay W ES	2	100%	55%	24.46	17.56	17.19	24.46
Jones Blackhurst, Jan L ES	5	28%	*	22.45	24.26	25.44	23.26
Jydstrup, Helen ES	3	100%	24%	21.91	24.16	23.44	22.62
Kahre, Marc ES	2	100%	*	22.90	16.87	15.57	20.68
Katz, Edythe & Lloyd ES	2	100%	17%	18.81	18.08	20.05	23.16
Keller, Charlotte & Jerry ES	1	100%	47%	21.11	19.97	17.07	18.15
Kelly, Matt ES	2	100%	10%	27.07	17.44	17.75	22.79
Kesterson, Lorna J ES	4	47%	*	28.19	24.59	24.71	23.59
Kim, Frank ES	2	69%	22%	18.23	27.03	21.31	29.79
King Jr , Martin Luther ES	1	100%	40%	34.84	25.39	20.99	28.76
King, Martha P ES	4	100%	*				24.96

School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3
Lake, Robert E ES	3	100%	47%	15.37	18.65	17.63	20.17
Lamping, Frank ES	5	17%	*	26.08	20.21	22.80	22.44
Lincoln ES	2	100%	60%	25.14	19.01	19.83	22.56
Long, Walter V ES	1	100%	44%	22.99	17.26	15.36	20.83
Lowman, Mary & Zel ES	1	100%	16%	18.58	16.98	13.99	14.62
Lummis, William ES	5	22%	*	23.54	22.26	20.61	21.25
Lunt, Robert ES	2	100%	55%	21.00	19.96	22.17	21.03
Lynch, Ann ES	1	100%	48%	23.53	16.42	25.60	18.41
Mack, Nate ES	3	47%	*	18.12	21.49	23.95	22.25
Mackey, Jo ES	5	70%	19%	20.67	19.54	20.60	22.75
Manch, J E ES	1	100%	20%	25.79	15.49	16.75	21.11
Martinez, Reynaldo L ES	3	100%	39%	23.28	27.92	24.17	24.97
Mathis, Dr. Beverly S ES	5	52%	15%	22.99	21.07	20.44	22.70
May, Ernest ES	5	50%	*	20.54	32.67	22.10	26.14
McCall, Quannah ES	1	100%	51%	16.32	16.96	18.79	25.35
McCaw, Gordon ES	5	58%	*	15.75	19.17	23.40	23.00
McDoniel, Estes M ES	5	100%	*	25.04	23.12	23.41	25.64
McMillan, James B ES	3	100%	21%	25.83	23.00	23.16	37.16
McWilliams, J T ES	2	100%	48%	22.89	17.01	16.21	22.46
Mendoza, John F ES	2	77%	44%	25.83	18.71	17.63	22.76
Miller, Sandy Searles ES	3	70%	34%		14.82	18.83	19.17
Mitchell, Andrew ES	Not Rated	100%	*	20.17	20.55	17.76	
Moore, William K ES	1	100%	45%	21.49	16.77	20.07	19.92
Morrow, Sue H ES	4	42%	*	23.85	18.18	25.27	25.23
Mountain View ES	1	82%	30%	20.91	17.09	22.15	21.53
Neal, Joseph M ES	2	100%	*	20.75	25.44	25.95	22.65
Newton, Ulis ES	3	100%	*	23.35	17.95	19.91	22.82
NW Career-Technical Academy ES	#N/A	*	*	20.00			
O Roarke, Thomas ES	5	26%	*	21.50	21.75	22.56	25.70
Ober, D'Vorre & Hal ES	3	33%	13%	26.32	23.61	32.42	24.50
Ortwein, Dennis ES	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	18.41	29.07	22.86	21.56
Paradise Prof Dev ES	2	100%	39%	22.71	25.14	23.36	25.77
Park, John S ES	2	100%	40%	19.99	16.19	15.00	20.89
Parson, Claude & Stella ES	1	100%	26%	21.00	11.25	15.43	16.13
Perkins, Dr Claude G ES	2	100%	25%	24.77	32.25	21.26	29.69
Perkins, Ute ES	2	100%	*	20.44	17.50	19.00	22.06
Petersen, Dean ES	1	100%	44%	20.86	18.46	18.58	23.28
Piggott Academy ES	3	31%	11%	21.16	19.50	23.40	22.00
Pittman, Vail ES	3	100%	37%	23.38	19.93	17.50	22.88

School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3
Priest, Richard C ES	2	100%	20%	28.40	19.11	15.02	21.37
Red Rock ES	1	100%	34%	23.54	15.54	19.60	20.34
Reed, Doris M ES	1	100%	29%	23.87	16.11	16.16	21.15
Reedom, Carolyn S ES	2	32%	*	26.11	25.16	23.32	28.25
Rhodes, Betsy ES	4	38%	*	23.18	23.75	20.12	24.93
Ries, Aldeane Comito ES	2	42%	11%	22.45	20.75	22.70	20.67
Roberts, Aggie ES	1	100%	11%	20.47	20.31	23.25	27.89
Rogers, Lucille S ES	4	45%	12%	24.87	20.81	22.90	28.58
Ronnow, C C ES	2	100%	50%	19.78	25.63	20.32	19.79
Ronzone, Bertha ES	2	100%	38%	20.66	19.99	19.25	21.85
Roundy, Dr C Owen ES	3	100%	55%	22.19	26.65	21.00	30.32
Rowe, Lewis E ES	4	100%	32%	19.49	19.39	30.35	20.32
Rundle, Richard ES	1	100%	39%	28.95	17.45	22.95	20.73
Sandy Valley ES	1	100%	19%	17.00	19.46	18.00	11.50
Scherkenbach, William & Mary ES	3	100%	*	24.37	22.00	23.43	23.60
Schorr, Steve ES	3	45%	*	20.19	28.16	27.75	22.52
Scott, Jesse D ES	1	76%	17%	20.47	15.76	17.78	18.10
Sewell, C T ES	3	100%	*	19.78	17.18	19.34	28.10
Simmons, Eva G ES	3	60%	13%	24.16	22.82	24.24	23.05
Smalley, James E & A Rae ES	5	12%	*	22.17	23.32	23.62	25.80
Smith, Hal ES	1	100%	24%	26.72	15.88	15.48	22.81
Smith, Helen M ES	5	100%	17%	28.49	18.49	25.83	34.23
Snyder, Don & Dee ES	3	42%	*	22.74	23.94	21.45	26.89
Snyder, William E ES	3	100%	42%	21.21	14.25	18.48	15.88
Squires, C P ES	3	100%	63%	23.88	19.82	18.86	21.20
Stanford ES	2	100%	42%	19.42	21.57	23.92	18.85
Staton, Ethel W ES	4	20%	*	19.09	24.40	21.44	24.62
Steele, Judith D ES	4	32%	12%	23.94	25.12	17.50	25.83
Stevens, Josh ES	4	57%	11%	23.94	23.72	21.03	26.58
Stuckey, Evelyn ES	4	32%	*	24.08	21.41	27.29	22.96
Sunrise Acres ES	3	100%	53%	25.04	18.94	20.59	19.02
Tanaka, Wayne N ES	2	50%	*	24.94	22.22	27.71	20.02
Tarr, Sheila Academy of Int'l Studies ES	3	40%	*	20.50	18.75	19.39	23.00
Tartan, John ES	1	100%	13%	22.88	15.42	21.99	20.65
Tate, Myrtle ES	3	100%	43%	21.61	19.16	16.18	26.12
Taylor, Glen C ES	5	22%	*	20.67	20.47	21.95	30.32
Taylor, Robert L ES	1	100%	*	27.25	18.11	20.15	31.70
Thiriot, Joseph E ES	4	100%	32%	23.92	19.07	20.26	27.68
Thomas, Ruby S ES	2	100%	46%	29.88	19.31	16.08	19.05

School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3
Thompson, Sandra L ES	4	40%	*	25.35	20.26	20.78	35.24
Thorpe, Jim ES	2	69%	17%	21.04	16.50	14.94	29.04
Tobler, R E ES	3	100%	19%	18.67	17.18	18.73	21.21
Tomiyasu, Bill Y ES	2	58%	20%	24.46	19.33	19.66	19.57
Treem, Harriet ES	2	100%	14%	18.87	16.79	19.08	26.78
Triggs, Vincent L ES	2	100%	*	20.61	21.01	21.89	26.25
Twin Lakes ES	2	100%	58%	19.13	18.51	18.34	21.43
Twitchell, Neil C ES	5	20%	*	26.15	21.65	24.70	22.24
Ullom, J M ES	2	100%	36%	25.54	20.95	18.25	21.68
Vanderburg, John ES	5	10%	*	23.67	20.09	32.68	23.50
Vassiliadis, Billy & Rosemary ES	5	*	*	21.83	24.00	27.27	28.25
Vegas Verdes ES	2	100%	42%	21.95	19.30	22.80	24.71
Virgin Valley ES	4	62%	22%	23.01	17.86	21.14	21.72
Walker, J Marlan Int'l School ES	4	26%	*	26.18	19.48	21.91	26.32
Wallin, Shirley & Bill ES	4	10%	*	24.61	18.13	20.44	25.91
Ward, Gene ES	2	100%	41%	23.46	19.93	18.32	18.79
Ward, Kitty McDonough ES	4	33%	*	25.00	20.91	20.81	26.07
Warren, Rose ES	2	100%	50%	20.51	19.73	17.75	20.49
Wasden, Howard ES	2	100%	23%	24.99	19.35	21.46	23.96
Watson, Fredric W ES	1	71%	18%	15.25	16.88	12.61	27.90
Wengert, Cyril ES	3	100%	43%	21.13	24.50	21.49	21.60
West Prep ES	3	86%	53%	18.91	16.01	15.00	16.75
Whitney ES	1	100%	23%	18.54	13.02	17.72	22.84
Wiener, Jr , Louis ES	4	100%	13%	19.56	26.29	27.65	29.85
Wilhelm, Elizabeth ES	2	100%	18%	22.40	20.47	27.49	22.26
Williams, Tom ES	3	100%	61%	21.95	17.93	17.14	19.62
Williams, Wendell ES	1	100%	17%	16.33	19.75	16.20	17.99
Wolfe, Eva ES	1	100%	17%	22.69	17.46	22.76	15.15
Wolff, Elise L ES	3	15%	*	24.99	21.85	22.83	24.75
Woolley, Gwendolyn ES	2	100%	38%	26.39	22.14	12.74	28.15
Wright, William V ES	4	34%	*	20.70	22.36	21.61	25.32
Wynn, Elaine ES	1	100%	53%	27.41	21.85	24.43	25.95

Lander County School District

School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3
Austin Combined Schools	Not Rated	*	*	3.03	3.03		
Battle Mountain ES	4	34%	10%	22.61	20.77	21.85	16.95

Lincoln County School District

School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3
Caliente Elem	4	64%	*	14.00	10.00	14.00	16.00
Panaca Elem	5	46%	*	19.00	20.41	16.00	17.00
Pioche Elem	3	51%	*	14.06	13.89	8.00	14.00
PVES	2	42%	*	22.00	24.00	13.00	17.00

Pershing County School District

School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3
Imlay Elementary	Not Rated	100%	*	16.88		15.44	15.38
Imlay Elementary	Not Rated	100%	*		23.08		
Lovelock Elementary	2	55%	*		16.82		
Lovelock Elementary	2	55%	*	15.16			
Lovelock Elementary	2	55%	*			19.33	22.00

Washoe County School District

School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3
Alice Smith Elementary	2	60%	23%	18.85	17.19	15.79	18.48
Allen Elementary	2	100%	38%	16.62	15.73	15.31	18.81
Anderson Elementary	1	100%	43%	19.24	14.99	15.69	16.84
Beasley Elementary	3	20%	*	20.38	18.60	16.63	20.68
Beck Elementary	5	24%	11%	19.55	19.20	20.97	20.28
Bennett Elementary	2	70%	30%	21.67	14.61	15.13	20.05
Booth Elementary	1	100%	33%	15.42	14.53	14.14	20.27
Brown Elementary	5	10%	*	21.46	17.44	16.85	19.70
Cannan Elementary	1	100%	39%	14.30	14.87	14.95	15.97
Caughlin Ranch Elementary	5	*	*	24.18	19.75	19.92	24.88
Corbett Elementary	2	100%	57%	15.21	17.37	12.60	16.96
Desert Heights Elementary	1	100%	24%	18.90	14.21	15.16	17.44
Diedrichsen Elementary	4	39%	*	19.26	20.01	17.14	22.91
Dodson Elementary	2	61%	28%	19.85	14.35	12.33	15.51
Donner Springs Elementary	2	53%	21%	20.75	13.43	19.91	15.89
Double Diamond Elementary	4	22%	10%	23.64	17.34	16.03	17.35
Drake Elementary	2	67%	28%	20.65	13.83	12.98	16.67
Duncan Elementary	1	100%	51%	18.96	14.55	13.76	18.16
Dunn Elementary	3	53%	22%	17.78	18.00	21.78	24.00
Elmcrest Elementary	2	63%	18%	15.28	15.00	13.07	15.22
Gomes Elementary	2	39%	*	21.45	16.70	15.59	19.73
Gomm Elementary	5	*	*	20.06	19.66	15.29	23.87
Greenbrae Elementary	2	100%	45%	17.96	14.00	16.00	15.99
Hall Elementary	3	27%	*	21.33	18.60	16.77	19.80
Hidden Valley Elementary	3	46%	12%	20.78	20.39	17.40	16.62
Huffaker Elementary	3	25%	*	12.16	17.28	16.32	17.55
Hunsberger Elementary	5	*	*	23.05	16.80	17.44	24.07
Hunter Lake Elementary	5	42%	*	18.22	18.61	14.23	18.63
Incline Elementary	2	32%	38%	20.99	10.40	14.87	14.25
Juniper Elementary	4	45%	18%	19.41	18.69	16.90	18.64
Kate Smith Elementary	2	100%	55%	21.67	13.82	17.00	17.45
Lemelson Elementary	3	100%	38%	14.11	11.88	18.28	14.25
Lemmon Valley Elementary	3	54%	26%	21.50	17.32	16.24	19.90
Lenz Elementary	5	*	*	19.64	18.37	16.64	19.88
Lincoln Park Elementary	2	100%	38%	21.65	14.34	14.85	17.16
Loder Elementary	1	100%	60%	18.41	14.36	17.24	18.10

School Name	Star Rating	FRL	ELL	K	1	2	3
Mathews Elementary	1	100%	49%	20.97	16.20	13.93	17.13
Maxwell Elementary	3	100%	32%	15.71	16.97	20.87	23.33
Melton Elementary	5	*	*	21.41	17.00	17.56	21.78
Mitchell Elementary	2	100%	38%	20.10	12.74	14.00	16.55
Moss Elementary	3	37%	16%	19.13	17.13	19.27	19.97
Mount Rose Elementary	4	37%	*	23.93	19.49	17.66	23.07
Natchez Elementary	1	100%	*	14.00	10.00	10.00	20.00
Palmer Elementary	2	67%	33%	16.18	15.32	13.72	16.66
Peavine Elementary	3	43%	12%	17.67	18.97	22.00	19.21
Pleasant Valley Elementary	3	#N/A	#N/A	20.59	18.15	17.96	24.00
Risley Elementary	3	100%	48%	16.43	17.29	21.36	21.52
Sepulveda Elementary	3	25%	12%	22.85	17.53	17.39	24.66
Silver Lake Elementary	3	43%	19%	14.11	18.11	16.96	19.82
Smithridge Elementary	2	100%	51%	17.97	15.15	15.41	17.40
Spanish Springs Elementary	2	12%	*	18.49	15.92	15.34	19.92
Stead Elementary	1	65%	27%	22.10	14.92	14.85	17.50
Sun Valley Elementary	2	100%	52%	21.19	15.57	15.96	18.82
Taylor Elementary	5	18%	*	20.07	21.99	18.93	20.04
Towles Elementary	3	43%	*	15.19	16.27	19.85	22.95
Van Gorder Elementary	5	*	*	21.76	18.11	18.51	22.53
Verdi Elementary	4	16%	*	21.35	19.32	15.54	18.99
Veterans Elementary	2	100%	43%	19.09	11.16	15.07	16.53
Warner Elementary	2	65%	17%	20.49	16.08	12.95	15.39
Westergard Elementary	4	16%	*	21.23	18.04	17.22	22.45
Whitehead Elementary	3	26%	*	20.21	13.85	16.07	22.10
Winnemucca Elementary	3	35%	10%	21.90	18.20	19.05	21.92