

Steve Sisolak
Governor



Amy Stephenson
Director

Robin Hager
Deputy Director

Jim Rodriguez
Administrator

**STATE OF NEVADA
GOVERNOR'S FINANCE OFFICE
Budget Division**

209 E. Musser Street, Suite 200 | Carson City, NV 89701-4298
Phone: (775) 684-0222 | www.budget.nv.gov | Fax: (775) 684-0260

Date: July 28, 2022

To: Amy Stephenson, Director
Governor's Finance Office

From: David Lenzner, Executive Branch Budget Officer 
Budget Division

Subject: INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE **INFORMATION** ITEM

The following describes an information item submitted for placement on the agenda of the next Interim Finance Committee meeting.

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



Agenda Item Write-up:

Pursuant to NRS 388.700 subsection 5, the State Board of Education shall report to the Interim Finance Committee on a quarterly basis each variance requested by a school district in the preceding quarter. Two quarterly reports have been submitted for the periods ending September 30, 2021, and December 31, 2021.

Additional Information:

The Department of Education on behalf of the State Board of Education has submitted quarterly reports of each variance requested by a school district, pursuant to NRS 388.700 subsection 4. The report identifies each elementary school for which a variance was granted, and the justification for the variance.

Statutory Authority:
NRS 388.700

REVIEWED: 
INFO ITEM:  2-M

Steve Sisolak
Governor

Jhone M. Ebert
Superintendent of
Public Instruction



Southern Nevada Office
2080 East Flamingo Rd,
Suite 210
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-0811
Phone: (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.doc.nv.gov | Fax: (775) 687-9101

MEMORANDUM

TO: Senator Chris Brooks, Chair
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Vice Chair
Interim Finance Committee

FROM: Heidi Haartz, Deputy Superintendent for Student Investment

DATE: June 9, 2022

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2022 Reports on Quarters 1 and 2 Class Size Reeducation Variances and Justifications

Attached, please find the 2021-22 school year first and second quarter Class Size Reduction reports as approved by the State Board of Education on April 11, 2022 regarding the number of variances requested by each school district and their justifications. These reports are being transmitted in accordance with Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 388.700(5).

Steve Sisolak
Governor

Jhone M. Ebert
Superintendent of
Public Instruction



Southern Nevada Office
2080 East Flamingo Rd,
Suite 210
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-0811
Phone: (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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Senator Chris Brooks, Chair
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Vice Chair
Interim Finance Committee

FROM: Heidi Haartz, Deputy Superintendent for Student Investment

DATE: June 9, 2022

SUBJECT: Report to the State Board of Education: Class Size Reduction Variances and Justifications, 1st Quarter Fiscal Year 2022 (July 1, 2021 – September 30, 2021)

Introduction

Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 388.700 outlines requirements intended for the reduction of student to teacher ratios for kindergarten through third grade through the development of annual Class Size Reduction (CSR) plans developed at the district level, and various quarterly, annual, and biennial reporting requirements; charter schools are excluded from these requirements. The Nevada Department of Education (NDE) submits a report on a quarterly basis to the Nevada State Board of Education (State Board) summarizing CSR efforts and the quarterly variance requests for approval. Per NRS 388.700(5), the State Board must then submit a report to the Interim Finance Committee on each variance requested by a school district, by school and justification.

With the implementation of the Pupil-Centered Funding Plan, funds previously identified for CSR were rolled into the adjusted base per-pupil funding amount, which allows districts flexibility in the allocation of funding to meet the needs of their students and school communities.

There are two types of CSR plans and ratios in use for the 2021-2023 biennium: regular and alternative. School districts are required to report on a quarterly basis the average daily enrollment of pupils and the number of licensed teachers designated to teach on a full-time basis in classes where core curriculum is taught, broken down by school, grade level, and classroom configuration. Per NRS 388.700, only licensed personnel teaching core curriculum classes may be counted for the class size ratio calculation; teachers of art, music, physical education, special education, librarians, and specialists may not be included for calculation purposes.


Each school that exceeds their target pupil-teacher ratio must request a variance for the next quarter of the school year, which the Nevada State Board of Education may approve for good cause. Good cause may include, but is not limited to, facility limitations, difficulty hiring, or funding limitations. Each variance must include the justification for the variance and a plan of action specific to that school to reduce the class size ratio, per Assembly Bill 204 (2019).

Class size ratios under the regular and alternative plan are as follows:

Regular Plan			
<i>As prescribed in NRS 388.700(1)</i>			
Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
16:1	16:1	16:1	18:1
Alternative Plan			
<i>As prescribed in NRS 388.720(2)</i>			
<i>Available for counties with populations less than 100,000</i>			
<i>Fifth-sixth grades within elementary schools only</i>			
Kindergarten	First-Third Grades	Fourth Grade	Fifth-Sixth Grades
16:1	22:1	25:1	25:1


Enrollment

According to the Fiscal Year 2022 (FY22) quarter one (Q1) average daily enrollment (ADE) report, enrollment increased by 1,991 students: 328 at the district level and 1,663 in charter schools across all grade levels for a total enrollment of 472,680 students. Of this enrollment, approximately 30%, or 136,762 students, are in grades Kindergarten through third.




More specifically, Q1 district enrollment for K-3 was 115,405 students, with an average district class size ratio of 19.8 based on the Q1 ADE count and the Q1 CSR educator count of 5,837 district K-3 teachers.

Districts on alternative plans also submit enrollment and educator counts for grades 4-6, however, only if those grades are within an elementary school. Because this data is not statewide, nor inclusive of all grades 4-6 within a given district, the averages may not be meaningful reflections of ratios or the barriers to target ratios across the state. Per the Q1 ADE report, district enrollment for grades 4-6 is 90,783 students. Within the Q1 CSR report, 8,465 students were reported for grades 4-6, along with 385 educators, for an average class size ratio of 22.



Variance Requests

In FY21, Senate Bill (SB) 555 (2019) made a temporary allowance for CSR ratios under the regular plan: first and second grade were increased to 17:1 and third grade increased to 20:1. Since two of the largest districts are on the regular plan (Clark and Washoe), SB 555 created a decrease in variance requests through the 2020-2021 biennium. However, SB 555 expired effective FY22, returning ratios within the regular plan for K-2 to 16:1 and third grade to 18:1, and creating a commensurate increase in variances.




In Q4 of FY21, there were a total of 794 variance requests; variances increased by 176 for a total of 970 variance requests in Q1 of FY22.

Count of Variances by Grade								
District	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	Total
Carson	0	1	2	0	0	0	6	9
Churchill	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3
Clark	166	178	180	0	0	0	204	728
Douglas	0	1	3	1	4	0	7	16
Elko	0	3	5	0	3	0	10	21
Eureka	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Humboldt	1	1	1	0	1	0	3	7
Lander	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Lincoln	2	2	1	0	1	2	2	10
Lyon	1	2	5	2	1	2	7	20
Mineral	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Nye	1	3	1	3	2	0	7	17
Pershing	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
Storey	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Washoe	21	25	23	0	0	0	60	129
White Pine	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Grand Total	193	216	222	7	13	4	315	970

Of the 375 reporting elementary schools, 347 requested one or more variances – approximately 92% of all elementary schools across Nevada. 44%, or 165 of the reporting elementary schools have a 1- or 2-star rating, of which 150 have variance requests – 91% of all 1- and 2-star schools, and 40% of all elementary schools statewide.

The greatest increase was in third grade by 67 variances, then second grade by 48, Kindergarten by 31, and first grade by 25. While Kindergarten has consistently led variance requests, in previous years first or second grade often had the highest number of variances thereafter. However, in FY22, third grade variances grew by 41% compared to the FY21 annual average, making up nearly a quarter of all variance requests. This is likely due to the shift in ratios between the 2019-2021 and 2021-2023 biennia.




309 of the reporting elementary schools, or 82%, have a free-and-reduced-price lunch (FRL) percentage of 50% or greater. Of those schools, 92% of them have variance requests – equivalent to 76% of all elementary schools. 48%, or 179 of the reporting elementary schools have an English learner (EL) population of 20% or more. 150 of those schools – 84% – have a variance request, accounting for 40% of elementary schools across Nevada.

Variances by the Numbers			
92% of elementary schools requested a variance	40% of elementary schools have a 1- or 2-star rating and requested a variance	76% of elementary schools have an FRL percentage of 50% or greater and requested a variance	40% of elementary schools have an EL population of 20% or more and requested a variance

Districts may report one or more reasons for their variance request including: facility limitations, difficulty hiring, funding limitations, or other. 98% of all variance requests cited funding limitations, most often describing insufficient funds to build classrooms, hire competitively, and/or generally expand programs, linking closely with cited issues of difficulty hiring and facility limitations. 97% of variance requests cited difficulty hiring, reflective of the increase in teacher shortages due to retirement, attrition, and decreases in pipeline recruitment and retention. 80% of variance justification cited facility limitations, which typically reflect a lack of space to provide physical classrooms. The single case of “other cause” cited unexpected enrollment growth.

Count of Variance Justifications




Class Size Ratios

In FY22 Q1, 13 districts exceeded the target class size ratio for one or more grades at the district level and required district variances. All of those requests included Kindergarten. Additionally, districts submitted four requests for first grade, four requests for second grade, and two requests for third grade.

District Average Class Size Ratios									
District	Plan	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	District Variance
Carson	Alternative	20.50	21.33	20.33	21.33	20.33	N/A	20.83	✓
Churchill	Alternative	20.00	21.00	21.00	25.00	25.00	N/A	19.00	✓
Clark	Regular	19.24	19.62	22.59	N/A	N/A	N/A	21.33	✓
Douglas	Alternative	20.00	21.00	20.29	21.38	23.63	4.00	24.14	✓
Elko	Alternative	17.25	18.08	21.50	21.50	22.56	19.40	19.08	✓
Esmeralda	Regular	9.33	4.67	7.00	4.00	4.67	8.33	7.67	
Eureka	Alternative	16.50	11.00	11.00	11.50	14.00	12.00	16.50	✓
Humboldt	Alternative	15.13	14.00	15.43	16.43	14.60	12.60	14.25	
Lander	Alternative	15.00	14.00	14.00	16.00	N/A	N/A	14.50	
Lincoln	Regular	17.00	17.50	12.50	12.75	16.25	17.50	17.00	✓
Lyon	Alternative	20.89	20.22	21.56	21.44	22.71	24.29	18.67	✓
Mineral	Alternative	17.50	20.50	19.50	21.00	21.00	20.50	17.50	✓
Nye	Alternative	16.60	17.80	17.20	19.60	20.40	N/A	17.90	✓
Pershing	Regular	18.00	16.50	17.00	18.50	9.50	N/A	18.00	✓
Storey	Alternative	16.00	17.50	22.00	24.50	21.50	N/A	16.00	
Washoe	Regular	16.82	16.95	19.49	N/A	N/A	N/A	20.12	✓
White Pine	Alternative	16.00	19.67	17.75	16.25	18.25	17.00	17.67	✓

Statewide calculations for average class size ratios are difficult to assess, as differing target ratios, population densities, and reporting schools within the data set create distinct contexts that may not be encapsulated in a single number. Since districts are required to report for all K-3 classrooms, average statewide class size ratios were calculated for grades Kindergarten through third using a weighted average based on the representative district's population per the FY22 Q1 ADE report. It is important to note that Kindergarten is the only grade that all districts share a target ratio for: 16:1. Approximately 88% of students in grades 1-3 are on the regular CSR plan, with targets of 16:1 and 18:1. The remaining 12% of students in grades 1-3, across 12 districts, are on the alternative CSR plan with targets of 22:1. The average Kindergarten classroom in Nevada is nearly 5 students over the target ratio. Due to the differing targets for grades 1-3, it is difficult to assess the number of students over/under target in grades 1-3 based on the statewide averages. Please refer to the district averages for this assessment.



Statewide Average Class Ratios			
K	1	2	3
20.85	18.76	19.1	21.76

Please further note, that as only 9% of grades 4-6 are reported for class size reduction purposes, the district average ratios are a limited picture of the actual average class sizes for these grades.

In alignment with reporting requirements under AB 266 (2021) that board of trustees determine the number of job vacancies based on the number of licensed teachers needed to achieve the recommended ratios of pupils per licensed teacher. This report includes information related to the total number of students by grade and district that exceed the recommended ratio, along with an estimate of the number of additional classrooms needed to meet the recommended ratio. This report refers to classrooms rather than educators for two reasons: first, AB 266 requires that positions held by full-time substitute teachers be considered vacancies for the purposes of its report; however, CSR reporting does include full-time substitute teachers in its count. As such, district reporting under AB 266 may be higher than the classroom needs expressed in this report. In addition, addressing classrooms acknowledges that 80% of schools reported physical limitations for class size reduction. This data is reported below at the statewide level, with district specific data reported in each section within the table "CSR Ratio Surplus".

Carson City School District

Carson City School District (Carson City SD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program for FY22. Carson City SD requested variances for each of its elementary schools; every school requested a variance for Kindergarten, with the highest ratio being 22:1 in two of the schools and the lowest 19:1. Another variance was requested for second grade, at 23:1, and two more for third grade, with the highest ratio at 24:1. Carson City SD cited facilities limitations – no room to place classrooms – and difficulty recruiting and retaining teachers under their variance justifications.

District Overview

Carson City SD	K	1	2	3	4	5
Highest class size ratio	22	22	23	24	25	23
Lowest class size ratio	19	18	20	16	20	18
Average class size ratio	20.83	20.5	21.33	20.33	21.33	20.33

CSR Ratio Surplus

Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Grand Total
Students	116	0	4	19	0	0	0	139
Classrooms	7.25	0	0.18	0.86	0	0	0	~8

Detail by School

School Name	K	1	2	3	4	5	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Bordewich Bray Elementary	21	22	23	24	20	23	3	55.46%	8.89%
Empire Elementary	20	18	21	23	23	18	3	100.00%	33.39%
Fremont Elementary	22	22	21	22	20	21	3	100.00%	23.52%
Fritsch Elementary	19	21	21	16	20	20	4	43.47%	7.72%
Mark Twain Elementary	22	18	20	19	25	20	4	100.00%	20.32%
Seeliger Elementary	21	22	22	18	20	20	5	37.98%	14.88%
Grand Total		21	21	20	21	20	N/A	72.82%	18.12%

Churchill County School District

Churchill County School District (Churchill CSD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program for FY22. Churchill CSD requested both a district and school-level variance for Kindergarten. Due to the smaller size of Churchill CSD, Kindergarten is only offered at one school: Lahontan Elementary School (ES). At Lahontan ES, Churchill CSD cited facilities limitations and difficulty hiring. A variance was also requested for Numa ES in fourth and fifth grades, which exceeded the target ratios by a fractional amount.

District Overview

Churchill CSD	K	1	2	3	4	5
Highest class size ratio	19	20	21	21	25	25
Lowest class size ratio	19	20	21	21	25	25
Average class size ratio	19	20	21	21	25	25

CSR Ratio Surplus

Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Grand Total
Students	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Classrooms	2.31	0	0	0	0	0	0	~2

Detail by School

School Name	1	2	3	4	5	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
EC Best Elementary School		21	21				N/A	36.05%	9.33%
Lahontan Elementary School	20					19	N/A	28.28%	3.86%
Numa Elementary School				25	25		N/A	34.54%	9.11%
Grand Total	20	21	21	25	25	19	N/A	32.96%	7.44%

Clark County School District

Clark County School District (CCSD) implemented a regular class size reduction program for FY22. CCSD, as the fifth largest school district in the nation and the largest school district in Nevada, represents 72% of the state's K-3 population and reported 228 elementary schools. CCSD requested 728 variances, representing 75% of all variance requests.

CCSD has 159 schools with a K-2 ratio at 21 or more (5 students over the target ratio); 51 schools with a ratio at 26 or more (10 students over the target ratio); and 20 schools with a ratio at 31 or more (15 students over the target ratio). Similarly, they have 87 schools with a third grade ratio of 23 or more (5 students over the target ratio); and 24 schools with a third grade ratio of 28 or more (10 students over the target ratio). CCSD includes some of the highest class size ratios and cited funding limitations, facility limitations, and difficulty hiring under

their variance justifications.

District Overview

CCSD	K	1	2	3
Highest class size ratio	98	104	101	129
Lowest class size ratio	8	11	9	12
Average class size ratio	21.33	19.24	19.62	22.59

CSR Ratio Surplus

Grade	K	1	2	3	Grand Total
Students	5,059	3,390	3,853	4,107	16,409
Classrooms	316.18	211.87	178.31	228.16	~935

Detail by School

School Name	1	2	3	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Abston, Sandra B. Es	18	18	22	25	0	100.00%	10.27%
Adams, Kirk L. Es	29	19	23	20	N/A	100.00%	20.07%
Adcock, O. K. Es	15	18	25	22	2	100.00%	28.19%
Alamo, Tony Es	22	25	23	20	N/A	100.00%	17.97%
Allen, Dean Es	16	17	23	18	3	100.00%	3.93%
Antonello, Lee Es	18	19	20	21	1	100.00%	15.28%
Bailey, Sister R. J. Es	16	17	19	23	2	100.00%	17.71%
Barber, Shirley A. Es	21	21	22	23	3	100.00%	9.27%
Bartlett, Selma F. Es	15	17	21	21	4	100.00%	7.84%
Bass, John C. Es	21	22	19	25	3	100.00%	11.44%
Batterman, Kathy L. Es	19	18	23	14	5	100.00%	7.58%
Beatty, John R. Es	17	22	26	21	3	100.00%	8.27%
Beckley, Will Es	17	18	19	27	2	100.00%	33.81%
Bell, Rex Es	18	21	15	14	2	100.00%	24.10%
Bendorf, Patricia A. Es	17	20	23	21	3	100.00%	14.49%
Bennett, William G. Es	19	12	19	17	2	100.00%	3.09%
Berkley, Shelley Es	16	21	19	22	3	100.00%	9.59%
Bilbray, James Es	26	19	35	25	5	100.00%	2.68%
Bonner, John W. Es	21	22	23	22	4	100.00%	10.20%
Booker, Sr. Kermit R. Es	17	13	12	15	2	100.00%	25.79%
Bowler, Grant Es	25	20	27	24	5	100.00%	0.93%
Bowler, Joseph L. Es	17	17	23	18	2	100.00%	19.54%
Bozarth, Henry Evelyn Es	18	16	21	18	4	100.00%	1.96%
Bracken Es Magnet	26	19	23	21	3	100.00%	26.01%
Brookman, Eileen B. Es	15	18	15	20	2	100.00%	33.13%
Brown, Hannah Marie Es	18	18	20	16	0	27.69%	7.80%
Bruner, Lucile Es	17	22	39	22	2	100.00%	18.06%
Bryan, Richard H. Es	21	20	25	14	3	100.00%	12.61%
Bryan, Roger M. Es	21	17	21	23	4	100.00%	19.83%
Bunker, Berkeley L. Es	17	18	18	19	2	100.00%	27.56%
Cahlan, Marion Es	16	20	17	17	3	100.00%	44.67%
Cambeiro, Arturo Es	18	19	20	28	3	100.00%	41.68%
Carl, Kay Es	18	17	21	20	2	100.00%	8.94%

Teacher Name	1	2	3	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Cartwright, Roberta C. Es	17	20	46	27	4	100.00%	9.51%
Christensen, M. J. Es	20	23	19	34	4	100.00%	10.11%
Conners, Eileen Es	15	20	36	26	3	100.00%	5.14%
Cortez, Manuel J. Es	18	19	24	21	3	100.00%	33.18%
Cox, Clyde Es	18	16	15	25	2	100.00%	35.26%
Cox, David Es	26	18	21	15	2	100.00%	9.46%
Cozine, S. And L. Es	17	15	25	20	2	100.00%	16.98%
Craig, Lois Es	21	18	35	19	1	100.00%	34.88%
Crestwood Es	17	21	27	20	2	100.00%	43.92%
Culley, Paul E. Es	15	19	18	17	2	100.00%	41.42%
Cunningham, Cynthia Es	13	24	17	21	2	100.00%	13.74%
Dailey, Jack Es	18	18	22	19	3	100.00%	39.21%
Darnell, Marshall C. Es	18	21	19	26	3	100.00%	4.33%
Dearing, Laura Es	21	24	26	22	2	100.00%	26.83%
Decker, C. H. Es	17	17	17	31	2	100.00%	40.84%
Derfelt, Herbert A. Es	14	16	20	23	2	100.00%	15.88%
Deskin, Ruthe Es	25	18	22	21	3	100.00%	14.97%
Detwiler, Ollie Es	17	23	21	18	2	100.00%	25.42%
Diaz, Ruben P. Es	19	17	25	24	5	100.00%	36.17%
Dickens, D. L. Dusty Es	15	16	26	19	2	100.00%	9.81%
Diskin, P. A. Es	18	18	20	33	2	100.00%	29.67%
Divich, Kenneth Es	19	24	22	20	5	100.00%	3.97%
Dondero, Harvey N. Es	21	22	29	17	4	100.00%	37.44%
Dooley, John Es	22	28	17	25	3	100.00%	4.86%
Duncan, Ruby Es	22	14	26	19	1	100.00%	3.80%
Earl, Ira J. Es	14	18	20	17	2	100.00%	38.56%
Earl, Marion B. Es	15	20	19	24	2	100.00%	18.12%
Edwards, Elbert Es	14	15	46	24	2	100.00%	36.56%
Eisenberg, Dorothy Es	17	20	23	24	3	100.00%	18.31%
Elizondo, Raul Es	18	18	26	26	1	100.00%	14.67%
Ellis, Robert And Sandy Es	28	24	26	38	4	100.00%	2.28%
Ferron, William E. Es	16	14	20	21	2	100.00%	27.48%
Fine, Mark L. Es	19	21	23	29	4	100.00%	19.07%
Fitzgerald, H.P. Es	16	14	21	10	2	100.00%	18.96%
Fong, Wing And Lilly Es	19	17	20	21	3	100.00%	14.32%
Forbuss, Robert L. Es	22	25	23	24	3	100.00%	7.87%
French, Doris Es	37	25	29	47	3	100.00%	24.31%
Frias, C. P. Es	20	24	23	25	5	100.00%	6.67%
Galloway, Fay Es	18	15	18	22	2	100.00%	3.75%
Garehime, Edith Es	29	20	30	21	3	100.00%	7.74%
Gehring, Roger Es	21	18	24	22	5	100.00%	15.99%
Gibson, James Es	19	23	22	25	4	100.00%	7.52%
Gilbert, C.V.T. Es	17	15	18	17	2	100.00%	10.16%
Givens, Linda Rankin Es	22	20	20	19	5	100.00%	12.79%
Goldfarb, Daniel Es	22	21	19	22	3	100.00%	31.11%

School Name	1	2	3	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Goolsby, Judy John Es	20	19	20	18	5	100.00%	8.05%
Goynes, Theron Naomi Es	23	24	22	18	3	100.00%	6.92%
Gragson, Oran K. Es	15	25	43	20	3	100.00%	40.42%
Gray, R. Guild Es	21	22	20	20	2	100.00%	31.45%
Griffith, E.W. Es	14	17	18	30	2	100.00%	38.29%
Guy, Addeliar D. Iii Es	25	27	54	19	3	100.00%	12.88%
Hancock, Doris Es	17	16	17	22	1	100.00%	17.38%
Harmon, Harley Es	19	22	19	22	1	100.00%	32.42%
Harris, George E. Es	18	20	19	23	2	100.00%	30.78%
Hayden, Don E. Es	23	27	18	21	3	100.00%	6.47%
Hayes, Keith Karen Es	19	18	18	21	2	100.00%	14.68%
Heard, Lomie G. Es	19	19	21	21	2	100.00%	33.69%
Heckethorn, Howard E. Es	24	24	24	26	4	100.00%	2.45%
Herr, Helen Es	19	14	17	17	1	100.00%	30.55%
Herron, Fay Es	32	37	20	17	5	100.00%	46.60%
Hewetson, Halle Es	15	18	18	17	2	100.00%	43.87%
Hickey, Lilliam Lujan Es	15	18	36	20	2	100.00%	29.06%
Hill, Charlotte Es	17	17	23	20	4	100.00%	16.48%
Hinman, Edna F. Es	15	15	20	21	2	100.00%	7.46%
Hoggard, Mabel Es	18	22	23	20	4	100.00%	24.40%
Hollingsworth, Howard Es	18	23	22	28	1	100.00%	37.18%
Hummel, John R. Es	15	16	17	20	2	100.00%	6.32%
Indian Springs Es	16	12	22	17	1	100.00%	2.38%
Iverson, Mervin Es	14	15	16	15	2	100.00%	24.84%
Jacobson, Walter Es	14	16	25	20	2	100.00%	12.40%
Jeffers, Jay W. Es	13	15	17	20	2	100.00%	46.88%
Jenkins, Earl N. Es	19	20	20	21	0	100.00%	14.54%
Jones Blackhurst, Jan Es	20	20	23	19	5	100.00%	5.86%
Jydstrup, Helen Es	45	25	25	23	4	100.00%	25.43%
Kahre, Marc Es	11	14	17	18	2	100.00%	6.09%
Katz, Edythe Lloyd Es	17	17	22	25	1	100.00%	18.04%
Keller, C. J. Es	17	19	25	21	2	100.00%	35.91%
Kelly, Matt Es	32	15	26	17	1	100.00%	6.74%
Kesterson, Lorna J. Es	18	16	22	16	3	100.00%	7.55%
Kim, Frank Es	13	16	19	19	2	100.00%	23.77%
King, M. L. Es	13	16	17	31	2	100.00%	27.48%
King, Martha P. Es	0	0	22	0	3	100.00%	0.89%
Lake, Robert E. Es	23	19	25	22	3	100.00%	31.14%
Lamping, Frank Es	22	23	23	23	4	100.00%	3.06%
Lincoln Es	17	15	19	20	2	100.00%	43.33%
Long, Walter V. Es	13	14	17	20	1	100.00%	30.89%
Lowman, Mary Zel Es	13	13	21	16	1	100.00%	18.49%
Lummis, William Es	22	20	21	21	4	100.00%	9.50%
Lunt, Robert Es	16	16	15	16	2	100.00%	32.83%
Lynch, Ann Es	12	28	17	15	1	100.00%	24.74%

School Name	1	2	3	4	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Mack, Nate Es	21	20	20	24	4	100.00%	5.85%
Mackey, Jo Es	28	22	22	16	4	100.00%	14.54%
Manch, J.E. Es	16	18	14	13	1	100.00%	12.29%
Martinez, Reynaldo L. Es	16	13	29	19	3	100.00%	33.48%
Mathis, Beverly S. Es	19	20	19	20	4	100.00%	17.37%
May, Ernest Es	22	28	30	21	4	100.00%	8.66%
Mccall, Quannah Es	13	9	16	19	1	100.00%	38.20%
Mccaw, Gordon Es	19	22	23	23	5	100.00%	8.41%
Mcdoniell, Estes M. Es	22	19	19	22	5	100.00%	4.74%
Mcmillan, James B. Es	24	12	25	18	2	100.00%	14.48%
Mcwilliams, J. T. Es	22	15	25	16	2	100.00%	48.09%
Mendoza, John F. Es	16	16	18	22	2	100.00%	32.86%
Miller, Sandy Es	18	18	21	22	3	100.00%	36.73%
Mitchell, Andrew Es	18	21	0	19	0	100.00%	0.00%
Moore, William Es	31	16	17	16	1	100.00%	37.25%
Morrow, Sue H. Es	23	25	24	22	4	100.00%	3.47%
Mountain View Es	14	15	20	18	2	100.00%	25.71%
Neal, Joseph M. Es	19	25	26	26	4	100.00%	4.79%
Nevada Learning Academy Es	104	101	129	98	0	0.00%	11.83%
Newton, Ullis Es	17	17	26	19	4	100.00%	4.04%
Nw Career Tech Academy Es	0	0	0	15	0	100.00%	0.00%
Ober, Dvorre Hal Es	20	22	34	21	4	100.00%	14.13%
Oroarke, Thomas Es	24	18	20	22	5	100.00%	1.81%
Ortwein, Dennis Es	17	21	24	19	3	100.00%	8.06%
Paradise Es	19	23	15	24	2	100.00%	21.57%
Park, John S. Es	13	20	14	21	2	100.00%	37.74%
Parson, C. S. Es	12	16	42	23	2	100.00%	21.66%
Perkins, Claude Es	20	21	21	17	1	100.00%	13.67%
Perkins, Ute Es	22	25	19	14	2	100.00%	4.48%
Petersen, Dean Es	19	18	20	25	1	100.00%	26.07%
Piggott, Clarence Es	18	19	24	22	3	100.00%	17.51%
Pittman, Vail Es	27	21	25	17	3	100.00%	28.04%
Priest, Richard C. Es	16	15	21	16	2	100.00%	20.58%
Red Rock Es	13	15	17	21	1	100.00%	31.65%
Reed, Doris M. Es	17	14	18	17	2	100.00%	25.88%
Reedom, Carolyn S. Es	19	20	21	22	3	100.00%	7.74%
Rhodes, Betsy Es	31	21	21	20	3	100.00%	8.26%
Ries, Aldeane Comito Es	22	23	25	22	3	100.00%	7.84%
Roberts, Aggie Es	17	26	24	17	2	100.00%	8.71%
Rogers, Lucille S. Es	21	19	22	22	4	100.00%	16.82%
Ronnow, C.C. Es	16	14	17	15	2	100.00%	48.29%
Ronzone, Bertha Es	15	15	22	24	2	100.00%	31.39%
Roundy, Dr. C. Owen Es	13	19	12	17	2	100.00%	45.05%
Rowe, Lewis Es	13	21	18	22	4	100.00%	25.36%
Rundle, Richard Es	13	14	17	21	2	100.00%	28.07%

School Name	1	2	3	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Sandy Valley Es	12	17	16	8	3	100.00%	17.81%
Scherkenbach, W. M. Es	22	26	22	19	4	100.00%	2.38%
Schorr, Steve Es	27	17	25	33	3	100.00%	3.95%
Scott, Jesse D. Es	16	22	20	32	3	100.00%	10.91%
Sewell, C. T. Es	11	14	22	16	2	100.00%	9.19%
Simmons, Eva G. Es	28	25	28	23	4	100.00%	13.19%
Smalley, J. E. A. R. Es	24	23	22	17	5	100.00%	1.90%
Smith, Hal Es	15	15	21	16	1	100.00%	12.93%
Smith, Helen Es	20	16	19	23	4	100.00%	18.06%
Snyder, Don And Dee Es	15	32	22	19	3	100.00%	6.31%
Snyder, William E. Es	18	14	14	19	3	100.00%	34.15%
Squires, C.P. Es	15	13	16	18	2	100.00%	45.59%
Stanford Es	20	15	28	15	2	100.00%	29.14%
Staton, Ethel W. Es	17	23	20	19	4	100.00%	8.13%
Steele, Judith D. Es	20	25	23	22	5	100.00%	11.45%
Stevens, Josh Es	16	18	24	19	3	100.00%	9.80%
Stuckey, Evelyn Es	20	23	31	22	5	100.00%	7.59%
Sunrise Acres Es	11	19	19	18	2	100.00%	33.41%
Tanaka, Wayne N. Es	17	16	21	23	2	100.00%	12.41%
Tarr, Sheila Es	20	19	30	20	4	100.00%	8.58%
Tartan, John Es	20	37	22	17	1	100.00%	11.03%
Tate, Myrtle Es	16	20	22	19	2	100.00%	27.98%
Taylor, Glen C. Es	14	30	38	26	5	100.00%	7.38%
Taylor, Robert L. Es	18	24	20	19	1	100.00%	6.58%
Thiriot, Joseph E. Es	16	20	21	26	3	100.00%	34.35%
Thomas, Ruby S. Es	15	19	15	19	1	100.00%	28.97%
Thompson, Sandra L. Es	21	21	21	32	4	100.00%	3.01%
Thompson, Tyrone Es	20	26	23	26	0	100.00%	6.96%
Thorpe, Jim Es	17	18	17	23	2	100.00%	6.76%
Tobler, R. E. Es	16	17	19	19	3	100.00%	18.41%
Toland, Helen Anderson Int Acd	23	15	12	13	2	100.00%	28.66%
Tomiyasu, Bill Y. Es	22	16	19	24	2	100.00%	24.96%
Treem, Harriet Es	19	20	23	21	4	100.00%	6.75%
Triggs, Vincent Es	26	22	19	23	5	100.00%	3.92%
Twin Lakes Es	17	19	27	21	2	100.00%	39.11%
Twitchell, Neil C. Es	15	29	19	21	4	100.00%	8.19%
Ullom, J. M. Es	24	17	19	22	2	100.00%	31.21%
Vanderburg, John Es	22	20	24	13	4	100.00%	5.87%
Vassiliadis, B. R. Es	19	21	24	21	5	100.00%	6.02%
Vegas Verdes Es	18	16	18	18	3	100.00%	40.90%
Virgin Valley Es	23	22	24	23	4	100.00%	18.42%
Walker, J. Marlan Es	22	22	25	25	3	100.00%	2.98%
Wallin, Shirley Bill Es	21	21	24	22	5	100.00%	3.74%
Ward, Gene Es	19	16	16	31	1	100.00%	41.30%
Ward, Kitty Mcdonough Es	18	21	23	21	4	100.00%	1.12%

School Name	1	2	3	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Warren, Rose Es	19	17	25	24	3	100.00%	28.85%
Wasden, Howard Es	18	18	28	17	3	100.00%	15.99%
Watson, Fredric Es	15	16	21	17	2	100.00%	16.81%
Wengert, Cyril Es	27	18	25	31	3	100.00%	38.64%
West Prep Es	20	16	22	19	2	100.00%	28.88%
Whitney Es	16	18	14	10	1	100.00%	25.64%
Wiener, Jr., Louis Es	16	16	30	23	4	100.00%	16.31%
Wilhelm, Elizabeth Es	20	16	20	18	1	100.00%	16.07%
Williams, Tom Es	14	15	25	32	2	100.00%	49.02%
Williams, Wendell Es	13	23	15	25	1	100.00%	10.01%
Wolfe, Eva Es	19	18	15	18	2	100.00%	19.42%
Wolff, Elise L. Es	21	19	23	21	5	100.00%	7.37%
Woolley, Gwendolyn Es	13	16	19	19	2	100.00%	37.53%
Wright, William V. Es	17	18	20	18	3	100.00%	8.28%
Wynn, Elaine Es	24	17	19	24	2	100.00%	41.91%
Grand Total	19.24	19.62	22.59	21.33	N/A	99.24%	19.15%

Douglas County School District

Douglas County School District (Douglas CSD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program for FY22. Douglas CSD requested 16 variances across all seven of its schools, including variance requests for all of its Kindergarten classrooms and several of its third and fifth grade classrooms. Douglas CSD cited funding limitations for all of its variances, barring Kindergarten at Zephyr Cove Elementary with a ratio of 31:1, which cited both funding limitations and difficulty hiring. Similarly high numbers are seen in Zephyr Cove's fifth grade classroom with a ratio of 33:1, Gardnerville Elementary's fourth grade classroom with a ratio of 32:1.

District Overview

Douglas CSD	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
Highest class size ratio	31	22	25	24	32	33	4
Lowest class size ratio	18	17	18	12	20	20	4
Average class size ratio	24.14	20	21	20.29	21.38	23.63	4

CSR Ratio Surplus

Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Grand Total
Students	114	0	9	9	14	22	0	168
Classrooms	7.13	0	0.41	0.41	0.56	0.88	0	~9

Detail by School

School Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
CC Meneley Elementary	19	25	19	22	24	N/A	25	4	41.92%	5.10%
Douglas Nevada Online	0	0	0	6	10	4	0	0	70.37%	0.00%
Gardnerville Elementary	20	22	19	32	26	N/A	25	4	34.50%	9.16%
Gene Scarselli Elementary	22	18	23	24	20	N/A	23	4	30.13%	3.94%
Jacks Valley Elementary	17	20	22	23	29	N/A	25	N/A	34.54%	11.29%
Minden Elementary	21	21	23	20	20	N/A	22	4	29.77%	5.04%
Pinon Hills Elementary	19	20	24	23	27	N/A	18	4	20.05%	2.06%
Zephyr Cove Elementary	22	21	12	21	33	N/A	31	N/A	17.26%	1.28%
Grand Total	20	21	20.29	21.38	21.38	4	24.14	N/A	32.45%	5.05%

Elko County School District

Elko County School District (Elko CSD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program for FY22. Elko CSD requested 21 variances across Kindergarten, second, third, and fifth grades, and cited funding limitations and difficulty hiring for all of its variances.

District Overview

Elko CSD	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
Highest class size ratio	23	22	24	26	25	26	25
Lowest class size ratio	12	7	12	15	19	14	12
Average class size ratio	19.08	17.25	18.08	21.5	21.5	22.5	18.25

CSR Ratio Surplus

District	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Grand Total
Students	133	0	22	51	0	7	0	213
Classrooms	8.31	0	1	2.32	0	0.28	0	~12

Detail by School

School Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Carlin Elementary	15	12	15	20	26	25	18	2	42.45%	0.00%
Grammar #2	22	15	21	19	N/A	N/A	19	2	32.52%	9.84%
Jackpot Elementary	11	17	17	20	14	12	12	2	38.98%	9.46%
Liberty Peak Elementary	21	23	24	21	26	N/A	23	2	27.42%	23.24%
Mountain View Elementary	21	24	26	20	N/A	N/A	20	0	11.00%	1.55%
Northside Elementary	20	16	20	24	N/A	N/A	16	5	18.20%	12.31%
Owyhee Elementary	7	15	20	24	18	12	20	3	39.21%	15.12%
Sage Elementary	19	22	22	20	26	N/A	19	1	100.00%	4.40%
Southside Elementary	21	23	24	22	N/A	N/A	19	1	33.58%	5.53%
Spring Creek Elementary	20	17	25	21	24	N/A	21	4	100.00%	26.50%
Wells Elementary	14	12	24	25	24	24	23	3	9.33%	0.61%
West Wendover Elementary	16	21	20	22	22	N/A	19	3	52.46%	15.04%
Grand Total	17.25	18.08	21.5	21.5	22.5	18.25	19.08	2	65.34%	28.17%

Esmeralda County School District

Esmeralda County School District (Esmeralda CSD) is among the smallest by population, and notably has no variance requests or students in excess of the ratio. Their largest class size ratio across grades K-6 is 14:1, and their smallest 4:1.

Detail by School

School Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Dyer Elementary	14	0	8	7	4	7	14	1	100.00%	24.17%
Goldfield Elementary	9	9	8	0	10	13	9	N/A	100.00%	0.00%
Silver Peak Elementary	5	5	5	5	0	5	0	N/A	100.00%	0.00%
Grand Total	9.33	4.67	7	4	4.67	8.33	7.67	N/A	100.00%	8.53%

Eureka County School District

Eureka County School District (Eureka CSD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program in FY22. Eureka CSD requested a single variance for Kindergarten at Eureka Elementary, with a ratio of 26:1. Eureka Elementary has the only Kindergarten classroom, and there are 10 students in excess of the target ratio. Eureka

cited “other” on their variance justification – specifically that they had an unexpected increase in enrollment following multiple families moving to the district over the summer; they plan to monitor enrollment to determine when or if it may be appropriate to add an additional Kindergarten classroom.

Detail by School

School Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Crescent Valley Elementary	13	12	8	8	9	9	7	2	33.21%	0.00%
Eureka Elementary	20	10	14	15	19	15	26	3	23.25%	3.13%
Grand Total	16.5	11	11	11.5	14	12	16.5	N/A	29.73%	1.56%

Humboldt County School District

Humboldt County School District (Humboldt CSD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program in FY22. Humboldt requested seven variances in total: three for Kindergarten, and one each for first, second, third, and fifth. Humboldt CSD cited funding limitations at Grass Valley, Paradise Valley, and Sonoma Heights, and cited difficulty hiring at French Ford and Winnemucca Grammar Schools.

District Overview

Humboldt CSD	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
Highest class size ratio	22	24	24	23	23	26	24
Lowest class size ratio	7	7	6	7	7	6	2
Average class size ratio	14.25	15.12	14	15.43	16.43	14.6	12.6

CSR Ratio Surplus

Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Grand Total
Students	29	6	6	6	0	10	0	57
Classrooms	1.81	0.27	0.27	0.27	0	0.4	0	~3

Detail by School

School Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Denio Elementary School	7	6	0	0	7	0	7	N/A	58.33%	0.00%
French Ford MS	0	0	0	0	26	24	0	2	48.54%	10.49%
Grass Valley Elementary School	18	24	18	23	0	0	19	3	57.84%	9.85%
Kings River Elementary School	7	7	7	7	0	7	7	N/A	66.67%	33.33%
McDermitt Combined School	8	8	12	11	24	24	10	1	100.00%	0.00%
Orovada Elementary School	16	12	12	12	10	2	16	2	61.43%	11.19%
Paradise Valley Elementary School	20	22	23	20	6	6	22	2	64.88%	8.33%
Sonoma Heights Elementary School	21	20	20	22	0	0	18	3	46.90%	9.19%
Winnemucca Grammar School	24	13	16	20	0	0	15	4	48.43%	10.66%
Grand Total	15.12	14	15.43	16.43	14.6	12.6	14.25	N/A	64.18%	10.54%

Lander County School District

Lander County School District (Lander CSD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program in FY22. Lander CSD requested a single variance for Kindergarten at Battle Mountain Elementary School, citing funding

and facilities limitations and difficulty hiring.

CSR Ratio Surplus

Grades	K	1	2	3	4	Grand Total
Students	16	16	0	0	0	32
Classrooms	1	0.73	0	0	0	~2

Detail by School

School Name	1	2	3	4	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Austin K-12	10	9	10	9	9	0	10.00%	0.00%
Battle Mountain Elementary School	20	19	18	23	20	2	41.33%	5.44%
Grand Total	15	14	14	16	14.5	N/A	25.67%	2.72%

Lincoln County School District

Lincoln County School District implemented a regular class size reduction program in FY22; while Lincoln is only required to report on K-3 under a regular CSR plan, they elected to report on grades 4-6 as housed within their elementary schools. Lincoln CSD requested 10 variances, primarily for PVES and Panaca Elementary in grades K-3 and for grades 5-6 at PVES and Caliente Elementary. Lincoln CSD cited funding and facilities limitations, as well as difficulty hiring, for all schools and grades.

It is important to note that Pioche Elementary has a single combined classroom for grades 1-4, and Caliente Elementary has a single combined classroom for grades 5-6. When a single teacher is in the combined classroom, the student to teacher ratio is calculated in percentages to reflect what the equivalent ratio would be in a single classroom. For example, there are 24 students in the combined grade 5-6 Caliente classroom; because there is one instructor dividing time between 12 fifth grade students and 12 sixth grade students, the ratio is calculated at 24:1 for each grade level.

District Overview

Lincoln CSD	K	1	2	3
Highest class size ratio	26	23	25	23
Lowest class size ratio	7	8	9	6
Average class size ratio	17	17	17.5	12.5

CSR Ratio Surplus

Grade	K	1	2	3	Grand Total
Students	16	13	14	5	48
Classrooms	1	0.81	0.88	0.28	~3

Detail by School

School Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Caliente Elementary	8	9	8	9	24	24	13	4	57.40%	2.69%
Panaca Elementary	22	21	13	18	16	16	22	3	43.58%	0.95%
Pioche Elementary	15	15	6	6	9	11	7	4	47.39%	2.04%
PVES	23	25	23	18	16	19	26	3	40.23%	0.60%
Grand Total	17	17.5	12.5	12.75	16.25	17.5	17	N/A	47.15%	1.57%

Lyon County School District

Lyon County School District (Lyon CSD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program for FY22. Lyon CSD requested 20 variances across all but one of their eleven schools, including 7 in Kindergarten and 5 in third grade. Lyon CSD cited funding and facilities limitations and hiring difficulties for all 20 variances.

District Overview

Lyon CSD	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
Highest class size ratio	25	26	24	26	27	28	30
Lowest class size ratio	15	16	15	9	10	14	18
Average class size ratio	18.67	20.88	20.22	21.56	21.44	22.71	24.29

CSR Ratio Surplus

Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Grand Total
Students	89	10	26	62	8	9	18	222
Classrooms	15.56	0.45	1.18	2.82	0.32	0.36	0.72	~21

Detail by School

School Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Cottonwood Elementary	22	24	24	26			16	2	37.26%	4.64%
Dayton Elementary	22	20	17	20	23	30	21	3	32.73%	7.75%
East Valley Elementary	20	20	26	19			25	3	28.63%	5.39%
Fernley Elementary	21	18	25	25			17	2	36.32%	6.12%
Fernley Intermediate	0	0	0	0	25	22	0	3	35.83%	3.38%
Riverview Elementary	26	24	21	27	24	25	20	3	26.89%	5.44%
Silver Stage Elementary	18	21	26	22			18	3	100.00%	1.45%
Smith Valley	16	15	9	10	14	18	15	2	100.00%	1.89%
Sutro Elementary	21	18	26	21	23	25	18	3	21.37%	3.76%
Yerington Elementary	22	22	20	23			18	2	32.33%	11.30%
Yerington Intermediate	0	0	0	0	27	27	0	2	100.00%	14.74%
Grand Total	20.88	20.22	21.56	21.44	22.71	24.29	18.67	N/A	47.05%	7.34%

Mineral County School District

Mineral County School District (Mineral CSD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program for FY22. Mineral CSD requested one variance for Kindergarten at Hawthorne Elementary, citing funding limitations and difficulty hiring; in total, Mineral CSD has only 6 students exceeding the target ratio, all of them in Kindergarten.

Detail by School

School Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Hawthorne Elementary	14	19	17	17	20	19	19	4	100.00%	1.68%
Schurz Elementary	21	22	22	25	22	22	16	1	100.00%	51.19%
Grand Total	17.5	20.5	19.5	21	21	20.5	17.5	N/A	100.00%	26.44%

Nye County School District

Nye County School District (Nye CSD) is the largest rural district in Nevada, and the third largest rural district in the country. Nye CSD implemented an alternative class size reduction program for FY22 and requested 17 variances across 8 schools, primarily in Kindergarten, second, and fourth grades. They cited funding limitations and hiring difficulties for all of their variances, as well as facilities limitations at Floyd and JG Johnson Elementary. Nye has combined classrooms in four of its schools: Amargosa, Beatty, Duckwater, and Gabbs.

District Overview

Nye CSD	K	1	2	3	4	5
Highest class size ratio	28	23	28	24	30	32

Lowest class size ratio	8	7	7	7	8	7
Average class size ratio	17.9	16.6	17.8	17.2	19.6	20.4

CSR Ratio Surplus

Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Grand Total
Students	94	1	21	6	24	21	N/A	167
Classrooms	5.88	0.05	0.96	0.27	0.96	0.84	0	~9

Detail by School

School Name	1	2	3	4	5	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Amargosa Valley Elementary School	23	15	22	21	13	16	1	100.00%	37.13%
Beatty Elementary School	21	12	12	25	24	21	4	100.00%	10.25%
Duckwater Elementary School	7	7	7	0	7	0	5	0.00%	0.00%
Floyd Elementary School	18	21	20	30	32	22	2	100.00%	5.86%
Gabbs Elementary School	8	8	8	8	8	8	1	100.00%	0.00%
Hafen Elementary School	22	21	24	25	25	25	3	100.00%	7.19%
JG Johnson Elementary School	20	28	18	19	25	18	2	100.00%	7.54%
Manse Elementary School	18	19	19	28	23	19	3	100.00%	10.88%
Round Mountain Elementary School	18	23	20	16	21	22	1	100.00%	4.26%
Tonopah Elementary School	11	24	22	24	26	28	2	100.00%	4.25%
Grand Total	16.6	17.8	17.2	19.6	20.4	17.9	5	93.10%	9.04%

Pershing County School District

Pershing County School District (Pershing CSD) implemented a regular class size reduction program for FY22. While Pershing is only required to report on K-3 under a regular CSR plan, they elected to report on grades 4-6 as housed within their elementary schools. Pershing CSD requested 3 variances across Kindergarten and first grade and cited funding limitations and difficulty hiring for their variances. Please note that Imlay is a combined K-5 classroom.

District Overview

Pershing CSD	K	1	2	3
Highest class size ratio	19	19	17	17
Lowest class size ratio	17	17	16	17
Average class size ratio	18	18	16.5	17

CSR Ratio Surplus

Grade	K	1	2	3	Grand Total
Students	14	12	4	0	30
Classrooms	0.88	0.75	0.25	0	~2

Detail by School

School Name	1	2	3	4	5	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Imlay Elementary School	17	17	17	17	0	17	N/A	6.67%	0.00%
Lovelock Elementary School	19	16	17	20	19	19	2	100.00%	9.15%
Grand Total	18	16.5	17	18.5	9.5	18	N/A	57.58%	4.99%

Storey County School District

Storey County School District (Storey CSD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program for FY22. Storey CSD requested two variances: one for Kindergarten at Hugh Gallagher, citing funding limitations, and another for third grade at Hillside Elementary, citing funding and facilities limitations.

District Overview

Storey CSD	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
Highest class size ratio	23	17	20	24	25	23	N/A
Lowest class size ratio	9	15	15	24	25	23	N/A
Average class size ratio	16	16	17.5	22	24.5	21.5	N/A

CSR Ratio Surplus

Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Grand Total
Students	7	0	0	12	0	0	n/a	19
Classrooms	0.44	0	0	0.55	0	0	n/a	~1

Detail by School

School Name	1	2	3	4	5	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Hillside Elementary School	15	15	24	25	23	9	4	47.00%	0.00%
Hugh Gallagher Elementary	17	20	20	24	20	23	3	29.08%	0.00%
Grand Total	16	17.5	22	24.5	21.5	16	N/A	38.04%	0.00%

Washoe County School District

Washoe County School District (WCSD) implemented a regular class size reduction program for FY22. WCSD represents the second largest school district in Nevada by population, making up 16% of all K-3 students. WCSD requested 129 variances – 13% – 60 in Kindergarten, and 21, 25, and 23 in first, second, and third grades respectively.

WCSD has 30 schools with a K-2 ratio at 21 or more (5 students over the target ratio) – approximately 46% of schools; they have only one school with a K-2 ratio at 26 or more (10 students over the target ratio). Only 8 schools have a third grade ratio of 23 or more (5 students over the target ratio). WCSD cited funding limitations and hiring difficulties on all of their variances, with the addition of facilities limitations for three of their elementary schools: Gomes, Gomm, and Greenbrae.

District Overview

WCSD	K	1	2	3
Highest class size ratio	26	21	23	25
Lowest class size ratio	13	7	11	7
Average class size ratio	20.12	16.82	16.95	19.49

CSR Ratio Surplus

Grade	K	1	2	3	Grand Total
Students	950	342	407	401	2,100
Classrooms	59.38	21.38	25.44	14.32	~121

Detail by School

School Name	1	2	3	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Alice Smith Elementary	17	18	21	20	2	100.00%	24.33%
Allen Elementary	19	16	21	24	2	100.00%	44.57%
Anderson Elementary	16	15	16	16	1	100.00%	22.71%
Beasley Elementary	17	18	21	23	3	20.65%	4.44%
Beck Elementary	19	20	18	22	5	26.11%	6.73%
Bennett Elementary	17	17	18	19	2	100.00%	40.62%
Bohach Elementary	18	18	23	21	0	16.28%	8.87%
Booth Elementary	17	14	16	16	1	100.00%	22.08%

School Name	1	2	3	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Brown Elementary	17	18	25	23	5	18.95%	5.84%
Cannan Elementary	19	17	21	21	2	100.00%	29.75%
Caughlin Ranch Elementary	21	18	20	22	5	6.43%	2.20%
Corbett Elementary	18	16	20	17	4	100.00%	50.68%
Desert Heights Elementary	15	15	17	18	2	100.00%	21.54%
Diedrichsen Elementary	18	18	16	19	4	35.11%	11.40%
Dodson Elementary	17	18	16	20	3	100.00%	22.18%
Donner Springs Elementary	15	19	17	25	4	54.11%	19.72%
Double Diamond Elementary	18	17	22	22	3	33.35%	8.69%
Drake Elementary	16	13	21	20	4	100.00%	32.08%
Duncan Elementary	15	15	18	20	2	100.00%	47.91%
Dunn Elementary	16	17	18	20	2	46.86%	14.81%
Elmcrest Elementary	13	13	20	13	2	100.00%	16.47%
Gomes Elementary	17	14	22	22	2	43.86%	4.92%
Gomm Elementary	17	17	18	18	5	4.98%	2.43%
Greenbrae Elementary	15	15	20	19	2	100.00%	35.54%
Hall Elementary	18	18	19	19	3	27.68%	2.79%
Hidden Valley Elementary	17	22	20	21	3	50.65%	13.91%
Huffaker Elementary	16	19	17	22	4	23.81%	8.31%
Hunsberger Elementary	17	17	21	22	5	4.98%	1.45%
Hunter Lake Elementary	18	21	22	19	5	35.32%	4.37%
Incline Elementary	15	18	16	19	3	33.76%	45.68%
Inskeep Elementary	19	17	23	22	0	18.66%	3.90%
Juniper Elementary	13	15	20	22	3	35.50%	18.08%
Kate Smith Elementary	17	16	18	18	2	100.00%	54.36%
Lemelson Elementary	20	23	18	16	3	100.00%	36.10%
Lemmon Valley Elementary	17	17	20	21	2	100.00%	24.43%
Lenz Elementary	16	18	20	19	4	11.61%	3.01%
Lincoln Park Elementary	16	17	25	18	2	100.00%	30.78%
Loder Elementary	16	18	21	24	2	100.00%	47.50%
Mathews Elementary	15	15	18	20	2	100.00%	42.57%
Maxwell Elementary	16	17	22	19	4	100.00%	36.14%
Melton Elementary	16	19	22	19	5	13.13%	2.47%
Mitchell Elementary	17	17	19	17	2	100.00%	35.87%
Moss Elementary	17	16	17	26	3	32.41%	8.19%
Mount Rose Elementary	17	16	25	23	5	24.01%	12.73%
Natchez Elementary	7	11	7	19	1	100.00%	3.57%
Palmer Elementary	17	16	21	20	3	100.00%	36.72%
Peavine Elementary	20	18	25	24	3	39.43%	11.66%
Pleasant Valley Elementary	17	17	19	19	4	22.50%	4.26%
Poulakidas Elementary	18	17	23	22	0	12.01%	8.89%
Risley Elementary	18	15	19	19	N/A	100.00%	36.08%
Sepulveda Elementary	18	16	19	20	3	29.85%	13.16%
Silver Lake Elementary	17	17	19	19	4	31.80%	24.95%
Smithridge Elementary	17	14	18	20	N/A	100.00%	50.39%

School Name	1	2	3	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Spanish Springs Elementary	14	16	17	18	3	10.20%	3.30%
Stead Elementary	18	17	20	21	N/A	100.00%	26.78%
Sun Valley Elementary	17	15	21	18	2	100.00%	43.28%
Taylor Elementary	18	18	23	21	5	21.72%	3.03%
Towles Elementary	17	19	15	23	4	35.44%	5.17%
Van Gorder Elementary	17	18	19	17	5	16.48%	2.12%
Verdi Elementary	19	15	20	25	3	15.56%	1.61%
Veterans Elementary	15	16	16	19	1	100.00%	42.09%
Warner Elementary	19	20	19	22	3	100.00%	12.57%
Westergard Elementary	17	17	19	22	3	21.04%	8.14%
Whitehead Elementary	14	20	22	13	4	31.37%	14.87%
Winnemucca Elementary	19	18	18	21	4	33.60%	13.71%
Grand Total	16.82	16.95	19.49	20.12	N/A	59.06%	19.99%

White Pine County School District

White Pine County School District (White Pine CSD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program for FY22. White Pine CSD requested two Kindergarten variances in total, with ratios of 20:1 and 19:1 respectively. White Pine CSD cited funding limitations and difficulty hiring for both variances.

District Overview

White Pine CSD	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
Highest class size ratio	20	17	20	20	22	21	17
Lowest class size ratio	14	14	19	15	8	17	17
Average class size ratio	19.08	17.25	18.08	21.5	21.5	22.5	18.25

CSR Ratio Surplus

Grade	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Grand Total
Students	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Classrooms	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	~1

Detail by School

School Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	Star Rating	FRL%	EL%
Baker Elementary	0	0	17	17	17	17	0	4	0.00%	29.17%
D.E. Norman Elementary	17	20	19	22	21	0	19	N/A	100.00%	0.72%
Lund Elementary	14	20	20	18	18	0	14	1	34.03%	4.17%
McGill Elementary	17	19	15	8	17	0	20	2	100.00%	1.04%
Grand Total	16	19.67	17.75	16.25	18.25	17	17.67	N/A	63.83%	6.92%

Conclusion

The average Kindergarten classroom has 5 students more than the target ratio. First and second graders have 3 students over the ratio on average, while third graders have 4 students over the ratio on average. While districts consistently cite difficulties hiring and funding limitations, rural districts (in addition to CCSD) were most likely to cite facilities limitations.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Amelia Thibault via email at acthibault@doe.nv.gov or by phone at 775-387-2451.