

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: Felicia Ortiz, President
Nevada State Board of Education

FROM: Heidi Haartz, Deputy Superintendent for Student Investment

DATE: January 1, 2023

SUBJECT: Report to the State Board of Education: Class Size Reduction Variances and Justifications, 1st Quarter Fiscal Year 2023 (July 1, 2022 – September 30, 2022)

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.

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 NRS 388.700. CSR reporting is submitted to NDE quarterly on November 1, February 1, May 1, and August 1.

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

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

Class Size Reduction Reporting Efforts – Quarter 1 Pilot Program

In alignment with NDE’s 2020 Statewide Plan for the Improvement of Pupils (STIP) transparency strategy toward the goal that all students experience continued academic growth by streamlining reporting requirements, NDE worked with districts to renovate and pilot a new reporting process for CSR reporting. This was initially piloted in Q1 of FY23 with the participation of eleven enrolled districts: Carson City, Clark, Douglas, Elko, Eureka, Lander, Lincoln, Lyon, Nye, Pershing, and White Pine.

Each quarter, NDE provides a district-specific workbook that includes historical data from the previous quarter, including class sizes and the variances requested. When completing the quarterly report, all data entered is compared against the previous quarter’s data to determine whether a Renewal or New Variance would be more appropriate. For example, if John Doe Elementary had a kindergarten ratio of 20:1 in Q1, and a kindergarten ratio of 20:1 in Q2, they may submit a Renewal Variance. A Renewal Variance is a request for variance certifying that the data, reasoning, and school-level plan from the previously submitted (and currently approved) variance remains the same. New Variance requests must be submitted if either a) there has been an increase in ratio greater than one (e.g., John Doe went from 20:1 to 24:1 in kindergarten) or b) a variance is required and there was no variance submitted and approved in the preceding quarter. Automation creates a single renewal variance for all eligible schools and grades and populates information for new variances by school with supporting grade and ratio information.

Updates were made to the design, formulas, and automation of the workbook, including an overhaul of the instructions and supports available, and updated relevant forms. For reporting efficiency, a crosscheck between district average daily enrollment (ADE) and populations counted in CSR has been added to support CSR audit alignment under NRS 387.304. A reporting element related to the number of substitute teachers employed in long-term positions or to fill vacancies, pursuant to requirements under NRS 388.700, is also being added effective Q2.

Eight of eleven districts completed a post-pilot survey and provided the following responses:

- On a scale of 1-10, with 1 representing an increased reporting burden, 10 a greatly reduced reporting burden, and 5 being no change, how would you rate the reporting burden for class size reduction reporting under the pilot?
 - ***Five districts provided a score of 8; two a score of 7; and one a score of 6***
- On a scale of 1-10, with 1 representing reduced clarity in the class size reduction reporting process, 10 a significant increase in clarity for the class size reduction reporting process, and 5 representing no change, how would you rate the clarity of instruction and reporting requirements for class size reduction reporting under the pilot?
 - ***One district provided a score of 9; four a score of 8; one a score of 7; one a score of 5; and one a score of 4***
- On a scale of 1-5, 1 representing little to no engagement, and 5 representing comprehensive engagement,

how would you rate the stakeholder engagement and customer service from NDE regarding the pilot?

- *Six districts provided a score of 5; two districts a score of 4*



- On a scale of 1-5, 1 representing strong opposition, and 5 representing strong support, how would you rate your recommendation to transition the revised reporting process from pilot to standardized reporting for Q2?

- *All eight districts provided a score of 5*

Based on these results, as well as additional feedback from the survey, office hours, and improvements made during the course of the Q1 pilot, the pilot program will continue into Q2 to ensure that all formulas are running smoothly and the work in Q1 supports an increased reduction in burden for Q2. The goal of the pilot is to recruit increased enrollment in Q2 for statewide implementation in Q3.


Enrollment

According to the Fiscal Year 2023 (FY23) quarter one (Q1) average daily enrollment (ADE) report, enrollment for the school year began at 470,384 students, a decrease of approximately 4,405 students from the FY22 Q4 report. The following charts of district and charter enrollment illustrate how this total enrollment is divided across district schools and charter schools, including the declining enrollment of districts in favor of increased enrollment within charter schools.




Of this enrollment, approximately 28.6%, or 134,762 students, are in grades kindergarten through third. More specifically, Q1 district enrollment for K-3 was 112,077 students per Q1 ADE reporting, with 112,328 students reported in the Q1 CSR report. Based on Q1 ADE reporting and the Q1 CSR educator count of 5,624 district K-3 teachers, there was an average class size ratio of 20:1 in district K-3 classrooms.

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, total enrollment for grades 4-6 is 106,995 students. District enrollment for those grades is 89,318 students. Within the Q1 CSR report, 8,650 students were reported for enrollment in grades 4-6 within an elementary school, along with 383 educators, for an average class size ratio of 23:1.




Variance Requests


In Q4 of FY22, there were a total of 927 variance requests, with the largest number of variances for kindergarten. In Q1 of FY22, there were 970 variance requests. Comparatively, there is significant growth in Q1 of FY23, with a total of 1,103 variance requests in total. First, second, and third grades lead in variance requests, while kindergarten, though still significantly represented across 298 schools, is the only grade to see a significant reduction over FY22 Q4 variances.



Of the 384 reporting elementary schools, 343 requested one or more variances – approximately 89% of all reporting elementary schools across Nevada. Please note that there is an increase of eight reporting schools in SY22-23, but the 343 schools requesting variances have remained static. There was a 10% drop in the number of schools requesting kindergarten variances, shifting from 87% of all reporting schools in Q4 of FY22 to 77% in Q1 of FY23. However, there was an increase to 70% of all reporting schools requesting a third-grade variance in Q1 of FY23. While prior years have reflected significant weight to one or two particular grades, variance requests are more evenly distributed across grades K-3 while remaining largely static across grades 4-6.



Each variance represents a single grade within a single school. However, it does not represent a single classroom; this number is found by counting the number of classrooms for each grade requesting a variance within the school. This calculation expands 1,103 variance requests to 4,399 classrooms requesting a variance for exceeding the target class size ratio.



Overall, approximately 64% of all variance requests were in the form of the “Renewal Variance Request”. This indicates that in Quarter 1 of FY23, 64% of all grade levels across schools (2,405 classrooms) had previously requested and had approved a variance for that school and grade in Quarter 4 of FY22, and more specifically, the class size ratio of that grade and school **had not changed by more than 1 integer**. 36% of variances were for “New Variance Requests”, which indicated that a school’s grade level had not requested a variance in Q4 – indicating they had been within their target ratio – or that a school’s grade had previously had a variance, but their average ratio had increased by more than one integer. It is important to note that these variances represent 3,201 classrooms, despite having a small number of variances associated. This is indicative of large schools with a high number

of classrooms per grade that had a ratio increase greater than 1 integer.

Given grade migration between school years, the expectation is that between Q1 and Q2 of FY23, the total number of New Requests would decline, while the total number of Renewals would increase. Overall, this would indicate a certain stability to the data while increasingly reducing the burden of reporting on districts.


Variances by the Numbers			
38% of schools that requested a variance had both an FRL rate of 50% or greater and an EL rate of 15% or greater	81% of elementary schools have an FRL percentage of 50% or greater; 40% have an EL population of 15% or greater	75% of elementary schools have an FRL percentage of 50% or greater and requested a variance	39% of elementary schools have an EL population of 15% or more and requested a variance

Information related to school star ratings has not been included in this report, as star ratings are currently carried forward due to the COVID-19 pandemic from the 2018-19 school year. Since the kindergarten population in the elementary school system represented by those ratings have since exited the K-3 grade band, this data has not been included here as they no longer provide context for the data presented. Additionally, the percentage of

English learners (EL) and At-Risk students as defined by designation of Free-and-Reduced-Price lunch (FRL) eligibility may not be included for some schools (indicated by “N/A”) as the population group was fewer than 10 and the data was excluded to protect student privacy under FERPA, the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act.

Count of Variances by Grade								
District	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	Total
Carson	0	2	2	0	2	0	6	12
Churchill	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Clark	192	193	187	0	0	0	194	766
Douglas	1	3	4	1	4	0	7	20
Elko	3	2	8	0	0	0	9	22
Esmeralda	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	3
Eureka	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Humboldt	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	5
Lincoln	2	2	2	4	4	3	1	18
Lyon	1	1	3	3	1	2	6	17
Mineral	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Nye	2	3	3	2	4	0	5	19
Pershing	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Storey	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Washoe	50	45	57	0	0	0	60	212
White Pine	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
Grand Total	253	253	269	10	15	5	298	1103

Districts may report one or more reasons for their variance request including: facility limitations, difficulty hiring, funding limitations, or other. For the first time, difficulty hiring has surpassed funding limitations as the most cited cause for variance requests: 98% of all variance requests cited difficulty hiring, reflective of the increase in teacher shortages due to retirement, attrition, and decreases in recruitment and retention. 97% 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. 74% of justification cited facility limitations, which typically reflect a lack of space to provide physical classrooms. The four cases of “other cause” were largely related to combined-grade classrooms.



Class Size Ratios

In FY23 Q1, 12 districts exceeded the target class size ratio for one or more grades at the district level; however, only four districts exceeded their projected FY23 class size ratios as submitted and approved under their FY23 application for a program of class size reduction. Specifically, Douglas surpassed their projections for third and fifth grade; Lincoln for first and second; Storey for kindergarten; and Washoe for K-3, as they did not submit a FY23 application for a program of class size reduction pursuant to NRS. While many districts exceeded the target ratio for kindergarten, these were ratios that districts anticipated given their enrollment, facilities, and staffing capabilities.

District Average Class Size Ratios									
District	Plan	1	2	3	4	5	6	K	District Variance
Carson	<i>Alternative</i>	19.56	20.40	21.43	22.99	23.26	N/A	20.45	
Churchill	<i>Alternative</i>	20.27	20.12	21.95	21.65	25.47	N/A	18.67	
Clark	<i>Regular</i>	19.75	19.70	21.73	N/A	N/A	N/A	19.78	
Douglas	<i>Alternative</i>	18.30	21.14	22.86	22.86	26.64	N/A	22.38	✓
Elko	<i>Alternative</i>	19.68	19.87	22.19	21.88	21.80	18.94	19.13	
Esmeralda	<i>Regular</i>	13.09	12.97	6.55	6.38	6.35	3.00	12.82	
Eureka	<i>Alternative</i>	9.10	9.20	17.35	11.78	11.65	13.89	5.68	
Humboldt	<i>Alternative</i>	15.14	15.32	16.55	16.41	12.02	12.42	14.27	
Lander	<i>Alternative</i>	14.97	21.13	19.12	17.35	10.00	10.14	13.30	
Lincoln	<i>Regular</i>	17.75	18.72	16.02	14.27	15.23	13.67	15.25	✓
Lyon	<i>Alternative</i>	20.47	21.19	20.75	23.06	21.95	22.32	17.75	
Mineral	<i>Alternative</i>	20.58	17.22	16.09	16.60	18.61	20.46	16.71	
Nye	<i>Alternative</i>	17.78	18.43	18.82	21.10	24.33	N/A	16.74	
Pershing	<i>Alternative</i>	17.60	18.49	22.09	21.09	18.26	N/A	14.00	
Storey	<i>Alternative</i>	20.69	15.91	14.82	17.51	18.46	N/A	19.15	✓
Washoe	<i>Regular</i>	17.65	17.39	21.27	N/A	N/A	N/A	20.37	✓
White Pine	<i>Alternative</i>	19.38	15.74	17.73	14.81	15.12	15.38	15.65	

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 FY23 Q1 ADE report.

Weighted Statewide Average Class Ratios			
K	1	2	3
19.69	19.33	19.34	21.53

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 under the District Overview table. Please note that if a district had fewer than 10 students exceeding the ratio in a given grade, these numbers are not represented.

Carson City School District

Carson City School District (Carson City SD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program for FY23. Carson City SD requested variances for each of its elementary schools; every school requested a variance for kindergarten, with the highest ratio being 23:1 and the lowest 18:1. Two variances were requested for second grade at Fremont and Seeliger Elementary; two variances for third at Bordewich Bray and Empire; and two for fifth grade at Bordewich and Fremont. Carson City SD cited facility limitations – no room to place classrooms – and difficulty recruiting and retaining teachers under their variance justifications. Carson City SD

utilized 8 renewal variances and 4 new variances.

District Overview

Carson City SD	K	1	2	3	4	5
Highest class size ratio	23	22	23	24	25	26
Lowest class size ratio	18	17	16	19	21	19
Average class size ratio	20.5	19.5	20.33	21.33	22.83	23.33
Students exceeding the ratio	104	-	10	11	-	-

Detail by School

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	4	5	K
Bordewich Bray	9%	100%	22	22	23	21	26	23
Empire Elementary	29%	100%	17	16	24	22	23	19
Fremont Elementary	21%	100%	20	23	21	22	26	21
Fritsch Elementary	7%	100%	20	22	20	23	19	18
Mark Twain Elementary	16%	100%	19	16	19	24	24	21
Seeliger Elementary	15%	43%	19	23	21	25	22	21

Churchill County School District

Churchill County School District (Churchill CSD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program for FY23. Due to the smaller size of Churchill CSD, kindergarten is only offered at one school: Lahontan Elementary School (ES), which was the only school to request a variance. Kindergarten was also the only grade to have students exceeding the target ratio, with a total of 32 kindergarteners – equivalent to two classrooms. At Lahontan ES, Churchill CSD cited facilities limitations, funding limitations, and difficulty hiring.

Detail by School

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	4	5	K
EC Best Elementary	8%	100%		20	22			
Lahontan Elementary	8%	100%	20					19
Numa Elementary School	7%	100%				22	25	

Clark County School District

Clark County School District (CCSD) implemented a regular class size reduction program for FY23. CCSD, as the fifth largest school district in the nation and the largest school district in Nevada, represents approximately 62% of state enrollment and 73% of district enrollment, with 236 elementary schools. CCSD requested 766 variances across 223 schools – 94% of schools – representing 69% of all variance requests. CCSD cited funding limitations, facility limitations, and difficulty hiring under their variance justifications. CCSD utilized 515 renewal variances and 250 new variances.

District Overview

CCSD	K	1	2	3
Highest class size ratio	31	34	36	35
Lowest class size ratio	3	5	1	3
Average class size ratio	19.77	19.78	19.73	21.72
Students exceeding the ratio	3,630	4,130	4,103	3,836

Detail by School

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	K
ABSTON, SANDRA B. ES	10%	100%	23	16.5	19	19
ADAMS, KIRK L. ES	24%	100%	24	19	22	26

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	K
ADCOCK, O. K. ES	30%	100%	18	14	17	16
ALAMO, TONY ES	18%	100%	22	25	30	22
ALLEN, DEAN ES	3%	100%	23	22	34	17
ANTONELLO, LEE ES	14%	100%	23	19	23	18
BAILEY, SISTER R. J. ES	15%	100%	19	19	20	23
BARBER, SHIRLEY A. ES	7%	100%	22	21	23	20
BARTLETT, SELMA F. ES	7%	100%	21	18	18	17
BASS, JOHN C. ES	10%	100%	25	21	19	19
BATTERMAN, KATHY L. ES	9%	100%	23	21	22	22
BEATTY, JOHN R. ES	6%	100%	18	27	22	21
BECKLEY, WILL ES	34%	100%	23	27	21	29
BELL, REX ES	29%	100%	16	17	15	16
BENDORF, PATRICIA A. ES	17%	100%	20	24	23	15
BENNETT, WILLIAM G. ES	4%	100%	15	14	16	12
BERKLEY, SHELLEY ES	10%	100%	26	23	26	17
BILBRAY, JAMES ES	4%	100%	26	22	25	23
BLUE DIAMOND ES	N/A	100%	11	11	11	11
BONNER, JOHN W. ES	8%	100%	20	21	26	19
BOOKER, SR. KERMIT R. ES	24%	100%	15	12	18	14
BOWLER, GRANT ES	N/A	100%	19	21	26	21
BOWLER, JOSEPH L. ES	19%	100%	20	16	17	13
BOZARTH, HENRY EVELYN ES	3%	100%	20	19	25	21
BRACKEN ES MAGNET	24%	100%	34	25	30	17
BROOKMAN, EILEEN B. ES	28%	100%	22	29	24	17
BROWN, HANNAH MARIE ES	5%	100%	25	24	22	19
BRUNER, LUCILE ES	15%	100%	17	22	29	15
BRYAN, RICHARD H. ES	13%	100%	15	21	18	27
BRYAN, ROGER M. ES	18%	100%	19	22	22	17
BUNKER, BERKELEY L. ES	24%	100%	17	18	17	15
CAHLAN, MARION ES	44%	100%	19	17	18	22
CAMBEIRO, ARTURO ES	37%	100%	17	17	28	18
CARL, KAY ES	8%	100%	20	17	21	17
CARTWRIGHT, ROBERTA C. ES	10%	100%	17	19	30	18
CHRISTENSEN, M. J. ES	10%	100%	20	16	23	17
CONNERS, EILEEN ES	6%	100%	21	21	21	13
CORTEZ, MANUEL J. ES	29%	100%	18	22	21	26
COX, CLYDE ES	30%	100%	20	20	19	22
COX, DAVID ES	5%	100%	18	21	19	15
COZINE, S. AND L. ES	15%	100%	17	15	25	13
CRAIG, LOIS ES	33%	100%	17	22	15	19
CRESTWOOD ES	39%	100%	18	19	20	20
CULLEY, PAUL E. ES	33%	100%	28	26	24	17
CUNNINGHAM, CYNTHIA ES	13%	100%	21	17	20	19
DAILEY, JACK ES	32%	100%	18	21	22	17
DARNELL, MARSHALL C. ES	5%	100%	24	24	26	23

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	K
DEARING, LAURA ES	27%	100%	26	26	28	27
DECKER, C. H. ES	33%	100%	22	21	20	19
DERFELT, HERBERT A. ES	13%	100%	19	15	15	19
DESKIN, RUTHE ES	12%	100%	21	20	20	23
DETWILER, OLLIE ES	31%	100%	13	17	18	16
DIAZ, RUBEN P. ES	35%	100%	25	18	23	20
DICKENS, D. L. DUSTY ES	9%	100%	21	17	20	21
DISKIN, P. A. ES	26%	100%	20	17	23	22
DIVICH, KENNETH ES	2%	100%	21	18	26	20
DONDERO, HARVEY N. ES	32%	100%	23	20	22	17
DOOLEY, JOHN ES	3%	100%	18	21	23	21
DUNCAN, RUBY ES	5%	100%	19	19	26	28
EARL, IRA J. ES	34%	100%	21	16	23	16
EARL, MARION B. ES	14%	100%	15	21	20	18
EDWARDS, ELBERT ES	38%	100%	17	15	19	16
EISENBERG, DOROTHY ES	12%	100%	20	17	21	16
ELIZONDO, RAUL ES	14%	100%	24	21	19	20
ELLIS, ROBERT AND SANDY ES	4%	100%	25	24	25	25
FERRON, WILLIAM E. ES	22%	100%	17	18	20	18
FINE, MARK L. ES	17%	100%	19	22	23	22
FITZGERALD, H.P. ES	20%	100%	19	19	35	20
FONG, WING AND LILLY ES	17%	100%	16	20	19	25
FORBUSS, ROBERT L. ES	7%	100%	21	22	24	21
FRENCH, DORIS ES	24%	100%	25	21	29	24
FRIAS, C. P. ES	7%	100%	21	23	26	29
GALLOWAY, FAY ES	4%	100%	20	16	18	23
GAREHIME, EDITH ES	7%	100%	25	23	30	23
GEHRING, ROGER ES	10%	100%	21	17	20	20
GIBSON, JAMES ES	6%	100%	20	19	25	20
GILBERT, C.V.T. ES	11%	100%	22	17	19	20
GIVENS, LINDA RANKIN ES	10%	100%	27	20	21	21
GOLDFARB, DANIEL ES	26%	100%	22	20	19	22
GOODSPRINGS ES	N/A	N/A		1		
GOOLSBY, JUDY JOHN ES	6%	100%	20	22	28	17
GOYNES, THERON NAOMI ES	5%	100%	18	23	21	22
GRAGSON, ORAN K. ES	35%	100%	19	18	30	23
GRAY, R. GUILD ES	30%	100%	18	23	30	18
GRIFFITH, E.W. ES	30%	100%	20	14	21	21
GUY, ADDELIAR D. III ES	10%	100%	28	20	28	19
HANCOCK, DORIS ES	19%	100%	13	15	18	16
HARMON, HARLEY ES	30%	100%	18	18	17	22
HARRIS, GEORGE E. ES	29%	100%	21	20	22	22
HAYDEN, DON E. ES	7%	100%	19	23	19	21
HAYES, KEITH KAREN ES	13%	100%	17	21	23	16
HEARD, LOMIE G. ES	27%	100%	22	18	21	22

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	K
HECKETHORN, HOWARD E. ES	3%	100%	20	19	22	15
HERR, HELEN ES	27%	100%	25	19	24	12
HERRON, FAY ES	38%	100%	17	24	19	19
HEWETSON, HALLE ES	43%	100%	21	27	22	19
HICKEY, LILLIAM LUJAN ES	27%	100%	19	27	25	29
HILL, CHARLOTTE ES	14%	100%	22	25	24	18
HINMAN, EDNA F. ES	9%	100%	15	18	29	28
HOGGARD, MABEL ES	19%	100%	20	30	23	20
HOLLINGSWORTH, HOWARD ES	38%	100%	21	18	18	25
HUMMEL, JOHN R. ES	8%	100%	21	22	17	19
INDIAN SPRINGS ES	N/A	100%		21	21	12
IVERSON, MERVIN ES	20%	100%	19	12	17	14
JACOBSON, WALTER ES	13%	100%	18	15	20	31
JEFFERS, JAY W. ES	36%	100%	16	17	24	23
JENKINS, EARL N. ES	17%	100%	22	23	21	26
JONES BLACKHURST, JAN ES	6%	100%	31	23	28	18
JYDSTRUP, HELEN ES	22%	100%	24	30	19	29
KAHRE, MARC ES	8%	100%	18	13	16	18
KATZ, EDYTHE LLOYD ES	17%	100%	20	23	22	21
KELLER, C. J. ES	35%	100%	22	18	21	20
KELLY, MATT ES	9%	100%	16	20	25	25
KESTERSON, LORNA J. ES	6%	100%	19	13	23	17
KIM, FRANK ES	21%	100%	14	14	22	24
KING, M. L. ES	33%	100%	19	17	17	18
KING, MARTHA P. ES	N/A	100%			23	
LAKE, ROBERT E. ES	28%	100%	22	22	24	22
LAMPING, FRANK ES	4%	100%	24	25	23	18
LINCOLN ES	42%	100%	17	16	19	22
LONG, WALTER V. ES	29%	100%	22	14	18	21
LOWMAN, MARY ZEL ES	17%	100%	23	36	34	31
LUMMIS, WILLIAM ES	7%	100%	23	23	22	19
LUNDY, EARL ES	N/A	100%	9		4	8
LUNT, ROBERT ES	33%	100%	15	18	22	21
LYNCH, ANN ES	40%	100%	17	20	18	22
MACK, NATE ES	5%	100%	20	20	20	22
MACKEY, JO ES	11%	100%	27	20	28	19
MANCH, J.E. ES	12%	100%	22	22	22	26
MARTINEZ, REYNALDO L. ES	28%	100%	19	18	20	15
MATHIS, BEVERLY S. ES	16%	100%	16	21	18	23
MAY, ERNEST ES	7%	100%	22	29	24	17
MCCALL, QUANNAH ES	33%	100%	13	19	17	14
MCCAWE, GORDON ES	5%	100%	19	24	24	23
MCDONIEL, ESTES M. ES	5%	100%	24	24	28	21
MCMILLAN, JAMES B. ES	15%	100%	19	29	19	17
MCWILLIAMS, J. T. ES	39%	100%	24	22	21	19

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	K
MENDOZA, JOHN F. ES	32%	100%	19	26	24	22
Miley Achievement Center ES	N/A	100%		4	4	
Miller, John F	21%	100%	7	5	3	3
MILLER,SANDY ES	28%	100%	19	19	18	19
MITCHELL, ANDREW ES	N/A	100%	21	19		17
MOORE, WILLIAM ES	33%	100%	17	16	20	17
MORROW, SUE H. ES	4%	100%	25	25	23	14
MOUNTAIN VIEW ES	31%	100%	17	19	28	24
NEAL, JOSEPH M. ES	5%	100%	23	18	23	18
NV LEARNING ACADEMY ES	11%	N/A	15	15	16	10
NEWTON, ULIS ES	2%	100%	16	20	20	17
NW CT ACADEMY ES	N/A	100%				20
OBER, DVORRE HAL ES	13%	100%	20	21	23	25
OROARKE, THOMAS ES	2%	100%	24	23	19	20
ORTWEIN, DENNIS ES	6%	100%	21	22	22	17
PARADISE ES	22%	100%	20	20	20	22
PARK, JOHN S. ES	33%	100%	21	18	21	17
PARSON, C. S. ES	21%	100%	23	19	28	21
PERKINS, CLAUDE ES	17%	100%	15	20	27	25
PERKINS, UTE ES	N/A	100%	14	21	23	18
PETERSEN, DEAN ES	22%	100%	25	22	26	20
PIGGOTT, CLARENCE ES	15%	100%	17	20	24	25
PITTMAN, VAIL ES	24%	100%	17	23	22	21
PRIEST, RICHARD C. ES	18%	100%	18	20	21	20
RED ROCK ES	24%	100%	19	15	16	15
REED, DORIS M. ES	22%	100%	15	14	19	18
REEDOM, CAROLYN S. ES	9%	100%	20	20	28	19
REID, HARRY ES	N/A	100%		5	3	3
RHODES, BETSY ES	5%	100%	20	18	28	18
RIES, ALDEANE COMITO ES	10%	100%	19	27	26	21
ROBERTS, AGGIE ES	10%	100%	19	21	17	14
ROGERS, LUCILLE S. ES	14%	100%	25	23	24	23
RONNOW, C.C. ES	46%	100%	15	15	19	19
RONZONE, BERTHA ES	38%	100%	19	15	17	20
ROUNDY, DR. C. OWEN ES	37%	100%	16	19	20	23
ROWE, LEWIS ES	21%	100%	15	18	23	19
RUNDLE, RICHARD ES	23%	100%	21	20	16	19
SANDY VALLEY ES	12%	100%	12	8	20	13
SCHERKENBACH, W. M. ES	N/A	100%	22	19	18	22
SCHORR, STEVE ES	6%	100%	19	26	30	22
SCOTT, JESSE D. ES	12%	100%	22	17	25	22
SEWELL, C. T. ES	9%	100%	16	17	20	26
SIMMONS, EVA G. ES	11%	100%	24	22	20	19
SMALLEY, J. E. A. R. ES	N/A	100%	21	25	24	21
SMITH, HAL ES	15%	100%	17	19	25	18

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	K
SMITH, HELEN ES	20%	100%	16	22	23	19
SNYDER, DON AND DEE ES	9%	100%	24	24	26	28
SNYDER, WILLIAM E. ES	33%	100%	20	19	14	20
SQUIRES, C.P. ES	40%	100%	16	16	17	20
STANFORD ES	27%	100%	17	16	17	17
STATON, ETHEL W. ES	6%	100%	17	18	28	20
STEELE, JUDITH D. ES	12%	100%	22	20	27	24
STEVENS, JOSH ES	8%	100%	29	20	20	17
Stewart, Helen J	36%	100%	5	5	4	
STUCKEY, EVELYN ES	6%	100%	25	18	27	19
SUNRISE ACRES ES	33%	100%	17	22	25	30
TANAKA, WAYNE N. ES	11%	100%	18	16	23	21
TARR, SHEILA ES	7%	100%	21	20	21	20
TARTAN, JOHN ES	8%	100%	25	26	27	24
TATE, MYRTLE ES	25%	100%	17	21	24	14
TAYLOR, GLEN C. ES	6%	100%	22	21	31	21
TAYLOR, ROBERT L. ES	7%	100%	16	19	27	20
THIRIOT, JOSEPH E. ES	29%	100%	23	22	22	20
THOMAS, RUBY S. ES	30%	100%	15	18	18	16
THOMPSON, SANDRA L. ES	2%	100%	18	22	25	23
THOMPSON, TYRONE ES	7%	100%	23	25	24	21
THORPE, JIM ES	11%	100%	22	14	21	15
TOBLER, R. E. ES	17%	100%	20	23	20	16
TOLAND, HELEN ANDERSON	26%	100%	14	23	25	20
TOMIYASU, BILL Y. ES	20%	100%	19	25	17	20
TREEM, HARRIET ES	6%	100%	17	19	20	20
TRIGGS, VINCENT ES	4%	100%	24	27	25	20
TWIN LAKES ES	32%	100%	15	17	23	18
TWITCHELL, NEIL C. ES	6%	100%	21	18	20	18
ULLOM, J. M. ES	29%	100%	17	16	17	18
VANDERBURG, JOHN ES	5%	100%	21	20	22	18
Variety ES	N/A	100%			6	
VASSILIADIS, B. R. ES	5%	100%	23	21	24	19
VEGAS VERDES ES	36%	100%	18	19	21	22
VIRGIN VALLEY ES	15%	100%	20	18	23	20
WALKER, J. MARLAN ES	3%	100%	26	21	24	23
WALLIN, SHIRLEY BILL ES	5%	100%	22	25	21	23
WARD, GENE ES	28%	100%	20	21	19	16
WARD, KITTY MCDONOUGH ES	N/A	100%	23	19	27	16
WARREN, ROSE ES	30%	100%	19	20	22	21
WASDEN, HOWARD ES	17%	100%	17	17	24	30
WATSON, FREDRIC ES	13%	100%	16	23	27	19
WENGERT, CYRIL ES	34%	100%	20	26	20	21
WEST PREP ES	29%	100%	14	14	22	18
WHITNEY ES	20%	100%	14	17	15	17

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	K
WIENER, JR., LOUIS ES	9%	100%	19	17	21	22
WILHELM, ELIZABETH ES	14%	100%	17	20	19	17
WILLIAMS, TOM ES	43%	100%	17	20	21	21
WILLIAMS, WENDELL ES	6%	100%	26	12	14	24
WOLFE, EVA ES	16%	100%	22	23	18	20
WOLFF, ELISE L. ES	6%	100%	22	23	26	22
WOOLLEY, GWENDOLYN ES	30%	100%	20	18	23	23
WRIGHT, WILLIAM V. ES	6%	100%	18	25	24	29
WYNN, ELAINE ES	39%	100%	19	21	34	17

Douglas County School District

Douglas County School District (Douglas CSD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program for FY23. Douglas CSD requested 20 variances across each of its elementary schools, each of which requested a variance for kindergarten. Three schools requested for second grade; four schools for third; four schools for fifth; and one each for first and fourth. Douglas CSD cited funding limitations for all of its variances, and difficulty hiring for Zephyr Cove ES. Douglas CSD utilized 9 renewal variances and 11 new variances.

District Overview

Douglas CSD	K	1	2	3	4	5
Highest class size ratio	25	25	24	26	28	33
Lowest class size ratio	19	16	15	20	17	22
Average class size ratio	22.57	18.43	21.29	23	23	26.86
Students exceeding the ratio	90	-	-	18	35	-

Detail by School

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	4	5	K
C.C. Meneley Elementary	4%	41%	25	20	24	20	22	24
Gardnerville Elementary	8%	35%	17	23	26	28	29	25
Gene Scarselli Elementary	3%	34%	16	22	24	24	25	20
Jacks Valley Elementary	9%	43%	17	15	21	22	31	25
Minden Elementary	4%	25%	17	24	22	25	33	25
Pinon Hills Elementary	N/A	23%	20	21	20	25	22	20
Zephyr Cove Elementary	N/A	26%	17	24	24	17	26	19

Elko County School District

Elko County School District (Elko CSD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program for FY23. Elko CSD requested 22 variances: nine for kindergarten, eight for third grade, three for first, and two for second grade. Elko CSD cited funding limitations and difficulty hiring on each of its variances. Elko CSD utilized 10 renewal variances and 12 new variances.

District Overview

Elko CSD	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
Highest class size ratio	24	24	25	26	25	24	18
Lowest class size ratio	10	16	11	12	16	17	16
Average class size ratio	19.17	19.5	19.92	22.25	22	21.37	17.33
Students exceeding the ratio	157	19	22	54	-	-	-

Detail by School

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	4	5	6	K
Carlin Elementary School	N/A	53%	18	17	17	22	22		23
Grammar No. 2	10%	100%	19	21	26	25			22
Jackpot Elementary	23%	60%	17	17	21	21	17	16	15
Liberty Peak Elementary	2%	16%	24	22	24	24	23		20
Mountain View Elementary	11%	26%	19	25	24	24			20
Northside Elementary	11%	39%	20	21	24	21			22
Owyhee Elementary School	N/A	100%	16	11	12	21	20	18	18
Sage Elementary School	3%	38%	23	21	23	23	24		19
Southside Elementary	28%	100%	23	19	21	22			24
Spring Creek Elementary	N/A	16%	20	21	25	20	22		22
Wells Elementary School	15%	56%	16	20	26	25	20	18	10
West Wendover Elementary	25%	65%	19	24	24	16	23		15

Esmeralda County School District

Esmeralda County School District (Esmeralda CSD) is among the smallest by population, and requested three variances at Dyer Elementary for kindergarten, first, and second. It is important to note that Dyer ES has a single combined classroom. When a single teacher is in a combined classroom, the student to teacher ratio is calculated in percentages to reflect what the equivalent ratio would be in a single classroom. Esmeralda CSD cited “other” for each of these variances, specifically related to the ratio calculation for combined classrooms, despite the actual enrollment for the classroom being minimal. While the ratios would seem to indicate students in excess of the ratio, calculations using the ADE indicate that no students in Esmeralda CSD are exceeding ratios.

Detail by School

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	4	5	6	K
Dyer Elementary	24%	100%	18	18		6	6	1	18
Goldfield Elementary	N/A	100%	8	8	9	9	9	4	8
Silver Peak Elementary	N/A	N/A			4	4	4	4	

Eureka County School District

Eureka County School District (Eureka CSD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program in FY23 and requested a single new variance for third grade at Eureka Elementary, citing “other” as their justification, specifically relating to enrollment growth.

Detail by School

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	4	5	6	K
Crescent Valley Elementary	N/A	55%	10	10	12	12	7	7	2
Eureka Elementary	N/A	36%	8	8	23	12	16	21	9

Humboldt County School District

Humboldt County School District (Humboldt CSD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program in FY23. Humboldt requested five variances in total: three in kindergarten, and one each in second and third, citing funding limitations.

District Overview

Humboldt CSD	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
Highest class size ratio	21	21	24	23	25	18	18
Lowest class size ratio	7	7	4	8	4	4	4
Average class size ratio	14.14	15.29	15.38	16.57	16.57	10	9
Students exceeding the ratio	40	-	-	-	-	-	-

Detail by School

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	4	5	6	K
Denio ES	N/A	N/A	8	8	8		9	8	8
Grass Valley ES	7%	100%	20	20	23	24			21
Kings River ES	N/A	N/A		4		4	4		
McDermitt Combined	N/A	100%	21	21	21	18	18	18	9
Orovada Elementary	N/a	100%	16	15	13	13	13	4	16
Paradise Valley ES	N/A	100%	7	11	10	11	6	6	7
Sonoma Heights ES	12%	100%	18	20	22	25			18
Winnemucca Grammar	12%	53%	17	24	19	21			20

Lander County School District

Lander County School District (Lander CSD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program in FY23 and requested no variances in Q1.

Detail by School

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	4	K
Austin K-12	N/A	N/A	11	10	10	10	10
Battle Mountain Elementary School	4%	48%	19	21	19	24	16

Lincoln County School District

Lincoln County School District implemented a regular class size reduction program in FY23. Lincoln CSD requested 18 variances across each of its elementary schools: one for every grade at Panaca, grades 1-5 at Pahrnagat Valley, and grades 4-6 at both Caliente and Pioche elementary schools. Lincoln CSD cited funding and facilities limitations as well as difficulty hiring for all schools and grades. Lincoln CSD utilized 10 renewal variances and 8 new variances.

District Overview

Lincoln CSD	K	1	2	3
Highest class size ratio	23	26	27	21
Lowest class size ratio	9	9	9	8
Average class size ratio	15.25	17.75	18.75	16
Students exceeding the ratio	-	16	20	-

Detail by School

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	4	K
Caliente ES	N/A	58%	9	14	14	8	9
Pahrnagat Valley ES	N/A	49%	26	25	21	23	15
Panaca ES	N/A	41%	22	27	21	17	23
Pioche ES	N/A	54%	14	9	8	9	14

Lyon County School District

Lyon County School District (Lyon CSD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program for FY23. Lyon CSD requested 16 variances: six for kindergarten, three each for third and fourth grades, and one each for first, second, fifth, and sixth. Lyon CSD cited funding and facilities limitations and hiring difficulties for all 16 variances. Lyon CSD utilized 6 renewal variances and 10 new variances.

District Overview

Lyon CSD	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
Highest class size ratio	23	23	24	25	26	26	26
Lowest class size ratio	15	17	17	15	9	14	17
Average class size ratio	17.89	20.44	21.22	20.89	23	20.5	21.5
Students exceeding the ratio	78	-	-	25	10	-	-

Detail by School

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	4	5	6	K
Cottonwood Elementary	6%	44%	20	22	25	24			23
Dayton Elementary School	8%	37%	22	24	21	26	20	21	18
East Valley Elementary	5%	37%	22	21	21	26			19
Fernley Elementary School	8%	43%	20	21	20	25			18
Riverview Elementary School	9%	37%	17	22	18	24	26	26	19
Silver Stage Elementary	3%	100%	20	20	23	26			16
Smith Valley Schools	N/A	16%	19	17	15	9	14	17	15
Sutro Elementary School	13%	42%	21	22	20	24	22	22	15
Yerington Elementary School	20%	100%	23	22	25	23			18

Mineral County School District

Mineral County School District (Mineral CSD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program for FY23. Mineral CSD requested one variance for kindergarten at Hawthorne Elementary, citing facility limitations and difficulty hiring.

Detail by School

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	4	5	6	K
Hawthorne Elementary	N/A	100%	19	13	18	19	19	21	19
Schurz Elementary	35%	100%	22	22	14	14	19	20	14

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 FY23 and requested 19 variances across six schools: five in kindergarten, four in fifth grade, three each in third and second grade, and two each in first and fourth. Nye CSD cited facility limitations at Floyd and JG Johnson elementary, as well as funding limitations and difficulty hiring for their remaining schools. Nye CSD utilized 8 renewal variances and 11 new variances.

District Overview

Nye CSD	K	1	2	3	4	5
Highest class size ratio	25	26	29	28	30	32
Lowest class size ratio	6	6	3	3	3	8
Average class size ratio	16.89	17.67	18.4	18.9	21	24.22
Students exceeding the ratio	78	23	27	26	27	56

Detail by School

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	4	5	K
Amargosa Valley Elementary School	29%	100%	13	21	15	23	23	16
Beatty Elementary School	N/A	100%	11	18	18	25	25	10
Duckwater Elementary School	N/A	N/A		3	3	3		
Floyd Elementary School	5%	100%	24	22	22	28	32	22
Gabbs Elementary School	N/A	100%	6	6	8	8	8	6
Hafen Elementary School	7%	100%	26	24	22	24	30	22
JG Johnson Elementary School	7%	100%	21	29	28	25	23	20
Manse Elementary School	10%	100%	20	19	22	30	31	19
Round Mountain Elementary School	N/A	100%	22	18	28	21	20	25
Tonopah Elementary School	N/A	100%	16	24	23	23	26	12

Pershing County School District

Pershing County School District (Pershing CSD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program for FY23. Pershing CSD requested one new variance for third grade, citing funding limitations.

Detail by School

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	4	5	K
Imlay Elementary	N/A	N/A	18	18	18	18	18	
Lovelock Elementary	4%	100%	17	19	26	24	18	14

Storey County School District

Storey County School District (Storey CSD) implemented an alternative class size reduction program for FY23. Storey CSD requested two variances for kindergarten, citing funding limitations.

Detail by School

Row Labels	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	4	5	K
Hillside ES	N/A	100%	19	14	14	13	13	20
Hugh Gallagher ES	N/A	37%	22	18	16	22	24	19

Washoe County School District

Washoe County School District (WCSD) implemented a regular class size reduction program for FY23. WCSD represents the third largest school district in Nevada, recently surpassed by enrollment under the State Public Charter School Authority, making up 13% of state enrollment and 15% of district enrollment. WCSD requested 212 variances – 19% of variances– with 60 variances in kindergarten, 57 in third, 50 in first, and 45 in second grade. WCSD cited funding limitations and hiring difficulties on all of their variances.

District Overview

WCSD	K	1	2	3
Highest class size ratio	25	21	23	28
Lowest class size ratio	14	10	7	13
Average class size ratio	20.34	17.65	17.35	21.35
Students exceeding the ratio	881	489	425	743

Detail by School

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	K
Alice Smith Elementary	22%	100%	16	18	22	21
Allen Elementary	41%	100%	20	20	19	22

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	K
Anderson Elementary	29%	100%	20	16	20	19
Beasley Elementary	5%	25%	20	17	21	24
Beck Elementary	6%	25%	17	19	19	23
Bennett Elementary	34%	100%	18	18	23	22
Bohach Elementary	9%	21%	20	21	22	23
Booth Elementary	22%	100%	16	19	20	18
Brown Elementary	6%	20%	17	18	21	21
Cannan Elementary	23%	100%	17	20	21	22
Caughlin Ranch Elementary	N/A	7%	21	16	28	21
Corbett Elementary	42%	100%	17	16	17	20
Desert Heights Elementary	19%	100%	17	16	24	21
Diedrichsen Elementary	8%	38%	15	17	20	22
Dodson Elementary	23%	100%	17	18	18	15
Donner Springs Elementary	20%	100%	21	16	19	20
Double Diamond Elementary	8%	37%	17	17	21	22
Drake Elementary	27%	100%	19	17	20	14
Duncan Elementary	40%	100%	15	16	21	17
Dunn Elementary	16%	100%	18	16	19	22
Elmcrest Elementary	14%	100%	20	18	27	14
Gomes Elementary	11%	100%	16	15	19	19
Gomm Elementary	4%	11%	21	22	24	18
Greenbrae Elementary	39%	100%	18	16	22	21
Hall Elementary	4%	26%	20	17	19	20
Hidden Valley Elementary	14%	100%	19	17	23	15
Huffaker Elementary	9%	30%	16	18	24	24
Hunsberger Elementary	N/A	5%	19	20	28	23
Hunter Lake Elementary	7%	39%	20	18	19	20
Incline Elementary	38%	41%	18	15	17	16
Inskeep Elementary	4%	29%	20	19	25	20
Juniper Elementary	18%	41%	18	17	24	20
Kate Smith Elementary	47%	100%	18	18	15	19
Lemelson Elementary	35%	100%	16	16	16	17
Lemmon Valley Elementary	22%	100%	19	18	22	24
Lenz Elementary	2%	13%	18	18	23	18
Lincoln Park Elementary	29%	100%	17	15	27	17
Loder Elementary	40%	100%	17	17	21	19
Mathews Elementary	37%	100%	19	17	23	23
Maxwell Elementary	30%	100%	20	21	21	21
Melton Elementary	3%	18%	17	18	19	22
Mitchell Elementary	33%	100%	16	19	25	22
Moss Elementary	9%	37%	18	16	25	17
Mount Rose Elementary	9%	27%	14	17	27	25
Natchez Elementary	N/A	100%	10	7	13	25
Palmer Elementary	36%	100%	18	16	22	23
Peavine Elementary	10%	100%	15	15	22	22

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	K
Pleasant Valley Elementary	3%	18%	16	18	18	17
Poulakidas Elementary	7%	15%	19	19	23	22
Risley Elementary	39%	100%	17	18	19	18
Sepulveda Elementary	12%	30%	18	17	21	20
Silver Lake Elementary	21%	41%	20	15	26	23
Smithridge Elementary	49%	100%	17	17	23	23
Spanish Springs Elementary	2%	18%	17	18	25	18
Stead Elementary	25%	100%	19	19	21	23
Sun Valley Elementary	42%	100%	18	17	22	19
Taylor Elementary	3%	27%	19	17	19	22
Towles Elementary	5%	37%	16	18	19	24
Van Gorder Elementary	2%	15%	17	18	24	20
Verdi Elementary	N/A	12%	13	16	17	17
Veterans Elementary	39%	100%	15	14	22	23
Warner Elementary	12%	100%	17	16	19	19
Westergard Elementary	7%	22%	18	19	23	22
Whitehead Elementary	10%	34%	18	23	20	18
Winnemucca Elementary	11%	44%	18	18	20	21

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 and a first-grade variance, citing funding limitations and difficulty hiring for all new variances.

District Overview

White Pine CSD	K	1	2	3	4	5	6
Highest class size ratio	23	23	22	22	19	21	15
Lowest class size ratio	17	9	9	8	9	15	8
Average class size ratio	15.5	19.33	15.75	17.8	14.8	15.2	15
Students exceeding the ratio	23	-	-	-	-	-	-

Detail by School

School Name	EL%	FRL%	1	2	3	4	5	6	K
Baker Elementary	N/A	N/A			15	15	15	15	
D.E. Norman Elementary	N/A	100%	23	16	21	19	21		23
Norman and McGill Online Schools	N/A	100%		9	9	8	9		8
Lund Elementary	N/A	32%	17	22	22	17	17		17
McGill Elementary	N/A	100%	18	16	22	15	14		14

Conclusion

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Amelia Thibault, Office of Division Compliance, via email at acthibault@doe.nv.gov or by phone at 775-687-2451.