


# Outcomes

State Board of Education Members will:

- Understand the methodology and approach to the Nevada ASD's recommendations 2017 conversion schools





1 The **Nevada Department of Education** publishes the list of **NV ASD Eligible Schools**  
 📅 October 15 ● NDE

2 **NV ASD** recommends at least **20%** of eligible schools for transformation to the State Board of Education.  
 📅 November 15 🕒 NV ASD

3 **State Board of Education** approves at least **50%** of the recommended schools  
 📅 Within 30 days 🕒 SBE



NV ASD selects up to six schools for transformation  
 🏠🏠🏠  
 📅 February 1 NV ASD

The approved schools for transformation are paired with authorized operators

School Operators  
 Transformation Teams

🏠  
 Achievement School  
 📅 Fall 2017



# Defining the Need



# How do Rising Star Schools Compare?

## ★★★★★ 5-Star School

9 of 10 Students are **proficient** in Reading and Math



Students are only **absent** 5 days per school year



Students of all backgrounds reach their **yearly** academic goals



8 of 10 high school graduates are **College-Ready** based on the ACT



**1 violent or serious incident** per 100 students



## Average Rising Star School

18% of Students are proficient in Reading and Math



Students are absent 13 or more days per school year



Less than 1 out of 20 student with IEPs are proficient in Reading and Math



4% high school graduates are **College-Ready** based on the ACT



4.6 violent or serious incidents per 100 students



Destination 5-Stars



# What we have heard from families...

- 56% of families who believe their school needs improvement
- 

*NOTE: there were 168 online responses from a single school (by far the largest concentration)*

- Removing that single school, 67% of families who believe their school needs improvement



# What we have heard from families...

- 44% of families believe that Quality of Instruction matters most for their student's education
- 69% of families believe that the Quality of Instruction needs improvement
- 65% of families surveyed by phone (656 Respondents) agreed that they would consider sending their children to other school options if they existed in their neighborhoods



# Building an Ecosystem: A CASE STUDY ON CLARK COUNTY





2016

2017

2018

2019

2020

# 86 Low Performing Schools (1 & 2 Star Schools)



2016

2017

2018

2019

2020

18 Schools in the Turnaround Zone



21 Schools in the Turnaround Zone  
 + 2 Schools in the NV Achievement School District



Average Growth  
Four Schools

2016

2017

2018


2019

2020

24 Schools in the Turnaround Zone  
+ 6 Schools in the NV Achievement School District



27 Schools in the Turnaround Zone  
 + 10 Schools in the NV Achievement School District



30 Schools in the Turnaround Zone  
 + 14 Schools in the NV Achievement School District



2016

2017

2018

2019



2020

# 42 Low Performing Schools


Deep Dive:  
CCSD Turnaround Zone School  
Selection




# Entry into the CCSD Turnaround Zone




# Entry into the CCSD Turnaround Zone




CCSD Average  
Proficiency (25+  
Students Assessed)




# Entry into the CCSD Turnaround Zone



CCSD 5<sup>th</sup> Percentile  
(25+ Students)




# Entry into the CCSD Turnaround Zone




CCSD Schools

CCSD Schools with fewer than 25 Students Assessed



# Entry into the CCSD Turnaround Zone




● A high school's performance on the state assessment in 2011 (the spring of the 2010-11 school year).

That school was selected to enter the Turnaround Zone in the fall of the 2011-12 School year.

- CCSD Schools
- CCSD Schools with fewer than 25 Students Assessed
- CCSD 5th Percentile (Schools with 25+ Students Assessed)
- CCSD Average (Schools with 25+ Students Assessed)
- Schools selected to enter Turnaround Zone for following School Year
- Schools Selected to enter Turnaround Zone in 2015 or 2016

# Entry into the CCSD Turnaround Zone

## High School Math Proficiency (Grade 11) Clark County School District



● A high school's performance on the state assessment in 2014 (the spring of the 2013-14 school year).



That school was selected to enter the Turnaround Zone in 2015 or 2016.

- CCSD Schools
- CCSD Schools with fewer than 25 Students Assessed
- CCSD 5th Percentile (Schools with 25+ Students Assessed)
- CCSD Average (Schools with 25+ Students Assessed)
- Schools selected to enter Turnaround Zone for following School Year
- Schools Selected to enter Turnaround Zone in 2015 or 2016

# Entry into the CCSD Turnaround Zone



- Schools are entering with a range of prior performance
- From 2011-2014, 2 schools out of 16 entering the Zone had scores in the bottom 5% of CCSD prior to entry
- For schools entering in 2015 or 2016, 3 of 7 schools had math and reading scores in the bottom 5% of CCSD in 2014.

# Entry into the CCSD Turnaround Zone: High Schools





- CCSD Schools
- CCSD Schools with fewer than 25 Students Assessed
- CCSD 5th Percentile (Schools with 25+ Students Assessed)
- CCSD Average (Schools with 25+ Students Assessed)
- Schools selected to enter Turnaround Zone for following School Year
- Schools Selected to enter Turnaround Zone in 2015 or 2016

# Entry into the CCSD Turnaround Zone: Middle Schools



- CCSD Schools
- CCSD Schools with fewer than 25 Students Assessed
- CCSD 5th Percentile (Schools with 25+ Students Assessed)
- CCSD Average (Schools with 25+ Students Assessed)
- Schools selected to enter Turnaround Zone for following School Year
- Schools Selected to enter Turnaround Zone in 2015 or 2016

# Entry into the CCSD Turnaround Zone: Elementary Schools



- CCSD Schools
- CCSD Schools with fewer than 25 Students Assessed
- CCSD 5th Percentile (Schools with 25+ Students Assessed)
- CCSD Average (Schools with 25+ Students Assessed)
- Schools selected to enter Turnaround Zone for following School Year
- School Selected to enter Turnaround Zone in 2015

*DATA DISCLAIMER: Assessment data files provided to you by ADAM/NDE are for informational purposes only. Although every reasonable effort is made to assure the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of the data as reported from the source documents or source data, reports are not represented to be error-free. Data may be subject to update and correction without notice and are not considered final until published in the Nevada Report Card.*

# Deep Dive: CCSD Turnaround Zone Current Performance






# Current Performance: Schools with 2 or more years in the Turnaround Zone

- Ten schools have exited and six are currently in the Zone and have been there for 2 or more years.



# Current Performance: Schools with 2+ years in Turnaround Zone



\*Data Disclaimer



Partnering to put kids first



# Opting-in to the NV ASD

- The Board of Andre Agassi Prep has elected to opt-in to the Nevada Achievement School District community engagement process to consider a partnership with a qualified operator.



# Approach to Recommending NV ASD Conversion eligible Schools



# Narrowing the list of Eligible Schools

- 13 charter schools are not eligible
  - 7 Sponsored by the Clark County School District
  - 4 Sponsored by the SPCSA
  - 2 Sponsored by Washoe County School District
- SPCSA has already put in place steps to remediate 3 of the 4 Rising Star Schools that they sponsor



# ASD Eligible Schools

- There are 34 schools eligible for the Nevada ASD
- This means we will recommend at least 7 Schools (at least 20%)



# School Recommendations Approach

- Evaluate schools within each category:
  - Student Proficiency
  - Student Growth
  - Equity (Proficiency among subgroups)
  - Other indicators
    - Attendance
    - Discipline
    - Teacher Vacancies
  - Community input



# School Recommendations Approach

- Use a Tiered System to demonstrate current performance across multiple measures
- Tier schools 1 through 3



# School Recommendations Approach

Tier	Description
1	IF...A school is high priority for several indicators, including Proficiency and/or Growth...THEN...they will be in Tier 1
2	IF...A school is high priority for some indicators, including either Proficiency or Growth...THEN...they will be Tier 2
3	IF...A school is high priority for few or no indicators, and medium or low priority for Proficiency and Growth...THEN...they will be Tier 3

# EXAMPLE: Student Proficiency

Proficiency Tier	Description
1	If the school is in the bottom 10th percentile now AND has either consistently been in the bottom 10th percentile OR trended downwards
2	If the school is in the bottom 10th percentile now AND has previously been mixed OR is not in the bottom 10th percentile but is trending down
3	If the school trending upwards OR is no longer in the bottom 10th percentile then it is a Tier 3 for Proficiency.

District	State Board District	School Name	2013 Prof. Math	2013 Perc. Math	2014 Prof. Math	2014 Perc. Math	2016 Prof. Math	2016 Perc. Math*	2013 Prof. Read	2013 Perc. Read	2014 Prof. Read	2014 Perc. Read	2016 Prof. Read	2016 Perc. Read*	ACT Comp.	ACT Perc.*
Clark	1	Cambeiro ES	42.4%	2	32.8%	2	14.1%	8	35.6%	1	36.2%	1	21.0%	5	N/A	N/A
Clark	4	Cox Clyde ES	57.4%	18	62.3%	38	10.5%	3	52.7%	19	58.7%	31	22.5%	6	N/A	N/A
Clark	1	Desert Pines HS	56.3%	11	54.5%	9	N/A	N/A	61.2%	7	61.5%	5	N/A	N/A	14.0	5
Clark	4	Bailey MS	26.7%	13	23.1%	7	12.9%	6	33.8%	6	37.8%	9	21.3%	5	N/A	N/A
Clark	4	Von Tobel MS	29.8%	18	29.9%	21	12.2%	5	45.1%	21	42.0%	15	19.9%	4	N/A	N/A
Clark	1	Global Community HS	37.7%	2	18.8%	1	N/A	N/A	13.2%	1	12.5%	1	N/A	N/A	12.9	4
Clark	4	Fitzgerald ES	36.1%	1	27.7%	1	14.8%	9	37.5%	2	24.3%	1	18.5%	2	N/A	N/A
Clark	4	Brinley MS	29.7%	17	33.3%	31	11.8%	4	39.6%	13	37.9%	9	20.4%	4	N/A	N/A
Clark	1	Jerome Mack MS	30.1%	20	24.2%	9	7.5%	1	49.0%	28	42.1%	16	23.7%	7	N/A	N/A
Clark	4	Craig ES	48.7%	7	46.9%	8	12.5%	5	41.1%	5	43.3%	6	22.9%	6	N/A	N/A
Clark	1	Monaco MS	25.6%	10	25.1%	10	15.1%	10	36.3%	9	31.9%	2	22.7%	6	N/A	N/A
Clark	4	Kelly ES	59.4%	22	31.9%	2	16.8%	13	64.4%	46	30.5%	1	14.2%	1	N/A	N/A
Clark	1	Petersen ES	44.4%	4	42.5%	4	14.2%	8	27.4%	0.2	36.4%	2	23.2%	7	N/A	N/A
Clark	4	Priest ES	48.7%	7	45.7%	7	25.3%	32	49.3%	12	46.9%	9	32.0%	21	N/A	N/A
Clark	1	Williams Tom ES	54.0%	12	49.4%	11	21.4%	22	37.1%	2	39.9%	3	25.5%	9	N/A	N/A
Clark	4	Williams Wendell ES	59.0%	21	59.5%	30	11.6%	4	41.0%	5	56.2%	25	13.4%	0.4	N/A	N/A
Clark	4	West Prep Sec MS	17.1%	6	17.9%	3	9.0%	2	25.9%	2	29.8%	2	19.7%	4	N/A	N/A
Clark	1	Orr MS	33.1%	24	23.7%	8	11.3%	4	37.5%	11	32.5%	3	23.1%	7	N/A	N/A
Clark	4	Lowman ES	47.2%	5	31.8%	2	17.1%	13	44.4%	7	40.9%	4	25.8%	10	N/A	N/A
Elko	2	Carlin HS	78.8%	45	78.1%	41	N/A	N/A	78.8%	35	75.8%	18	N/A	N/A	14.6	14
Elko	2	Owyhee ES	30.8%	1	28.9%	1	1.9%	0.4	40.0%	4	43.4%	6	18.4%	2	N/A	N/A
Elko	2	Owyhee MS	9.1%	2	17.5%	2	9.4%	2	33.3%	5	35.0%	6	16.1%	1	N/A	N/A
Elko	2	West Wendover ES ES	40.0%	1	41.3%	4	11.9%	4	36.5%	1	40.7%	4	13.5%	1	N/A	N/A
Elko	2	West Wendover HS HS	86.2%	68	71.9%	29	N/A	N/A	70.9%	20	75.0%	17	N/A	N/A	16.9	42
Elko	2	West Wendover MS MS	31.4%	21	26.6%	17	9.8%	2	40.0%	13	34.5%	6	22.7%	6	N/A	N/A
Mineral	4	Hawthorne E.S. ES	38.0%	1	30.9%	2	18.2%	15	56.9%	27	50.5%	13	30.0%	17	N/A	N/A
Mineral	4	Schurz ES	**	**	**	**	0.0%	0.2	**	**	**	**	6.5%	0.2	N/A	N/A
Nye	4	Round Mtn ES	60.4%	23	56.1%	24	16.7%	12	69.8%	58	63.2%	42	16.7%	1	N/A	N/A
Washoe	2	Desert Heights ES	50.9%	9	36.4%	3	18.4%	15	60.0%	33	42.9%	5	20.4%	4	N/A	N/A
Washoe	2	Natchez ES	68.6%	43	52.1%	15	12.9%	6	62.9%	42	58.9%	31	21.2%	5	N/A	N/A
Carson	2	Pioneer HS	47.4%	8	67.6%	18	N/A	N/A	51.3%	4	85.7%	50	N/A	N/A	15.3	22
Clark	1	Burk Horizon SW HS	39.2%	3	**	**	N/A	N/A	53.2%	5	48.4%	2	N/A	N/A	13.1	4
Clark	4	Desert Rose HS	**	**	**	**	N/A	N/A	**	**	**	**	N/A	N/A	12.2	1
Nye	4	Pathways HS HS	**	**	40.0%	3	N/A	N/A	61.5%	8	84.0%	45	N/A	N/A	15.0	17

\* Data Disclaimer

\*\*Less than 25 students assessed

**Bottom 10%**

District	State Board District	School Name	2013 Prof. Math	2013 Perc. Math	2014 Prof. Math	2014 Perc. Math	2016 Prof. Math	2016 Perc. Math*	2013 Prof. Read	2013 Perc. Read	2014 Prof. Read	2014 Perc. Read	2016 Prof. Read	2016 Perc. Read*	ACT Comp.	ACT Perc.*
Clark	1	Cambeiro ES	42.4%	2	32.8%	2	14.1%	8	35.6%	1	36.2%	1	21.0%	5	N/A	N/A
Clark	4	Cox Clyde ES	57.4%	18	62.3%	38	10.5%	3	52.7%	19	58.7%	31	22.5%	6	N/A	N/A
Clark	1	Desert Pines HS	56.3%	11	54.5%	9	N/A	N/A	61.2%	7	61.5%	5	N/A	N/A	14.0	5
Clark	4	Bailey MS	26.7%	13	23.1%	7	12.9%	6	33.8%	6	37.8%	9	21.3%	5	N/A	N/A
Clark	4	Von Tobel MS	29.8%	18	29.9%	21	12.2%	5	45.1%	21	42.0%	15	19.9%	4	N/A	N/A
Clark	1	Global Community HS	37.7%	2	18.8%	1	N/A	N/A	13.2%	1	12.5%	1	N/A	N/A	12.9	4
Clark	4	Fitzgerald ES	36.1%	1	27.7%	1	14.8%	9	37.5%	2	24.3%	1	18.5%	2	N/A	N/A
Clark	4	Brinley MS	29.7%	17	33.3%	31	11.8%	4	39.6%	13	37.9%	9	20.4%	4	N/A	N/A
Clark	1	Jerome Mack MS	30.1%	20	24.2%	9	7.5%	1	49.0%	28	42.1%	16	23.7%	7	N/A	N/A
Clark	4	Craig ES	48.7%	7	46.9%	8	12.5%	5	41.1%	5	43.3%	6	22.9%	6	N/A	N/A
Clark	1	Monaco MS	25.6%	10	25.1%	10	15.1%	10	36.3%	9	31.9%	2	22.7%	6	N/A	N/A
Clark	4	Kelly ES	59.4%	22	31.9%	2	16.8%	13	64.4%	46	30.5%	1	14.2%	1	N/A	N/A
Clark	1	Petersen ES	44.4%	4	42.5%	4	14.2%	8	27.4%	0.2	36.4%	2	23.2%	7	N/A	N/A
Clark	4	Priest ES	48.7%	7	45.7%	7	25.3%	32	49.3%	12	46.9%	9	32.0%	21	N/A	N/A
Clark	1	Williams Tom ES	54.0%	12	49.4%	11	21.4%	22	37.1%	2	39.9%	3	25.5%	9	N/A	N/A
Clark	4	Williams Wendell ES	59.0%	21	59.5%	30	11.6%	4	41.0%	5	56.2%	25	13.4%	0.4	N/A	N/A
Clark	4	West Prep Sec MS	17.1%	6	17.9%	3	9.0%	2	25.9%	2	29.8%	2	19.7%	4	N/A	N/A
Clark	1	Orr MS	33.1%	24	23.7%	8	11.3%	4	37.5%	11	32.5%	3	23.1%	7	N/A	N/A
Clark	4	Lowman ES	47.2%	5	31.8%	2	17.1%	13	44.4%	7	40.9%	4	25.8%	10	N/A	N/A
Elko	2	Carlin HS	78.8%	45	78.1%	41	N/A	N/A	78.8%	35	75.8%	18	N/A	N/A	14.6	14
Elko	2	Owyhee ES	30.8%	1	28.9%	1	1.9%	0.4	40.0%	4	43.4%	6	18.4%	2	N/A	N/A
Elko	2	Owyhee MS	9.1%	2	17.5%	2	9.4%	2	33.3%	5	35.0%	6	16.1%	1	N/A	N/A
Elko	2	West Wendover ES ES	40.0%	1	41.3%	4	11.9%	4	36.5%	1	40.7%	4	13.5%	1	N/A	N/A
Elko	2	West Wendover HS HS	86.2%	68	71.9%	29	N/A	N/A	70.9%	20	75.0%	17	N/A	N/A	16.9	42
Elko	2	West Wendover MS MS	31.4%	21	26.6%	17	9.8%	2	40.0%	13	34.5%	6	22.7%	6	N/A	N/A
Mineral	4	Hawthorne E.S. ES	38.0%	1	30.9%	2	18.2%	15	56.9%	27	50.5%	13	30.0%	17	N/A	N/A
Mineral	4	Schurz ES	**	**	**	**	0.0%	0.2	**	**	**	**	6.5%	0.2	N/A	N/A
Nye	4	Round Mtn ES	60.4%	23	56.1%	24	16.7%	12	69.8%	58	63.2%	42	16.7%	1	N/A	N/A
Washoe	2	Desert Heights ES	50.9%	9	36.4%	3	18.4%	15	60.0%	33	42.9%	5	20.4%	4	N/A	N/A
Washoe	2	Natchez ES	68.6%	43	52.1%	15	12.9%	6	62.9%	42	58.9%	31	21.2%	5	N/A	N/A
Carson	2	Pioneer HS	47.4%	8	67.6%	18	N/A	N/A	51.3%	4	85.7%	50	N/A	N/A	15.3	22
Clark	1	Burk Horizon SW HS	39.2%	3	**	**	N/A	N/A	53.2%	5	48.4%	2	N/A	N/A	13.1	4
Clark	4	Desert Rose HS	**	**	**	**	N/A	N/A	**	**	**	**	N/A	N/A	12.2	1
Nye	4	Pathways HS HS	**	**	40.0%	3	N/A	N/A	61.5%	8	84.0%	45	N/A	N/A	15.0	17

\* Data disclaimer

Tier 1 - Proficiency

Tier 2 - Proficiency

Tier 3 - Proficiency

# Proficiency

School Name
Cambeiro ES
Cox Clyde ES
Desert Pines HS
Bailey MS
Von Tobel MS
Global Community HS
Fitzgerald ES
Brinley MS
Jerome Mack MS
Craig ES
Monaco MS
Kelly ES
Petersen ES
Priest ES
Williams Tom ES
Williams Wendell ES
West Prep Sec MS

School Name (cont.)
Orr MS
Lowman ES
Carlin HS
Owyhee ES
Owyhee MS
West Wendover ES ES
West Wendover HS HS
West Wendover MS MS
Hawthorne E.S. ES
Schurz ES
Round Mtn ES
Desert Heights ES
Natchez ES
Pioneer HS
Burk Horizon SW HS
Desert Rose HS
Pathways HS HS

Tier 1 - Proficiency

Tier 2 - Proficiency

Tier 3 - Proficiency

# School Recommendations Approach

- Evaluate schools within each category:
  - Student Proficiency
  - Student Growth
  - Equity (Proficiency among subgroups)
  - Other indicators
    - Attendance
    - Discipline
    - Teacher Vacancies
  - Community input



# What to expect on November 15

- School profile
- Spreadsheet with complete data on all Eligible Schools



# School Profile Sample

## Why is SAMPLE School a Rising Star School?


- SAMPLE School qualifies as a Rising Star School because it was in the bottom five (5) percent of Elementary and Middle Schools in 2014 and in 2016.
- In 2016 SAMPLE School was in the bottom three (3) percent of elementary and middle schools in combined math and reading proficiency on the Smarter Balanced Assessment.

## How student achievement at SAMPLE School compare to the state and district?



### Background: 2015-16 Demographics

Total Enrollment	800
% of Students with IEPs	14.2%
% of ELL Students	29.3%
% of Students Qualifying for Free or Reduced Lunch	88.7%

### Math Proficiency



### Reading Proficiency



### Star Ratings

School Year	Star Rating (1 to 5)	Index Score (out of 100)
2015-16	<i>No Star Ratings Available</i>	
2014-15	<i>1-Star (Rating from 2013-14)</i>	<i>No Index Score Available</i>
2013-14	2-Star	41/100
2012-13	2-Star	33/100
2011-12	1-Star	31/100
<b>Summary</b>	<b>2-Star in all years rated since 2012</b>	

### Other Indicators

School Year	Average Daily Attendance (ADA)	Suspensions/Expulsions per 100 Students
2015-16	93.4%	6.8 Incidents per 100 Students
2014-15	93.7%	8.9 Incidents per 100 Students
2013-14	94.0%	7.6 Incidents per 100 Students
2012-13	93.5%	8.3 Incidents per 100 Students
2011-12	93.6%	7.4 Incidents per 100 Students
2010-11	94.9%	7.8 Incidents per 100 Students

# Appendix

District	State Board District	School Name	Rising Star Criteria Met	Current Interventions	Previous Interventions	Victory Funding?	Zoom Funding?	Total Enrollment	% IEP	% ELL	% FRL
Clark	1	Cambeiro ES	Bottom 5% (2016)	-	-	-	y (2013)	642	13%	63%	100%*
Clark	4	Cox Clyde ES	Bottom 5% (2016)	-	-	-	-	753	14%	50%	100%*
Clark	1	Desert Pines HS	Grad Rate Below 60%	CCSD TZ (2015)	-	-	-	2539	12%	26%	81%
Clark	4	Bailey MS	Botom 5% (2014); Bottom 5% (2016)	CCSD TZ (2014); SIG	-	-	-	1259	13%	30%	90%
Clark	4	Von Tobel MS	Bottom 5% (2016)	-	-	-	y (2016)	1187	12%	39%	95%
Clark	1	Global Community HS	Grad Rate Below 60%	-	-	-	y (2015)	194	8%	88%	63%
Clark	4	Fitzgerald ES	Botom 5% (2014); Bottom 5% (2016)	CCSD TZ (2015); Reinvent	Prime 6	y (2015)	-	472	16%	30%	100%*
Clark	4	Brinley MS	Bottom 5% (2016)	-	-	-	y (2016)	959	12%	28%	90%
Clark	1	Jerome Mack MS	Bottom 5% (2016)	-	-	-	-	1292	12%	33%	90%
Clark	4	Craig ES	Bottom 5% (2016)	-	-	-	y (2013)	724	12%	52%	100%*
Clark	1	Monaco MS	Botom 5% (2014)	-	-	y (2015)	-	1380	11%	36%	94%
Clark	4	Kelly ES	Botom 5% (2014); Bottom 5% (2016)	CCSD TZ (2015); Reinvent	Prime 6	y (2015)	-	341	23%	13%	100%*
Clark	1	Petersen ES	Botom 5% (2014)	Turnaround Grant	-	-	y (2013)	853	8%	45%	100%*
Clark	4	Priest ES	Botom 5% (2014)	CCSD TZ (2015)	-	-	-	831	14%	21%	82%
Clark	1	Williams Tom ES	Botom 5% (2014)	-	-	-	y (2013)	988	12%	65%	100%*
Clark	4	Williams Wendell ES	Bottom 5% (2016)	Reinvent	Prime 6	y (2015)	-	309	17%	20%	100%*
Clark	4	West Prep Sec MS**	Botom 5% (2014); Bottom 5% (2016)	-	-	y (2015)	-	1369	14%	23%	91%
Clark	1	Orr MS	Bottom 5% (2016)	-	-	-	y (2015)	906	14%	35%	89%
Clark	4	Lowman ES	Botom 5% (2014)	CCSD TZ (2015)	-	y (2015)	-	856	11%	22%	100%*
Elko	2	Carlin HS	Grad Rate Below 60%	-	-	-	-	104	26%	-	31%
Elko	2	Owyhee ES	Bottom 5% (2016)	-	-	y (2015)	-	188	15%	9%	65%
Elko	2	Owyhee MS	Bottom 5% (2016)	-	-	y (2015)	-	36	-	0%	78%
Elko	2	West Wendover ES ES	Bottom 5% (2016)	-	-	y (2015)	y	607	9%	40%	63%
Elko	2	West Wendover HS HS	Grad Rate Below 60%	-	-	-	-	320	10%	21%	68%
Elko	2	West Wendover MS MS	Bottom 5% (2016)	-	-	y (2015)	-	137	9%	37%	75%
Mineral	4	Hawthorne E.S. ES	Bottom 5% (2016)	-	-	-	-	247	19%	-	53%
Mineral	4	Schurz ES	Bottom 5% (2016)	-	-	-	y	65	22%	0%	100%
Nye	4	Round Mtn ES	Bottom 5% (2016)	-	-	-	-	142	14%	0%	8%
Washoe	2	Desert Heights ES	Botom 5% (2014)	WCSD AZ	-	-	-	486	30%	26%	100%*
Washoe	2	Natchez ES	Bottom 5% (2016)	-	-	y (2015)	-	171	29%	-	100%*
Carson	2	Pioneer HS	Grad Rate below 60%	-	-	-	-	120	10	-	48.33
Clark	1	Burk Horizon SW HS	Grad Rate below 60%	-	-	-	-	136	7.35	36.03	100%*
Clark	4	Desert Rose HS	Grad Rate below 60%	-	-	-	-	314	12.1	9.87	100%*
Nye	4	Pathways HS HS	Grad Rate below 60%	-	-	-	-	140	17.14	-	0

\*\*Enrollment and demographics include High School and Middle School

\*CEP or Provision 2

# Data Disclaimer (Reminder)

- **For 2016 Data:** *Assessment data files provided to you by ADAM/NDE are for informational purposes only. Although every reasonable effort is made to assure the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of the data as reported from the source documents or source data, reports are not represented to be error-free. Data may be subject to update and correction without notice and are not considered final until published in the Nevada Report Card.*