E. C. Best students will achieve a 10% gap reduction in MAPs reading deficiency.
Current data shows 60% of fall 2nd graders and 48% of fall 3rd Graders are deficient (score below the 40th percentile) as measured by NWEA MAP. (End of year 2nd 50% or less/3rd 38% or less) 40% of 2nd and 30% of 3rd graders are deficient in reading (decrease in deficiency of 20 and 18 percent)

Goal 1: Teachers will implement common pacing and assessment with Read Well and with fluency work. Additionally, teachers will collaborate and make instructional decisions based on student data. (pacing guides, walkthroughs, sign in sheets, student work/data) Complete

Goal 2: Differentiated Original Reading Instruction and ReadWell implementation, data based professional collaboration, and professional learning on Best Practices for Literacy.. (walkthroughs, lesson plans, and sign in sheets) Complete

Goal 3: Weekly collaboration around student data (formative and summative) and Read by Grade 3 monitoring (student data, teacher records, assessment data) Complete

Goal 4: Conducting timely safety drills as well as the use of Tribes and Bulldog bucks focuses on positive and proactive environments.. (drill records, lesson plans, walkthroughs, Bulldog store) Complete

Goal 5: Family Literacy Events help parents increase literacy learning at home, Family sessions provide additional resources. Partnerships with Pioneer Theater and the Churchill Coalition as well as Difference Maker assemblies increases community partnerships and participation. (calendar, sign in sheets, and artifacts) Complete

Goal 6: Monthly advisory meetings address budgetary guidelines and concerns. Complete

E. C. Best students will achieve a 10% gap reduction in MAPs math deficiency.
Current data shows 57% of 2nd and 51% of 3rd graders score below the 40th percentile as measured by NWEA MAP. 39% of 2nd are deficient (18% reduction and 34% of 3rd are deficient in math (17% reduction)

Goal 1: Teachers will implement common pacing and assessment with Eureka Math. Additionally, teachers will collaborate and make instructional decisions based on student data. (pacing guides, walkthroughs, sign in sheets, student work) Complete

Goal 2: Reteaching and regrouping of small groups in math. Data based professional collaboration (walkthroughs, lesson plans) Complete

Goal 3: Weekly collaboration around module assessments and gap data/ trends will guide instructional modifications (student data, teacher records, assessment data) Complete

Goal 4: Conducting timely safety drills as well as the use of Tribes and Bulldog bucks focuses on positive and proactive environments.. (drill records, lesson plans, walkthroughs, Bulldog store) Complete

Goal 5: Learning Strategists host family sessions that incorporate math activities. Additionally, parents are given math resources and have access to help with guiding students in math. (calendar, sign in sheets, artifacts) Complete

Goal 6: Monthly advisory meetings address budgetary guidelines and concerns. Complete
## Applied Analysis Projected Funding Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>75,676,452</td>
<td>77,480,354</td>
<td>71,034,706</td>
<td>73,132,100</td>
<td>1,803,902 2.4% (6,445,648) -8.3%</td>
<td>743,508 2.4% (3,898) 0.0%</td>
<td>846,348 2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill</td>
<td>31,191,320</td>
<td>31,934,828</td>
<td>31,930,930</td>
<td>32,777,278</td>
<td>61,429,334 2.4% (19,077,744) -17.5%</td>
<td>2,097,394 3.0%</td>
<td>2,677,786 3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>2,577,054,897</td>
<td>2,638,484,231</td>
<td>2,899,538,165</td>
<td>2,982,619,454</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
<td>83,081,289 2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>61,003,377</td>
<td>62,457,516</td>
<td>54,083,807</td>
<td>55,689,144</td>
<td>1,454,139 2.4% (8,373,709) -13.4%</td>
<td>1,605,337 3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elko</td>
<td>106,194,952</td>
<td>108,726,325</td>
<td>89,648,581</td>
<td>92,326,367</td>
<td>61,429,334 2.4% (19,077,744) -17.5%</td>
<td>2,097,394 3.0%</td>
<td>2,677,786 3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esmeralda</td>
<td>2,469,399</td>
<td>2,528,262</td>
<td>1,847,181</td>
<td>1,876,414</td>
<td>58,863 2.4% (681,081) -26.9%</td>
<td>846,348 2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka</td>
<td>10,726,032</td>
<td>10,981,708</td>
<td>4,407,925</td>
<td>4,523,611</td>
<td>255,766 2.4% (6,445,648) -8.3%</td>
<td>2,097,394 3.0%</td>
<td>2,677,786 3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>37,913,778</td>
<td>38,817,530</td>
<td>34,037,535</td>
<td>34,900,363</td>
<td>61,429,334 2.4% (19,077,744) -17.5%</td>
<td>2,097,394 3.0%</td>
<td>2,677,786 3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lander</td>
<td>12,789,550</td>
<td>13,094,415</td>
<td>11,861,774</td>
<td>12,224,698</td>
<td>304,865 2.4% (1,232,641) -9.4%</td>
<td>362,928 2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>13,398,773</td>
<td>13,718,160</td>
<td>11,828,276</td>
<td>12,181,183</td>
<td>3,893 0.0% (1,889,884) -13.8%</td>
<td>352,907 3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>80,849,885</td>
<td>82,777,106</td>
<td>81,276,414</td>
<td>83,562,946</td>
<td>1,297,221 2.4% (1,500,692) -1.8%</td>
<td>2,286,532 2.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral</td>
<td>7,129,979</td>
<td>7,299,936</td>
<td>7,636,943</td>
<td>7,858,600</td>
<td>169,957 2.4% (337,007) 4.6%</td>
<td>326,215 2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nye</td>
<td>57,362,646</td>
<td>58,730,001</td>
<td>51,556,019</td>
<td>52,913,046</td>
<td>1,367,355 2.4% (7,173,982) -12.2%</td>
<td>1,357,027 2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershing</td>
<td>9,589,496</td>
<td>9,818,081</td>
<td>9,300,503</td>
<td>9,560,374</td>
<td>228,585 2.4% (517,578) -5.3%</td>
<td>259,884 3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storey</td>
<td>7,582,697</td>
<td>7,763,446</td>
<td>6,171,995</td>
<td>6,347,503</td>
<td>180,749 2.4% (1,591,451) -20.5%</td>
<td>175,508 2.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe</td>
<td>518,664,721</td>
<td>531,028,148</td>
<td>559,721,109</td>
<td>576,317,549</td>
<td>12,363,427 2.4% (28,692,961) 5.4%</td>
<td>16,596,440 3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Pine</td>
<td>18,805,802</td>
<td>19,254,077</td>
<td>15,264,128</td>
<td>15,659,169</td>
<td>448,275 2.4% (3,989,949) -20.7%</td>
<td>395,041 2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Schools</td>
<td>335,826,578</td>
<td>343,831,686</td>
<td>392,018,151</td>
<td>405,136,563</td>
<td>8,005,108 2.4% (48,186,465) 14.0%</td>
<td>13,118,412 3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total School Districts</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,964,230,334</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,058,725,810</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,333,164,142</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,459,606,362</strong></td>
<td><strong>94,495,476 2.4%</strong> <strong>274,438,332 6.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>126,442,220 2.9%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Draft estimate based on current student-centered funding model. Subject to material review and revision.
2. Allocations reflect funding from all budget accounts, not just the Distributive School Account.

**For Churchill:**

This is TENTATIVE and should not be used to project funding for any future years; FY2020 & FY2021 are not accurate. Our adult education program was included incorrectly as a small school - correction will decrease our funding by $178,367. I have not confirmed the 2018 or 2019 figures displayed yet. This funding captures all operating local taxes (property, sales, vehicle, franchise, etc.) and all the categorical funding we receive. I will know more on this model after it is approved and we have a chance to work on it. The presentation was based on holding harmless to FY2019 total funding; amendment changed that to FY2020. That could increase our funding FY2022 under the new model as our FY2020 total funding will be lower because of the corrections.
Phyllys Dowd  
Director of Business Services  
Churchill County School District

We are neutral to the language introduced with SB543. We do welcome the conversation to change the funding model that Nevada uses to allocate the funding for education. There are both positive and negative aspects to this language.

The positives include:
- It is a model based on the needs of our students
- Has an ongoing plan for monitoring the model
- Protects the funding streams for education from being diverted
- Reduces the number of categorical funding streams
- Having a two-year implementation period
- Protects our ending fund balances

As with any positives, there are negatives:
- Special Education MOE issues when we have another recession by reducing the weighted funding will require the district to transfer more funds into that program thus reducing base funding disproportionately (Section 4 on page 6)
- There is no mention for adequate funding and how we are going to get there
- Funding for transportation has been discussed to be outside the model, but no information has been shared on what that actual means to the districts
- Same for food services

We do appreciate the proposed amendment language introduced tonight.

We are neutral because we have concerns with the overall effect on the district cannot be determined without more details. We anticipate a robust discussion once the actual funding model is released for us to calculate the net change for our district.

We acknowledge our colleagues and their opinions. We are all looking out the best for our students.
### Semester 1, 2017-2018
351 courses were attempted this semester
- 243 courses were completed with an average grade of 75%
  - 7 students earned an A
  - 66 students earned a B
  - 123 students earned a C
  - 44 students earned a D
  - 3 students earned an F
- 69% Completion Rate with an average score of 75%
- 108 courses were not completed ranging from 2% complete to 79% complete
  - 2 students completed between 77 - 75%
  - 20 students completed between 50 - 74%
  - 19 students completed between 32 - 49%
  - 41 students completed between 10 - 30%
  - 26 students completed less than 10%
- 59 Credit Recovery courses were completed
  - 1 student earned an A
  - 14 students earned a B
  - 29 students earned a C
  - 14 students earned a D
  - 1 student earned an F

### Semester 2, 2017-2018
353 courses were attempted this semester
- 254 courses were completed with an average grade of 76%
  - 12 students earned an A
  - 83 students earned a B
  - 106 students earned a C
  - 47 students earned a D
  - 14 students earned an F
- 72% Completion Rate with an average score of 76%
- 99 courses were not completed ranging from 0% complete to 97% complete
  - 4 students completed between 79 - 97%
  - 12 students completed between 50 - 71%
  - 11 students completed between 32 - 49%
  - 23 students completed between 10 - 30%
  - 49 students completed less than 10%
- 43 Credit Recovery courses were completed
  - 1 student earned an A
  - 5 students earned a B
  - 23 students earned a C
  - 12 students earned a D
  - 2 students earned an F

### Semester 1, 2018-2019
396 courses were attempted this semester
- 352 courses were completed with an average passing rate of 75%
  - 31 students earned a 90% +
  - 86 students earned a 80-89%
  - 140 students earned a 70-79%
  - 92 students earned a 60-69%
  - 3 students failed
- 88% Completion Rate with an average passing score of 72%
- 42 courses were not completed ranging from 2% complete to 81% complete
  - 4 students completed between 71 - 82%
  - 4 students completed between 52 - 70%
  - 15 students completed between 32 - 49%
  - 12 students completed between 12 - 29%
  - 7 courses were less than 10% complete
- 79 Credit Recovery courses were completed
  - 0 students earned an A
  - 17 students earned a B
  - 36 students earned a C
  - 26 students earned a D
  - 0 students earned an F