nevada kids count newsletter

WHAT'S NEW WITH KIDS?

January 2016

Computer Statistics for Nevada

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, in 2013, 90.1 percent of *Nevadans* lived in a household with a computer.[1] Nevada was one of 25 states whose rate was higher than the national rate of 88.4 percent.[2] Among the states, Utah topped the list with 94.9 percent of individuals who live in a household with a computer, and Mississippi bottomed out at 80.0 percent.[3]

In 2014, 87.4 percent of Nevada *households* were estimated to have had a computer; the corresponding figure for the United States was 85.1 percent.[4]

Nevada school districts have been investing in computers to prepare their students with the technology skills needed to compete in the high-tech, global work place. In 2014-2015, Nevada school districts' inventory of computers totaled 192,598, which results in a state average of 2.4 students per computer (see table on following page). Eureka County, with an inventory of 340 computers, had the lowest number of students per computer, 0.7. Douglas County, with 1,527 computers, had 4.0 students per computer. Clark County, the state's largest school district, with 140,162 computers, had 2.3 students per computer.

Fifty-four percent of the school districts' computers were less than five years old. Esmeralda County had 90 percent of its computers of this age, and Humboldt County had only 7 percent.

Among the states, Nevada ranks last (worst) on education as measured by four indictors, and Massachusetts ranks first (best).[5] So, how does Nevada compare to Massachusetts on technology in schools? In 2010-2011, Massachusetts reported an average rate of 3.0 students per computer in its school districts, slightly higher than Nevada's rate of 2.4 in 2014-2015.[6]

Based on the data, Nevada students appear to have access to computers at home and at school, which is important for improving educational outcomes.

---

[1]File, Thom and Camille Ryan, November 2014 "Computer and Internet Use in the United States," *American Community Survey Reports*, https://www.census.gov/history/pdf/2013comp-internet.pdf, as of 1/15/16.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

[4]U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder, Table B28003, Presence of a Computer and Type of Internet Subscription in Household, http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=bkmk, as of 1/15/16.

[5]The four education indicators are children not attending preschool, fourth graders not proficient in reading, eighth graders not proficient in math, and high school students not graduating on time. Source: Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2015, *KIDS COUNT Data Book 2015*.

[6]Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, *Technology Statewide Report 2010-2011*, http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/profiles/student.aspx?orgcode=00000000&orgtypecode=0&leftNavId=306&, as of 1/15/16. Data for 2014-2015 are not available, but the three students to one computer is still pretty accurate (Kenneth Klau, January 19, 2016, Digital Learning, Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary, Education, telephone interview.

Technology Data on Nevada Schools: 2014-2015

School District	*Number of Students*	*Number of Computers*	*Number of Students per Computer*	*Percent of Computers Less Than 5 Years Old*
Carson City	7,526	5,034	1.5	82
Churchill	3,488	1,061	3.3	40
Clark	318,040	140,162	2.3	49
Douglas	6,054	1,527	4.0	71
Elko	9,859	4,472	2.2	61
Esmeralda	74	50	1.5	90
Eureka	247	340	0.7	73
Humboldt	3,473	2,351	1.5	7
Lander	1,049	521	2.0	44
Lincoln	1,015	798	1.3	58
Lyon	8,065	2,187	3.7	72
Mineral	475	205	2.3	63
Nye	5,167	3,685	1.4	53
Pershing	692	277	2.5	42
Storey	401	416	1.0	69
Washoe	63,108	19,766	3.2	70
White Pine	1,250	465	2.7	82
TOTAL	459,095	192,598	2.4	54

Notes: Data as of spring.
District totals do not include state- or district-sponsored charter school data.
Source: Nevada Department of Education, *2014-2015 State Accountability Summary Report*, available online at http://www.nevadareportcard.com/di/, as of 1/15/16.

Rennae Daneshvary, PhD
Nevada KIDS COUNT

The views expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas or the Nevada System of Higher Education.

This research was funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation. We thank them for their support but acknowledge that the findings presented in this report are those of the author alone and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Foundation.