

December 2024

***Report of the Working Group on
Justice Engaged Students***

Improving Inter-Agency Collaboration To Better Understand Academic Performance & Needs of Justice Engaged Students



The recommendations contained within this report are a product of the interagency workgroup and should not be construed as officially endorsed recommendations, specific opinions, or legislative priorities of the participating state agencies.

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction.....	1
Complexities	1
Shared Beliefs & Themes of Discussions.....	2
System Problems, Recommendations and Paths Forward.....	3
Background	4
JES Working Group Membership	4
Defining “Justice Engaged Students”	5
Necessity Of The Work	5
Structure & Approach to Recommendations	5
Considerations & Limitations	6
JES Working Group Process	8
Level-Setting & Learning.....	8
Recommendation Development.....	8
The Data on Justice Engaged Students	10
Understanding the Purpose(s) of Data Collection.....	10
Data Deep Dive.....	10
Gaps in Data or Sharing & Future Data Opportunities	14
Recommendations & Policy Options	16
The Intended End State	16
Available Levers.....	16
Problem(s) To Solve	17
Key Problem to Supporting Justice Engaged Students Through Data.....	18
System Problem 1: Responsibility for Data and reporting.....	18
System Problem 2: Lack of Statewide System & Standards	19
System Problem 3: Limits on Data Sharing	22
System Problem 4: Gaps & Variations in Local Data	23
System Problem 5: Multiple Unique Identifiers	24
Summary of Recommendations	26
Legislative Actions	26
State Agency Actions	27
Appendix A: Justice Engaged Definitions	29
Appendix B: Data Inventory	35

Executive Summary

Introduction

To undertake a comprehensive effort to better understand the needs of and provide support to justice engaged students, the Colorado General Assembly passed House Bill 24-1216, the Justice Engaged Students in Education Act during the 2024 legislative session. One component of that legislation was the creation of an interagency working group to examine the data collected by the State and make recommendations relating to and based on that data. The Colorado Department of Education (CDE) was directed to convene that group which was to include representatives of CDE, the Division of Youth Services, the Department of Human Services and the Judicial Department. Pursuant to that legislation, members were appointed and the Justice Engaged Students (JES) Work Group was convened in July 2024.

Because of the short time for the JES Work Group to complete the work it was tasked with by the legislature, in addition to monthly three-hour meetings, each member met regularly with the facilitators supporting the Work Group and all members completed numerous tasks, exercises and intra-agency examinations or discussions between meetings.

Although the primary task assigned to the group were straightforward, the initial discussions quickly highlighted the challenges both to collecting or sharing data based on information collected by the state about this population of students. Many members of the working group entered the discussions with an assumption that there were very concrete actions that would be able to immediately address existing challenges for every sub-set of the justice engaged student population. As the group identified the scope of challenges, unique experiences and contexts of students with different types of justice engagement and the varying contexts within which each agency operates, it became clear that many of the ideas would require a multi-year, multi-faceted approach to changing agencies and systems.

Complexities

Among the complexities and challenges identified during the first half of the group's work together during August and September were:

1. The multiple purposes of data collection that directly shape how, when and what data is collected depending on whether the collecting agency is using the data for reporting and learning or for time-sensitive action and intervention;
2. The limits of an initiative that relied strictly on state agency and state held data in a system in which much of the data is collected locally;
3. The complex array of data protections, sharing limitations, formats and taxonomies used in data and agency or institutional resources, norms and cultures of data sharing;
4. The limitations on the membership of the JES Work Group which did not include key state agencies who collect and analyze relevant data such as the Colorado Department of Public Safety (CDPS), its Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) that oversees Juvenile Diversion functions and data in Colorado. These agencies are responsible for information on a large proportion of justice engaged students.

As noted in items 1, 2 and 3 above, across state agencies and data collections, there is significant variation in the frequency and schedule of data collection. Much of the data, especially within education, is collected annually with further time necessary for validation and analysis. In most cases, this data is used to help understand outcomes and inform large initiatives across a certain metric but is not set up to be used to respond immediately with services.

All of the above are challenges that can be overcome with a combination of:

1. Directions, mandates and resources provided to state agencies by the legislature;
2. Priorities, processes and practices of state agencies;
3. Collaboration across state agencies and with local partners.

Shared Beliefs & Themes of Discussions

Among the clear, consistent themes of conversations were the commitment to improving outcomes for justice engaged students, the belief that data is a critical tool for understanding how well the state is doing in serving this population and an understanding of the unique role each agency plays in this effort as well as the importance of collaboration.

The group's discussions highlighted shared beliefs that:

- An essential step for ensuring students are successful when transitioning back into their communities is supporting their educational progress;
- The purpose of data sharing is to improve services and support to students and better understand the challenge;
- Caution should be used in how information is shared about justice engaged youth to not create additional roadblocks to accessing education and protect a student and families privacy;
- Intentional, continued coordination of efforts, sharing of data and collaboration on a whole-of-system approach across state agencies is critical to maximizing the effectiveness of efforts and the outcomes for justice engaged students;
- Data-informed decision-making can better inform support for justice engaged students at an individual level to ensure they have the opportunity to meet CDE's goals for all students as outlined in the CDE Strategic Plan, graduation from high school and have at least one of the following:
 - Earned a [quality, in-demand non-degree](#) credential
 - Earned 12 college credits that count toward a postsecondary credential
 - Participated in one high-quality work-based learning (WBL) opportunity (from the Learning Through Work and Learning at Work on the [Work-based Learning Continuum](#))

As is further discussed in The Data on Justice Engaged Students section of this report, conversations throughout the Working Group's convening highlighted the dual uses of data and the role of each agency within these uses:

1. Transparency, Accountability & Learning: Ensuring there is consistent information for the General Assembly, the Governor, and the public that helps understand student outcomes and trends within the data.
2. Interventions & Actions: Ensuring there is data that helps staff of agencies, local education providers, or other organizations respond in a timely manner.

Throughout discussions, members emphasized the importance of each agency being clear on the use or purpose of any one data collection or program and of the role of their agency in using data.

System Problems, Recommendations and Paths Forward

After conducting a comprehensive inventory of current data collections and reports, the JES Work Group discussed the gaps in data or data sharing, differences in how data is used and the system-level challenges to creating the ideal state for leveraging data to support justice engaged students. During these discussions, the group identified one over-arching problem and five system level problems that each need to be addressed to position the state with the most comprehensive approach to the use of data in supporting justice engaged students.

The current collection processes and sharing (or lack of sharing) of data increases the risk that justice engaged students fall through the cracks and can be lost in a larger system. This can prevent or delay monitoring of academic performance or persistence, delay or mask the need for delivery of targeted interventions and supports to ensure their academic success and reduce opportunities to learn from the experience of these students.

Contributing to this current situation are five system level problems:

1. **Responsibility for Data and reporting.** Multiple state agencies are responsible for different data, oversight or reporting within the overall topic of the academic performance of justice engaged students.
2. **Lack of Statewide System & Standards.** There is an absence of standardized data collection procedures and/or a comprehensive statewide system across the education, judicial, public safety, and/or human services systems which leads to challenges within and across agencies;
3. **Limits on Data Sharing.** There are a variety of different state and federal statutes and rules that limit if and how data sharing can be conducted across state agencies;
4. **Gaps & Variations in Local Data.** There are gaps in available data at the local and state level for all of the definitions of justice engaged youth *and* there is inconsistency in data sharing across local agencies;
5. **Multiple Unique Identifiers.** There are different individual and student identifiers used across education, judicial, and human services that limits data sharing.

Each of these system level problems involves multiple components including technical, resource and practices or processes. Some of these will require changes at both the state and local levels for maximum improved awareness or opportunities for support while others can be addressed by specific actions or shifts within one or more state agencies.

In the Recommendations and Policy Options section of the report, the group provides specific steps that should be taken by both the legislature and by state agencies. While incremental improvements are possible by the actions of one or more agencies acting alone, they will be significantly limited without legislative action.

Background

During the 2024 legislative session, the General Assembly passed, and the Governor signed, HB 24-1216: Supports for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System. The legislation contained several components. In addition to creating the Justice Engaged Students (JES) Interagency Working Group, HB24-1216 established a Justice-engaged student’s bill of rights. The bill also directed the Department of Education to provide guidance on participation in school activities, to establish a hotline for justice engaged students and their families, directed the promulgation of rules relating to credit transfer and established additional support requirements for justice engaged students in small and rural districts.

The JES Working Group’s charges as defined by HB24-1216 are to:

“at a minimum, review and make recommendations to the Department of Education and the Joint Education Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate no later than December 1, 2024 regarding:

- a) Criteria and a mechanism for identifying and quantifying the number of justice engaged students;*
- b) Indicators of and contributing factors to academic attainment;*
- c) Data-sharing agreements and regulatory and statutory changes required to implement the recommendations;*
- d) Additional funding or system enhancements required to implement the recommendations made pursuant to this subsection; and*
- e) Any other recommendations that the Interagency Working Group finds relevant to better understand outcomes for justice engaged students and ways the state can support this population.”*

JES Working Group Membership

The JES Working Group membership was defined by legislation and included representatives from:

- Colorado Department of Education (CDE)
- Colorado Department of Human Services (CDHS) and its Division of Youth Services (DYS)
- Colorado Judicial Branch and its Division of Probation Services

In addition to the appointed members, additional staff and leadership of each participating agency were engaged by members and the facilitators during the process. As is discussed elsewhere in this report, additional outreach was conducted to add the perspectives and relevant program or data information from other state agencies including the Department of Public Safety, not represented in the official membership.

Defining “Justice Engaged Students”

The legislation establishing the JES Working Group defined a Justice Engaged Student as “a student who is involved in the criminal justice system in any capacity, including, but not limited to, adjudication, probation, ticketing, detention, diversion, commitment, or community service.” Conversations among members of the Working Group surfaced multiple definitions or interpretations of the term Justice Engaged (or Justice Involved) in referring to students who have had an interaction or involvement with the justice system. The definition contained in HB24-1216 was used to guide the discussions of the Working Group. As is discussed later in the report, the participating state agencies did not or do not currently collect information for each of the categories listed in legislation.

Necessity Of The Work

The JES Working Group was created, in part, because of the historic lack of an intentional and strategic structure for data sharing and coordination between state agencies in support of justice engaged students. While each of the individual agencies has and does undertake great efforts to support these students, they do so through the more narrow lens of the mission of their agency, of each division or program and their unique role in serving this population. It was essential therefore to create a baseline understanding between the JES Working Group members about each agency’s work and data sharing practices.

Structure & Approach to Recommendations

Approach/Options

The Recommendations and Policy Options contained in this report were developed to provide leaders with multiple paths forward. Some of these options, while discussed in the workgroup, would be a major shift in how agencies currently operate. The group discussions included an acknowledgement of the fiscal realities for the State today, the local control dynamics of the state and the already extensive reporting requirements placed on state and local agencies alike. The group also maintained an ambitious view of what is possible within current constraints and if there were fewer or no constraints on the ability to collect, share and act on data.

Recommendations are offered in this report along a continuum including:

- *What is possible with a shift in priorities or internal resource allocation with minimal or no additional investment;*

HB24-1216, THE LEGISLATION THAT CREATED THIS WORKING GROUP, LISTS DIFFERENT TYPES OF INVOLVEMENT IN THE JUSTICE SYSTEM WHILE NOTING THE DEFINITION INCLUDES, BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO THESE:

- ADJUDICATION
- DETENTION
- COMMITMENT
- PROBATION
- DIVERSION
- TICKETING
- COMMUNITY SERVICE

More detailed definitions and detail about each of these types of involvement and other aspects of the juvenile justice system are included in Appendix A, Justice Engaged Definitions.

- *Improvements in data use to inform supports for justice engaged students through expanded data sharing and inter-agency collaboration with modest to moderate investment of staff time;*
- *Transformational changes possible through expanded sharing of data between the state and local partners, additional areas of focus for an agency, or through substantive investment of resources and political capital in the effort.*

Examples of elements of a comprehensive, multi-year strategy with actions at each of these levels could include:

- ✓ Establishing a standing inter-agency working group to ensure collaboration and maximizing the use of data-sharing between agencies;
- ✓ Developing tools, protocols and agency norms for cross-walking information across databases and multiple unique identifiers in use;
- ✓ Significantly expanding the aggregation or collection of locally held data to empower the state with a more comprehensive picture through the development of a standardized, statewide system.

Considerations & Limitations

A consistent topic of discussion for the JES Working Group were the practical considerations and limitations of inter-agency or statewide data sharing and use. Members identified three broad categories of limitations that will need to be addressed in all efforts going forward:

- Restrictions on Sharing Data and Information;
- Limitations of JES Working Group Membership;
- Limitations of Local Data Available to State Agencies.

Restrictions on Sharing Data and Information

There are numerous restrictions that limit the sharing of data or information, particularly when it contains personally identifiable information (PII). These restrictions range from state or federal legal requirements on the handling of data to agency policies, rules on sharing judicial data on minors, district or local agency policies and the norms or standards that are sometimes embedded into the culture or practices of different state and local agencies.

At the state agency level, there are multiple such restrictions relating to the release or sharing of a minor's records within the Judicial agencies and the Department of Youth Services.

FERPA restrictions apply to school created and maintained records. Per the 2022 Attorney General's guidance in their School Safety Legal Manual, records created by local law enforcement are not protected by FERPA unless they are used by school officials to discipline the student. There are additional exceptions that specifically address the disclosure by schools to criminal justice agencies. Schools are required or permitted to disclose to criminal justice agencies (CJAs) when it involves an active investigation, an offense against a school employee, minors under court supervision or certain information tracked by school resource officers.

Limitations of JES Working Group Membership

Discussions within and outside of the JES Working Group highlighted the need to engage even more state agencies, coordinating bodies and councils in the work to support justice engaged students going forward. Though not appointed to serve on the JES Working Group, the Colorado Department of Public Safety (CDPS) and its Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) Office of Research and Statistics (ORS) is mandated to collect and report data on criminal justice contacts with students, pursuant to 24-33.5-503 (1) (aa) & (2) [see also, 20-1-113 and 22-32-146(5), C.R.S.]. That information is published on a [web-based dashboard maintained by ORS](#). The Alternative Metrics Working Group established in [Senate Bill 2024-029](#) is convened by DCJ as a working group to make recommendations to the Colorado General Assembly regarding metrics other than recidivism to assess criminal justice system outcomes. Among the topics to be examined by that group is education. The Office of Adult and Juvenile Justice Administration (OAJJA) at CDPS supports, administers grants and collects data on and from the State's twenty-two judicial districts' juvenile diversion programs. OAJJA also administers and supports the [Colorado Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention \(JJDP\) Council](#) which is appointed by the Governor as the State Advisory Group pursuant to the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act and is charged under the Act to advise and make recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature on juvenile justice issues. The Council reviews and approves applications for federal grant funding through the JJDP Act, monitors and evaluates projects funded, and oversees compliance with the core requirements of the JJDP Act. Among the JJDP's committees are a diversion committee and an education committee.

Limitations of Local Data Available to State Agencies

In addition to the above highlighted state agency voices that should be engaged in efforts going forward, there is significant data that is collected and lives exclusively at the local level. This includes data on activities involving municipal courts, certain law enforcement contacts that occur outside of and away from school property and information collected or known by local education providers that state agencies are not explicitly directed or authorized to collect.

As a result of the above limitations on data collection, the information about justice engaged students that is known by the state is limited, particularly as it relates to those individuals whose interactions or involvement with the justice system did not include one of the factors that would cause a state agency to collect that information. The historic lack of comprehensive, intentional and supported collaboration between state agencies creates additional limitations such as those described above relating to CDPS, DCJ and OAJJA. There are other state bodies such as the District Attorney's Diversion Council who, similar to the professionals at CDPS, have not historically been engaged in discussions or inter-agency collaborations about student outcomes even when they include outcomes for students who have been justice engaged.

It is also important to note and to keep as a consideration going forward that a student being engaged with the justice system rarely occurs in isolation. There are multiple other factors of intersectionality ranging from mental or behavioral health and child welfare considerations to foster care, parental involvement in the justice system and learning or developmental disabilities. To look exclusively at academic attainment of justice engaged students will tell an important part of the story but it will not be a complete assessment and could miss critical other contributing factors if they are not examined in parallel.

JES Working Group Process

Leaders from the Colorado Department of Education worked with the facilitators to design a process that would empower members to bring their unique professional experiences and expertise to the group, draw on the varying perspectives and set an aspirational vision of what is possible in supporting justice engaged students. The group held monthly three hour meetings with extensive efforts between meetings.

Members of the Working Group all contributed to the success of the group by attending monthly meetings, holding agency-specific discussions with the facilitators and undertaking tasks, research and idea development as well as reading the input of their peers between meetings. This allowed the time together during monthly meetings to focus on idea generation, problem solving and collaborative solution development.

Level-Setting & Learning

During the earlier meetings in July and August of 2024, the group sought to align on a clear picture of success, the need to develop recommendations that balanced bold, aspirational thinking with a recognition of the practical constraints. Early conversations also surfaced the need to focus on a mix of the “low hanging fruit” that could be acted on swiftly to begin gathering or analyzing data that would provide more information *and* setting out a comprehensive picture of steps to be taken that could take years to fully implement.

To create a full assessment of the data currently collected by participating agencies, a data inventory spreadsheet was created that was used to capture information about existing data uses and collections. That inventory, summarized in Appendix B to this report, includes:

- Data type, purpose & collection;
- Summary of information collected;
- Identifier used;
- Frequency of updates;
- Existing data sharing agreements and sharing restrictions;
- Descriptions of reports generated from the data;
- Whether and how the data provides direct or indirect information relating to:
 - Attendance;
 - Academic performance;
 - K-12 matriculation;
 - Post-secondary enrollment and persistence; *or*
 - Employment.

Recommendation Development

The data inventory was used as one element of a conversation in which members were asked to meet within their agency in advance of the working group meeting on what could be done in three scenarios:

1. With no changes in data collection or sharing, what is one thing you could do with data already collected by your agency? *For this scenario, assume no additional FTE or resources AND assume an agency level determination to prioritize this work;*
2. With greater data sharing between agencies OR with additional resources in your agency, what is one thing you could do leveraging your existing data and that of another agency?
3. With expanded sharing of data by local agencies to the state, what is one thing you could do to address the purposes described above? What is that local data and its source? What (if you know it), is the current obstacle to sharing?

Each agency shared their ideas and the group was invited to ask questions, build upon ideas shared and offer ways to collaborate at each of these levels of change. These discussions were also used to surface challenges, barriers or problems in systems or practices to accomplish the outcomes or new efforts discussed.

Based on the discussion, a set of problem statements was drafted and circulated for discussion. During the subsequent working sessions, members refined those problem statements and focused on developing recommendations for policies, systems or practices to address each problem.

The members developed the ideas discussed above with recognition of the need to do so as part of a comprehensive, sustainable and long-term strategy that recognized fiscal and practical constraints without letting those be an excuse for inaction.

The foundational cornerstones of the JES Work Group recommendations include actions by the Colorado General Assembly and by executive branch state agencies as is highlighted below and detailed in this report.

Legislative Action

- Legislative direction to maximize the use of data sharing agreements across state agencies;
- Creation of a standing inter-agency work group to coordinate data collection and reporting;
- Legislative direction and resources to explore and where possible establish statewide information system;
- Legislative clarification of when a district must be notified of a students' justice involvement.

State Agency Actions

- Consistent collaboration across all state agencies to maximize the sharing and use of data;
- Creation of a centralized repository of all agency reports, research, ongoing efforts or other information about justice engaged students;
- Create intentional system and standards for communication to better support sharing of information that helps support a justice engaged student in re-entering a district school;
- Collaborative development of processes or tools for matching data drawing from databases with different unique identifiers for individuals.

The Data on Justice Engaged Students

Understanding the Purpose(s) of Data Collection

Across state agencies and data collections, there is significant variation in the frequency and schedule of data collection. This reflects the multiple uses or purposes of data collection. As a result of the differing purposes, much of the data, especially within education, is collected annually with further time necessary for validation and analysis. In most cases, this data is used to help understand outcomes and inform large initiatives but is not set up to be used to respond immediately with services.

Workgroup members emphasized that in addition to identifying gaps in collection or sharing, a clearly articulated purpose for the use of the data is essential. This is especially true when considering any new or changed efforts. These different uses intersect with agency purpose, role and mission.

For the participating state agencies, there are two primary purposes of data collection:

1. Reporting, Transparency and Learning. This includes cases in which data is used for accountability and for providing public or stakeholder transparency into different information, conditions or the effectiveness of programs. For state agencies, this is a critical tool to inform their work and where additional support or shifts in approaches at a system level may be needed.

2. Student and Family Response, Intervention or Action. This is a smaller set of more timely and time-sensitive data that can be used for taking targeted intervention or action to support an individual student. This requires frequent collection and monitoring of the data and is utilized by agencies whose role focuses on the individual rather than a broad cohort or population (ie a probation officer having information about an individual they are working with). In some cases, annual information can be compiled from this to inform the first purpose, such as the annual report by DYS of youth who were committed to a detention facility during the previous year.

Members all agreed that each of these uses need to inform the policies, data collections, data sharing and resource allocation or priorities within each agency. A critical component to success is clarity at the state, agency, division and program level regarding the purpose of any one or more data collections and the overall role of the agency or program.

For example, *it is not the role of CDE to provide direct interventions to students or families.* Whether there is a role for CDE or other executive agencies to play in collecting & managing data in a way that enables others to do so is something to be determined by executive and legislative branch leadership. It is important to note that doing so would be a significant shift. This example and distinction in purpose is true with different considerations across state agencies.

Data Deep Dive

An inventory and map of the data collected by the agencies represented on the JES Working Group is included as Appendix B to this report. It is important to note that this does not include data collected, held or owned by other agencies who were not part of this group including the Colorado Department of Public Safety (CDPS), the Office of Adult and Juvenile Justice Administration (OAJJA) at CDPS. As is noted elsewhere in this report, the state does not collect and has very limited

access to data that is collected or owned by local agencies including but not limited to municipal courts, District Attorney's Offices and their Diversion programs.

The data inventory exercise, the results of which are contained in Appendix B, highlighted both the breadth of data being collected by state agencies and the gaps in either how that data is used, how it is shared or what data is assessed and reported in useful, timely ways. The data mapping did reveal a number of opportunities for reporting on certain aspects of academic attainment among justice engaged students within existing reports and data collections and often without need for significant additional resources. These examples do require additional data sharing such as the need for a data use and sharing agreement to be established between CDE and Justice if either agency were to report on outcomes among justice engaged students.

While there are multiple data collections that contain information about attendance or academic progression that could be used to report on the performance of justice engaged students as a population and disaggregated to report on sub-sets of this population, there are significant gaps in more detailed information. For example, there are few if any data collections that contain the information to easily report on K-12 completion, post-secondary enrollment and persistence or employment among this population during or after their justice engagement.

HB24-1216 defines justice engaged students as including, but not being limited to the following statuses or sub-categories of justice involvement:

- Adjudication
- Probation
- Ticketing
- Detention
- Diversion
- Commitment
- Community Supervision

The table on the following page provides a high-level summary of the data collected by state agencies that does or may include data relating to each status.

Data collected by justice engagement status or category across state agencies

Agency	Adjudication	Probation	Ticketing	Detention	Diversion	Commitment	Community Supervision	Notes
CDE	No	No	No	No	No	Yes, enrollment and performance if enrolled during state testing.	No	*CDE has "referral to law enforcement" as a type of discipline, but collects no further information on the resulting steps
Judicial: Probation	Yes, JPOD	Yes, JPOD	No	Yes, JPOD	No	Yes, JPOD	Yes, JPOD (Adjudicated, Deferred Adjudications, Supervised and Unsupervised)	Probation has access to Judicial Records through the Judicial Paper On Demand (JPOD) System. Ticketing enter is based on level of offense. Judicial does not have access to municipal court data.
Judicial: Other	Yes, JPOD	Yes, JPOD	No	Yes, JPOD	No	Yes, JPOD	Yes, JPOD (Adjudicated, Deferred Adjudications, Supervised and Unsupervised)	Probation has access to Judicial Records through the Judicial Paper On Demand (JPOD) System. Ticketing enter is based on level of offense. Judicial does not have access to municipal court data.
CDHS: DYS	Yes, Trails (Detained, Committed, Paroled Population Only)	No	No	Yes, Trails	No	Yes, Trails	Yes, Trails (Detained, Committed, Paroled Population Only)	
CDHS: Other	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Other State Agency			CDPS ORS has data for all LE encounters on school property		CDPS, OAJJA have data reported by DA Offices (Diversion Directors).			

Relating to the specific topics identified in HB24-1216, the following data collections that are detailed in Appendix B provide or could be further utilized to provide data regarding the first two topics of inquiry identified in the legislation:

“at a minimum, review and make recommendations to the Department of Education and the Joint Education Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate no later than December 1, 2024 regarding:

1. Criteria and a mechanism for identifying and quantifying the number of justice engaged students”

- a. *CDPS collects data from local LEOs and CBI data on the number of law enforcement encounters with students where the point of contact is on school grounds.*
- b. *The Office of Adult and Juvenile Justice Administration (OAJJA) in CDPS’ Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) collect data from District Attorney’s Diversion Directors Offices.*
- c. *CDHS/DYS collects data about the detention population that includes a student-level identifier. This information is available in Monthly, Quarterly, Annual Updates; Includes Detaining Authority. Importantly, this is dynamic and recorded with time stamps. A youth may be initially detained by Law Enforcement, and the detaining authority transitions to the Courts following review. CDHS-DYS also has data with cross-system matching identifiers. Available in Monthly, Quarterly, Annual Updates; Without access to Trails, personal information is needed to match youth across data systems. Common identifiers used in the matching process by DYS when working with State Court Administrator’s Office, Collaborative Management Program, and others;*
- d. *Judicial collects data in the Judicial Paper on Demand (JPOD) system that can provide data on adjudication, probation, detention, commitment and community supervision (Adjudicated, Deferred Adjudications, Supervised and Unsupervised). Ticketing data entry is based on level of offense. Judicial does not have access to municipal court data.*

2. Indicators of and contributing factors to academic attainment;

- a. *CDE collects extensive student population data that, with additional analysis and cross-matching with other databases, could provide greater insights into the academic performance of justice engaged students. While current collections only cover a small portion of the students within the justice engaged definition (those students who were in detention prior to sentencing), with data sharing and use cases, additional analysis could be created. In addition to the October Count data, collections managed by CDE that could provide information about academic attainment for this population include:*
 - i. *Student End of Year: Graduation/Completion. Enrollment records for all students in CO public schools and detention centers, including entry/exit types to show status when they joined or left a LEP. Enrollment records are used alongside Anticipated Year of Graduation (AYG) to determine the graduation/completion cohort for a student;*
 - ii. *Student End of Year: Dropout & Mobility Stability. Enrollment records for all students in CO public schools and detention centers, including entry/exit types to show status when they joined or left a LEP. Enrollment records are used to*

determine 7th-12th grade membership and dropout status. CDE could add an annual indicator for any of the categories of justice engagement that if an LEP knew, they could complete to determine mobility/stability rates for students who were justice engaged at any point during the school year. CDE could also calculate the average number of mobility instances for a student who was justice engaged during the school year for the parts of the justice engaged definitions. Detention centers do not receive mobility/stability rates.;

iii. Attendance. Student level attendance information used to determine attendance rates, truancy rates, habitually truant student counts, and chronic absenteeism rates. With data sharing, use of previous year's enrollment data, or the addition of an indicator for any of the categories for 'justice engaged' to allow the possibility of creating rates based upon this group of students, but those rates would be based upon the student's attendance within a school district. Detention centers are excluded from the publicly posted rates.

b. CDHS/DYS also collects information on:

- i. Credit Recovery. This includes data about the population of students committed to a DYS facility including Academic Proficiency, Academic Achievement, Academic Growth, College Readiness, Median Achievement Percentile, Graduation Status. Available data points are condensed here for Credit Recovery discussions: Essential in the re-entry process, and transitioning youth back into their communities. Data connected to Trails ID. Reported in Aggregate in Annual Educational Outcomes Report to Colorado Legislature for students discharged from DYS care during prior FY (2024-25 report includes outcomes for youth discharged in 2023-24).*
- ii. Academic Services. Available data points are condensed here for Credit Recovery discussions: Academic services and supports. Reported in Aggregate in Annual Educational Outcomes Report to Colorado Legislature for students discharged from DYS care during prior FY (2024-25 report includes outcomes for youth discharged in 2023-24).*

Gaps in Data or Sharing & Future Data Opportunities

Identifying the current placement of justice engaged students is challenging. The Division of Youth Services Education Department experiences similar challenges returning students to their school districts. An interface allowing CDE, School Districts, DYS, and others engaged in this process to share data would allow staff to identify current and previous student location. Data retained in the system could include historical context regarding prior school district(s) and reflect steps to return students to their community following justice engagement.

In addition, additional work between DYS and CDE, with input from local education providers is necessary to confirm what would be needed to ensure credits attained while in the care of DYS will transfer to a local education provider. With expanded sharing and the movement of information between CDE, Colorado School Districts, and DYS for students experiencing extended detention

stays while pending court hearing, and students committed to the care of DYS, it's possible to crosswalk and confirm the alignment of demonstrated proficiency in academic subjects.

Data Scenarios Identified for Further Learning

Discussions of the JES Working Group surfaced multiple, specific studies or analyses that would position the state to better support justice engaged students directly or by providing more information and more timely information to local leaders.

Among the analyses identified by the group as helpful would be data collections and report on justice engaged students as a cohort including disaggregated by type of justice involvement:

- A. The absolute performance and educational attainment of the individual student or group of students as measured by grade completion, high school graduation, GED, PSAT/SAT or CMAS after involvement;
- B. The relative performance and educational attainment of the individual student or group of compared to a cohort of their peers;
- C. The relative performance of a cohort of some or all students in a detention facility vs. a cohort of their peers in public schools;
- D. The rate of post-secondary enrollment and completion relative to their peers including 2-year or 4-year college, industry certificate, credential program or trade school;
- E. The rate of enrollment relative to their peers in district-based early college programs;
- F. The rate of drop-out prior to graduation or GED including when after release from detention they stopped attending;
- G. The differences in any of the above or general education persistence across different types of offenses that led to being justice engaged (e.g. violent crime vs. property crime)?
- H. The rates of recidivism or re-engagement with justice system vs. educational activities (e.g. rates of either for those who do or do not return to K-12 OR rates compared to educational attainment).

For each of these analyses, decisions would need to be made about how long after justice involvement data would be analyzed.

Recommendations & Policy Options

The following pages contain the current problems or barriers that the workgroup identified within the existing landscape of data collection and reporting. As is discussed throughout this report, recognizing that data can serve two purposes is critical to understanding both the nature of the problem to solve and the tools appropriate to solving for one or both purposes. Where possible, the JES Working Group members offer recommendations along a continuum of cost or other resource needs. Some of the challenges require state and local leaders in partnership with all of the involved or affected stakeholders, to consider the appropriate or desired role of the state vs. role of local agencies to determine the path forward.

The Intended End State

The ideas and recommendations on the following pages are presented as individual tactics that, when combined, comprise a whole-of-system, multi-faceted and likely multi-year strategy to position the state to maximize its ability to support justice engaged students.

The recommendations are designed to serve three goals:

1. Significantly increase the state's knowledge about the academic progress and performance of justice engaged students as a cohort and disaggregated by key groupings;
2. Increase the ability to provide more robust and timely information to local education providers and other agencies who can take time-sensitive action to support these students and their families;
3. Increase alignment across agencies and, to the extent possible, with other offices, boards or bodies of state government to support the goals above and the ideas shared throughout this section.

Available Levers

Recognizing the complexities of the issue and the need to take action using all available levers regardless of the resources available in the current fiscal environment, the JES Working Group examined and offers ideas across all levers of action. Some actions require legislative action such as directives for certain data collection or appropriation of funds and directions to establish systems. Other actions can be made by leaders in executive agencies such as prioritizing time or existing resources. There are also actions identified that can be taken directly by the members.

Levers examined during the group's time included:

- Legislative directives, mandates and appropriations;
- Rulemaking, regulatory actions or legal interpretations;
- Agency priorities, decisions, resource allocations, and reporting;
- Collaboration within state government and between state and local agencies for shared reporting, coordinating service;
- Stakeholder awareness & education.

Problem(s) To Solve

The JES Working Group was intentional in developing recommendations that address a specific problem or set of problems. As is discussed in the JES Working Group Process section of this report, the group first sought to align on what the desired end state was of making changes, identified the information or actions that would be part of such end state. The group then worked together to identify the overarching gap or problem between today's information or approach and that desired state and to categorize each element into a clear set of problem areas.

Key Problem

Lack of data collections and accompanying systems in local and state agencies about justice engaged students that enables:

- ✓ Reporting to better understand outcomes and
- ✓ Responsiveness to connect students and families to services.

System Problems

Discussions about existing data, the dual purpose of data collection as discussed earlier and the desired end state led to the identification of five areas of challenges across two critical uses or purposes of data:

1. **Data as a learning tool.** Problems that limit reporting, understanding, learning by state and local officials or transparency; *and*
2. **Data as a tool for intervention.** Problems that limit responsiveness and targeted, timely services for students and families.

Within these two categories, members agreed on five system level problems that should all be addressed through a comprehensive approach. Different aspects of most of these affect both use areas noted above. Each of these system level problems involves multiple components including technical, resource and practices or processes. Some of these will require changes at both the state and local levels for maximum improved awareness or opportunities for support while others can be addressed by specific actions or shifts within one or more state agencies.

1. **Data Ownership & Control.** Multiple state agencies are responsible for different factors, oversight or reporting within the overall topic of the academic performance of justice engaged students.
2. **Lack of Statewide System & Standards.** There is an absence of standardized data collection and/or a statewide system within and across the education, judicial, public safety, and/or human services systems which leads to challenges within and across agencies;
3. **Limits on Data Sharing.** There are a variety of different state and federal statutes and rules that limit if and how data sharing can be conducted across state agencies;
4. **Gaps & Variations in Local Data.** There are gaps in available data at the local and state level for all of the definitions of justice engaged youth *and* there is inconsistency in data sharing across local agencies;

5. **Multiple Unique Identifiers.** There are different individual and student identifiers used across education, judicial, and human services that limits data sharing.

Key Problem to Supporting Justice Engaged Students Through Data

The current collection processes and sharing (or lack of sharing) of data increases the risk that justice engaged students fall through the cracks and can be lost in a larger system. This can prevent or delay monitoring of academic performance or persistence, delay or mask the need for delivery of targeted interventions and supports to ensure their academic success and reduce opportunities to learn from the experience of these students.

System Problem 1: Responsibility for Data and reporting

Multiple state agencies are responsible for different data, oversight or roles with the academic performance of justice engaged students. These different agencies or offices within agencies have ownership of not only the associated work or services but also stewardship of the data itself or the data sharing agreements. This creates a patchwork of data with each associated agency holding or having access to a small picture of the overall landscape.

Effects or Challenges

For Data As A Learning Tool

Each agency has a limited understanding of the multiple factors that may be contributing to the performance and academic attainment of the justice engaged student population. Data sharing can require one or more separate data sharing agreements (DSAs) and it can be complicated to navigate which data is held by which party or is subject to a separate DSA.

Challenges For Data As A Tool For Intervention

The time required to track down, negotiate and formalize DSAs can make it difficult to provide timely information that can empower local leaders to take action or intervene when a student is off track or in need of additional, targeted supports.

Desired End State

A culture of data sharing across state agencies and the ability of each state agency to access the most comprehensive data about justice engaged students.

Actions Recommended

State Agencies: Collaboratively examine the JES Data Inventory contained in Appendix B to update as necessary, conduct a gap analysis and create a list of desired DSAs.

Legislature: By legislative declaration or action, direct the state agencies to maximize the use of data sharing agreements that enable quicker responses and sharing of information to ensure the provision of information to the appropriate state or local agencies.

Legislative action to direct ongoing collaboration across agencies to support justice engaged students which should include:*

1. Create, provide necessary resources to and direct a state agency to convene, an inter-agency work group on justice engaged students to report on the outcomes of this population utilizing data and expertise from each member agency;
2. Direct membership of the inter-agency work group to include representatives from CDE, CDHS, Judicial, CDPS, CDHE and the Workforce Development Council.
3. Directions to publish on a regular schedule, a comprehensive inter-agency report on justice engaged students. Based on the input of participating agencies and the Attorney General's office, provide specific directives for data use and collection and data sharing agreements necessary to fulfill reporting requirements;

** This collaboration through an inter-agency group is also included in the recommendations relating to System Problem 3.*

System Problem 2: Lack of Statewide System & Standards

Colorado does not currently have a comprehensive, shared system or standards for data collection and reporting across state government. This limits the ability of the state to provide a comprehensive analysis of student outcomes for justice engaged students and requires individual data sharing agreements based on use cases. Furthermore, within the education system, there is not a Student Information System (SIS) that is shared between districts and the state so data is collected annually within a series of collections. This setup across agencies then requires coordination across multiple agencies at the state and local level. This is particularly challenging for smaller, less resourced districts, rural districts, districts in multiple counties, or counties that serve multiple districts. As a result of this:

1. There is significant variation in the data available to the state agencies, both from local education providers (LEPs) and municipal courts and in many cases, little information is known at the LEP about which students are justice engaged;
2. There are challenges across agencies in the completeness of the data for comparing and analyzing data.

Effects or Challenges

For Data As A Learning Tool

The fragmented and disparate data collections can cause delays in analyzing data, challenges matching data across systems, delays or inability to share data and significant challenges to in-depth annual reporting on a comprehensive data set with multiple disaggregated data points.

Challenges For Data As A Tool For Intervention

Significant challenges and, in many cases, inability to provide timely information to those agencies, offices or programs tasked with or who choose to prioritize efforts for time-sensitive interventions or service delivery.

Desired End State

A standardized, statewide system for student information that empower all involved in supporting justice engaged students with the best possible and most timely information to provide system level supports *and* targeted interventions to support justice engaged students. Through such a system, comprehensive reporting about justice engaged youth and their educational outcomes would be readily available across state systems and for local agencies. As a key element of this end state, there would be multiple supports provided to support justice engaged students and to ensure they can participate in all aspects of education including academics, wraparound services and others.

Benefit of Change

Stronger connections across agencies would enable a more robust understanding of the outcomes of justice engaged youth and enable individuals working directly with youth information that would help them reconnect to an appropriate educational environment.

In addition, pre-pandemic, the Department of Education was engaged in an in-depth analysis studying the viability and benefits of a Statewide Student Information System (SIS) that could create a more consistent system within the education system; the analysis from 2019 performed a value assessment of a statewide Student Information System. This initiative was put on hold during the pandemic years. One of the primary benefits to Statewide SIS is that it would provide great accessibility and availability of systems to smaller, less resourced districts. This could positively impact the equity for rural and other less resourced districts. Additionally, the previous analysis discussed the ability of a SIS to help in the LEP data. The study said:

There is currently a great deal of variance in approach to LEP data verification, entry, management, coding, and processing as illustrated earlier in the process management section of this report. Data discrepancies exact a high resource cost from personnel in lost time, rework, and error corrections. Relatively small changes in school data collection and entry processes can have a large impact on data quality, required time, and internal personnel usage.

While most LEPs believe the current CDE Data Pipeline has helped districts to some degree, they believe there are many improvements that could help improve the current submission, verification, and acquisition processes. Examples were given around common statewide reporting modules, potential CDE assistance and support in quality management, greatly improved transcript and student transfer processes, and possibilities for improved cross-district data transfers that could ease student transitions and improve educational outcomes.

There remain significant discussions on the approach, configuration, costs, and opportunity to such system, which would need to be explored through a comprehensive study.

An SIS implemented alongside other statewide data sharing, coordination, or systems could impact the reporting and service provision for justice engaged youth.

Actions Recommended

State Agencies: Work collaboratively to:

1. Create intentional system and standards for communication to better support sharing of information that helps support a justice engaged student in re-entering a district school. For example, after CDE produces guidance as required by the enabling legislation, develop communication and sharing of training materials for offices in Judicial and CDHS that have responsibility of supporting students as they re-enter school;
2. Identify challenges to and opportunities for increased standardization of data collection, database schemas and standards for data collection;
3. Active participation in the activities described below in recommended legislative action and, until such legislative action is taken, the agencies should undertake the activities described and others as necessary to advance the goals described below.

Legislature: Legislative action to direct a multi-component, collaborative development of statewide systems which should include, at a minimum:

1. Convening and/or support of support of groups that are exploring related work such as the newly created Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) and Student Information Systems group tasked with:
 - a. Collaborative development of the capabilities, information and other specifications of such a system intended to serve as a scope of work for its development. Such a system would need to have appropriate protections for personally identifiable information (PII). To establish confidence and focus sharing on appropriate uses, state leaders should consider starting with more narrow points of connection such as enrollment, that have been identified as necessary or helpful;
 - b. Examine and report to the legislature on the effect of the current frequency of data collection, analysis and reporting on the state's ability to act on that information in a meaningful way and to empower local agencies to do so on a timely basis;
 - c. Collaborative development of a set of data collection, storage and sharing standards that can be adopted by the state;
2. Directing the Office of the Attorney General to:
 - a. Conduct a comprehensive review of the perceived and actual limitations on data sharing between state agencies and between state and local agencies;
 - b. Review and provide updated guidance to executive branch agencies that considers:
 - i) all avenues and opportunities for data sharing while protecting personally identifiable information (PII) where needed, ii) any available or necessary carveouts, and iii) clarifies all legal restrictions for data sharing or use for this population.

System Problem 3: Limits on Data Sharing

Each state agency's ability to collect and share data is limited by state and federal privacy requirements and by the statutory authority or direction granted or withheld. While there is reporting for groups of justice engaged youth (e.g. an annual report on students who were committed), there is very little to no authority or directives given to any agency to collect, analyze and report on the academic performance of justice engaged students as an entire group. At present, there is an absence of a single, coordinating council or body and process for information that is being tracked, collected or studied that may intersect across state agencies. There are also institutional norms and varying interpretations of the authority to share data that may limit the otherwise acceptable and legal sharing of data between agencies.

Effects or Challenges

For Data As A Learning Tool

Each agency's data or data collection is limited to information about a subset of justice engaged students and no agency is required to report on the academic attainment of justice engaged students to identify points of success or needs for shifts in system level support.

Challenges For Data As A Tool For Intervention

The insights into and understanding of factors that may effect multiple groups within the broader population of justice engaged students is limited. This can reduce opportunities to identify the need for interventions that could help multiple individual students.

Desired End State

A shift in the culture and practices of sharing and the creation of a comprehensive periodic report on the academic attainment of justice engaged students. Culture of collaboration is established to maximize the sharing of information across agencies and clarification of legal requirements and limits to data sharing.

Actions Recommended Change

State Agencies: Collaborate to welcome legislative direction as described below and with it or in its absence, undertake an intentional strategy for information sharing and collaboration to include:

1. Intentional processes of sharing across agencies about data being collected, reports being developed or needs identified;
2. Periodic meetings not less than quarterly to coordinate efforts, share findings and provide updates on activities or priorities;
3. Leadership establishment of an expectation of coordination, collaboration and sharing;
4. Creating a centralized repository of all agency reports, research, ongoing efforts or other information about justice engaged students;
5. Identifying and acting on opportunities to include information about justice engaged students in existing reports. As one example, include in the annual Dropout Prevention and Student Re-engagement office legislative report a section on Justice Engaged Youth that includes attendance, enrollment and dropout information about students at the state

- detention centers and if additional data sharing is mandated, dropout, and graduation (if possible) about students involved in diversion, probation, detention, and commitment;
6. Request that each agency's representative from the Attorney General's office conduct a comprehensive review of the perceived and actual limitations on data sharing between state agencies and between state and local agencies.

Legislature: Legislative action to direct ongoing collaboration across agencies to support justice engaged students which should include:

1. Create an inter-agency work group on justice engaged students with appropriate resources to support their ongoing efforts as may be directed by the Judicial or Education Committees of the General Assembly and requested by the work group;
2. Direct membership of the inter-agency work group to include representatives from CDE, CDHS, Judicial, CDPS, CDHE and the Workforce Development Council.
3. Directions to publish on a regular schedule, a comprehensive inter-agency report on justice engaged students. Based on the input of participating agencies and the Attorney General's office, provide specific directives for data use and collection and data sharing agreements necessary to fulfill reporting requirements;
4. Direct the group to coordinate and lead on those activities described in items four and five in the above State Agencies sub-section.

System Problem 4: Gaps & Variations in Local Data

A significant and likely majority of information about students involved with the justice system, particularly prior to commitment or detention, is primarily held at the local level. This includes ticketing, diversion and activity involving municipal courts. Most if not all of this locally created and stored data is not currently reported to or shared with state agencies or with local education providers. As a result, the state has little if any information about students who have been engaged in the justice system in these ways.

In addition to the data that is primarily collected and held at the local level, there is inconsistency in the practices and standards for the sharing of local data with the state as a whole and sharing of data with different agencies. There are also significant differences in database schemas and taxonomies which create challenges comparing, cross-walking or analyzing multi-source data. At best, this creates challenges in state knowledge of the full picture of justice engaged student performance or needs and at the local level, inconsistent knowledge of which students may be justice engaged.

Effects or Challenges

For Data As A Learning Tool

State agencies have very limited data and information about large subsets of the justice engaged student population limiting the ability to learn from the challenges or successes of different approaches or supports for some of these groups of students.

Challenges For Data As A Tool For Intervention

In many cases, state agencies are unable to draw on a broader set of data or information to identify timely opportunities for intervention and service delivery. This limits the ability to intervene in early stages of justice engagement or to undertake all efforts to disrupt the school to prison pipeline.

Desired End State

The ultimate goal is a standardized system across all state and local agencies for collecting and reporting information about justice engaged students. With this, agencies and others would have better information about which services would be needed by or of benefit to different students.

Elements of this will need to include:

1. Clean, consistent, accurate and timely data about all students who have been engaged in any aspect of the justice system;
2. A standardized taxonomy, field or database structure or mapping ability across systems;
3. A formal process to share data on arrests and municipal court information with the state;
4. A process for sharing across local agencies (law enforcement, judicial, and local education providers).

As one outcome, the state would have better information to empower local leaders to make timely, data-informed interventions when a student or family is in distress.

Actions Recommended & Outcome Expected from Change

State Agencies: State agencies should collaborate to:

1. Align on, share out and support the consistent and standardized format of data sharing and collection that can be adopted by local agencies;
2. Utilize existing partnerships, programs and resources to introduce and support local adoption of the data collection and sharing standards;
3. Conduct a review of and reinforce with staff the current Attorney General's guidance on data sharing which includes but may not be limited to that offered in the [2022 School Safety Legal Manual](#);
4. Create and maintain clear lines and means of communication for data sharing both from local to state agencies and from state to local agencies.

Legislature: Legislative actions should include:

1. Inviting representatives of state agencies to meet with or testify at meetings of the Judicial, Education and Technology committees about their efforts and to inform legislative actions;
2. Appropriate funds and direct the Office of Information Technology (OIT) to support state agencies in the development of a deployable plug-in or script that could aid state and local agencies in mapping data across multiple fields in different databases using different

System Problem 5: Multiple Unique Identifiers

There are challenges in cross-referencing data across agencies because multiple agencies utilize different unique identifiers and systems to manage information about individual juveniles and students including the Trails database used by the Department of Human Services, the

Department of Education's SASID numbers and the Judicial Department's judicial identifier which may use of Date of Birth, Social Security Numbers & district specific ML number.

Effects or Challenges

For Data As A Learning Tool

Without an easy to use tool for matching records, there can at best be delays to matching student records across different systems and at worst, be significant gaps in identifying common individuals in multiple systems.

Challenges For Data As A Tool For Intervention

Delays and gaps as described above are exacerbated for interventions or actions that are time sensitive to support students and their families.

Desired End State

There is a simple means of cross-referencing data across databases and reconciling or consolidating data about the same individual who may be identified using a different identifier in multiple systems. Such means should have no per-use cost or burden and be available for all state agencies to use in real-time queries and analyses while maintaining fidelity of the underlying data.

Actions Recommended & Outcome Expected from Change

State Agencies: Collaborate to design the technical specifications and use standards for a tool or process that will provide: *

1. A consistent processes for matching data drawing from databases with different unique identifiers for individuals;
2. A system, algorithm or AI based tool that generates report of high likelihood matches that can be manually reviewed and confirmed;
3. A tool, plug-in or script that can be deployed in multiple databases that would identify when the data being entered (or subject of it) should interface or interact with other state agency databases or, at minimum, flag to such other agency the presence of new, potentially relevant data that should be reviewed;
4. A simple means of pulling a comprehensive report about an individual or sub-set of justice engaged students from information across different state agencies that would allow the user to map the prior system level involvement and transitions of the individual or group.

** A similar recommendation was made by the Recidivism Definition Working Group. Additional resources would likely be necessary.*

Legislature: Monitor the state agency activities above and, as requested or needed, appropriate funds to support the development, roll-out and integration of the tools described.

Summary of Recommendations

To address the system challenges identified throughout this report and to take action on the recommendations in this section, below are recommended minimum next steps.

Legislative Actions

1. Legislative declaration that cites the current challenges, including the need for a statewide system, the need for better inter-agency collaboration and outlining the benefits of more consistent, standardized local data;
2. Legislative clarification of when a district must be notified of a students' justice involvement;
3. The legislature should indicate the need for a state level report on the numbers of students involved in commitment, detention, parole, and probation and how those students perform academically;
4. The legislature should direct CDE and Judicial to execute a Data Sharing Agreement (DSA) to enable them to share, summarize and report on statewide trends for justice engaged students;
5. The legislature should establish an expectation, space for and resources to support regular meetings of an interagency group on justice engaged students (the JES Work Group). This group should:
 - a. Be convened by a state agency designated in the authorizing legislation;
 - b. At minimum, include representatives from CDE, CDHS, Judicial, CDPS, CDHE and the Workforce Development Council with additional standing members or members for subcommittees as identified by the convening agency and members;
 - c. In its first year, address necessary data sharing with the goal of improving academic outcomes for justice engaged youth by identifying and sharing each state agency's relevant youth outcomes and furthering state agency coordination. Among the topics to be addressed the JES Work Group during its first year should be:
 - i. Establish an MOU or other form of agency leadership support for ongoing and consistent collaboration and sharing including:
 1. Updates on changes in data collections;
 2. Reports or studies underway or being considered;
 3. Participation by all agencies with relevant information, data or areas of work including, but not limited to, CDE, CDHS (including DYS), Judicial, CDPS (including ORS, OAJJA and DCJ) and others as appropriate; *

** Even with such an MOU, agencies would still be bound by confidentiality limitations including CDHS who would be bound legislatively through Title 19 on what can be shared.*

- ii. Collaborative development of the technical specifications for a statewide justice engaged youth information system and publishing of an RFI to ascertain cost of such system;
 - iii. Establishing a workplan and budget to implement the technical changes or improvements identified in Problem 5 relating to the need to reconcile Multiple Unique Identifiers;
 - iv. With existing and above recommended DSAs as a foundation, conduct a gap analysis of needed DSAs to advance the work discussed herein including use cases and privacy considerations (and proposed resolutions.
- 6. In subsequent years, the JES Work Group should be directed to publish an annual report on the academic attainment of justice engaged students with disaggregated data where possible and, in at least bi-annual reports, publication of any recommended changes in data collection or student supports;
- 7. The legislature should direct the Office of the Attorney General to support the JES Work Group and its goal of maximizing the available data about justice engaged students by, at a minimum:
 - a. Conducting a comprehensive review of the perceived and actual limitations on data sharing between state agencies and between state and local agencies;
 - b. Review and provide updated guidance to executive branch agencies that considers:
 - i) all avenues and opportunities for data sharing while protecting personally identifiable information (PII) where needed, ii) any available or necessary carveouts, and iii) clarifies all legal restrictions for data sharing or use for this population.
- 8. The legislature should invite representatives of state agencies to meet with or testify at meetings of the Judicial, Education and Technology committees about their efforts and to inform legislative actions;
- 9. The legislature should appropriate funds and direct the Office of Information Technology (OIT) to support state agencies in the development of a deployable plug-in or script that could aid state and local agencies in mapping data across multiple fields in different databases. *This is likely to involve a significant cost. The interagency work group did not have sufficient time to engage with OIT or with others to develop budget or cost estimates.*

State Agency Actions

- 1. Collaborate to welcome legislative direction as described below and with it or in its absence, undertake a strategy for information sharing and collaboration to include:
 - a. Intentional processes for sharing across agencies about what data is being collected, and sharing of published reports or needs identified;
 - b. Periodic meetings not less than quarterly to coordinate efforts, share findings and provide updates on activities or priorities;
 - c. Leadership establishing an expectation of coordination, collaboration and sharing;
 - d. Creating a centralized repository of all agency reports, research, ongoing efforts or other information about how best to support justice engaged students;

- e. Identifying and acting on opportunities to include information about justice engaged students in existing reports;
 - f. Request that each agency's representative from the Attorney General's office conduct a comprehensive review of the perceived and actual limitations on data sharing between state agencies and between state and local agencies.
2. If a clear legislative mandate is detailed as outlined in legislation action #4, CDE and Judicial should create a data sharing agreement that allows sharing of data so that CDE or Judicial can summarize statewide trends. Judicial should continue their annual report of juveniles in each category as they do now. Every three years, the report should include the chronic absenteeism rate, enrollment status, dropout trends, and graduation numbers of students involved in any of the four categories. CDE should include in the Dropout Prevention and Student Re-engagement (DPSR) annual report an annual state level summary about what is currently collected about any of the definitions of justice engaged youth, which includes:
 - a. Number of students who were detained in a detention center and the number of students who transferred in from detention or transferred to detention.
 - b. Attendance rates and enrollment status in the following year, starting in 2025-26 school year.
 3. CDE and Judicial should create recommended best practices on when and what information should be shared locally when a student is arrested or charged.
 4. CDE should create recommended best practices for districts and families to support credit transfer and transitions into or out of a district.

Appendix A: Justice Engaged Definitions

HB24-1216 lists seven different types of involvement in the Justice System while noting that the definition intended includes but is not limited to these:

- Adjudication
- Detention
- Commitment
- Probation
- Diversion
- Ticketing
- Community Supervision

More detailed definitions and detail about types of justice engagement are listed below.

Adjudication

An adjudication refers to a finding of guilt for a delinquent offense involving a defendant under the age of 18, and is analogous to a conviction of an adult defendant found guilty of a criminal offense. In juvenile delinquency cases, adjudication refers to the process of a judge or jury determining whether a defendant is guilty or not guilty of a crime. If found guilty, the defendant may be sentenced to detention, commitment, probation, fines, or other programs and penalties. When a juvenile breaks the law, there are two possibilities after the arrest, depending on the type of charges involved/filed. Underage offenders who commit offenses are most often processed through the juvenile court system. Juveniles who commit more serious crimes, like serious person felonies, may be tried as an adult in the criminal justice system, through the direct file or transfer process.

Pre-adjudication: The legal status of youth pending delinquency adjudication decisions. Often these youth are referred to as “pre-trial” youth since they are generally admitted to detention pending some type of court action. This category can also include youth who are serving a sentence, such as probation, on a prior delinquency adjudication and who are in detention pending a new court action.

Detention vs Commitment

The Division of Youth Services (DYS) falls under Colorado’s Department of Human Services (DHS) and provides a continuum of services to two distinct populations: detention and commitment. In general terms ([see definitions that follow](#) for more detailed descriptions), detention is comprised of short-term secure confinement and a continuum of community-based detention alternatives. Conversely, commitment is long-term treatment and supervision for youth sentenced to the Department’s legal and physical custody. Once committed youth complete their commitment

sentence, they are required to serve a period of parole. The Division of Youth Services *currently* operates 14 youth centers in total: eight (8) serving detained youth, eight (8) serving committed youth, and several that serve both population types.

Note: The number of youth centers can fluctuate, depending on the statutory detention bed capacity, population changes, and other factors.

Detention

The custodial status of youth who are being confined or supervised after arrest, while awaiting the completion of judicial proceedings, or sentenced to detention by the court as a sanction. Detention youth are served in secure state-operated youth centers. Some detention youth are served in non-residential, community-based supervision programs and receive community-based detention services through the Colorado Youth Detention Continuum (CYDC).

The status of a detained individual informs how and where the individual is overseen:

- DYS serves youth between the ages of 10-17 who:
 - Are awaiting resolution of their criminal cases (pre-adjudicated) or
 - Have been sentenced to a term of incarceration (sentenced to detention) for a period of time.
- Pre-adjudicated or pre-trial youth or juveniles referred to detention are not “committed” to the care of Division of Youth Services. Legal custody remains with the guardian. These youth are being confined or supervised after arrest, while awaiting the completion of judicial proceedings, or sentenced to detention by the court as a sanction. Detention youth are served in secure state-operated youth centers.
 - Eight detention centers for pre-trial youth operated by the Division of Human Services (DHS) have educational services provided by the school district where they are located.

Commitment

Commitments are dispositions of juvenile cases resulting in the transfer of legal custody to the Department of Human Services by the court as a result of an adjudicatory hearing on charges of delinquent acts committed by the youth. Committed youth receive assessment services, residential treatments services (secure and non-secure), as well as parole supervision and services. Commitment jurisdiction in Colorado includes:

- Youth ages 10-20, for acts committed prior to a youth’s 18th birthday (19-2.5-1117, C.R.S.)
- Youth ages 10-12, for Class 1, 2 or 3 felonies only
- Majority of sentences are for a determinate period of up to two years
- All DYS commitments discharged at maximum age of 21

Parole

Each youth that is committed to the Department of Human Services is also mandated by the court to serve a “period of parole.” This period of parole typically occurs after a youth has completed serving their commitment sentence. Colorado juvenile offenders have a mandatory minimum parole length of 6 months. While on parole a youth is placed under the supervision of a parole officer (Client Manager) and is required to observe conditions of release set by the parole officer and the Juvenile Parole Board. *Note that only youth who have been committed get paroled. Those who were in detention are not paroled. Legal custody is returned to the guardian from CDHS during the period of parole after the commitment sentence has expired.*

Youthful Offender System

The YOS is part of the Colorado Department of Corrections (CDOC or DOC). The Youthful Offender System (YOS) is a sentencing option for certain youthful offenders that began in 1994. “YOS was originally designed for violent youthful offenders between the ages of 14 and 17 at the time of their offense who were direct filed or transferred as adults in accordance with Colorado Revised Statute (C.R.S.) 19-2-517, C.R.S. 19-2-518 and C.R.S. 18-1.3-407.”

“Effective October 1, 2009, the eligibility criteria for sentencing to YOS was expanded as a result of House Bill (HB) 09-1122 to include violent young adult offenders who commit Class 3 through 6 violent felony offenses between the ages of 18 and 19 at the time of their offense and who are sentenced prior to their 21st birthday. As a result of HB 09-1122, the Young Adult Offender sentencing statute, C.R.S. 18-1.3-407.5 was passed into law.”

Source: Colorado Department of Corrections, Youthful Offender System Fiscal Year 2023 Annual Report

Probation

Juvenile probation is a form of community supervision that may include reporting to a supervisory officer, participating in behavior-change programming, paying victim restitution, being tested for drug use or other conditions. Failure to follow these conditions can result in a probation violation, which may lead to additional conditions, incarceration or other sanctions or incentives to modify behavior.

Diversion

Diversion is a general term for decisions, programs or services that steer youth away from formal processing in the juvenile justice system if they fall within particular categories or are willing to comply with specific requirements. Most diversion programs in Colorado are administered by Diversion Directors within District Attorney offices in each of the judicial districts. Colorado also has a number of non-profit organizations providing diversion program services. Once juveniles have completed the requirements of their Diversion agreements, charges are dismissed.

Ticketing

An individual may be issued one of two types of tickets: Civil or Criminal. Tickets are most commonly issued for traffic or other related moving violations but can also include certain criminal behavior outside of traffic including, without limitation, issues such as trespassing, unlawful possession of alcohol or controlled substances. Civil tickets for civil violations typically result in

finances, points on drivers licenses or other restorative and restitution penalties. Criminal violations may result in arrest and can result in detention or commitment.

Community Supervision

Community Supervision generally means that the court has elected to suspend or forego confining an individual to a detention center or other facility and is instead allowing the person to live in their community subject to certain conditions. Depending on the nature of the infraction that led to the community supervision, in addition to a promise not to break any laws and to appear for court, those rules may include limits on things such as the right to own firearms, to interact with certain people or go to certain places and the individual may be required to provide information to the court about their activities.

Community Corrections

Community Corrections is often referred to as a “halfway house.” In Colorado these are typically occupied by ‘Diversion’ clients from Probation / judicial and ‘Transition’ clients from DOC. For DOC inmates the idea is to include graduated release through a systematic decrease in supervision and increase in offender responsibility. DOC offenders can go to a Community Corrections as an inmate and / or while on parole as a ‘Condition of Parole’ placement. Community Corrections programs are supervised by the Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ).

Sentencing

Colorado Revised Statutes Title 19. Children's Code § 19-2.5-1117. Sentencing--commitment to the department of human services--definitions

(1)(a) Except as otherwise required in subsection (6) of this section and [section 19-2.5-1127](#) for an aggravated juvenile offender, the court may commit a juvenile to the department of human services for a determinate period of up to two years if the juvenile is adjudicated for an offense that would constitute a felony or a misdemeanor if committed by an adult; except that, if the juvenile is younger than twelve years of age and is not adjudicated an aggravated juvenile offender, the court may commit the juvenile to the department of human services only if the juvenile is adjudicated for an offense that would constitute a class 1, class 2, or class 3 felony if committed by an adult.

(b) Any commitment to the department of human services pursuant to [section 19-2.5-1127](#) or [subsection \(1\)\(a\)](#) of this section must be followed by a mandatory period of parole of six months, unless the period of parole is extended by the juvenile parole board pursuant to [section 19-2.5-1203\(5\)](#).

(c) For purposes of this section:

(I) “Determinate period” is defined in [section 19-2.5-102](#).

(II) “Period of parole” means the period between the parole period start date and the parole period end date as determined by the juvenile parole board. The period of parole applies to both mandatory six-month parole and extended parole pursuant to [section 19-2.5-1203\(5\)](#). The period of parole continues unless the juvenile is deemed to be on escape status, parole has been suspended pursuant to [section 19-2.5-1203](#), or the juvenile returns to commitment status pursuant to [section 19-2.5-1206](#). In such circumstances, the period of parole stops until the juvenile has returned to parole status.

(2) A juvenile committed to the department of human services may be placed in the Lookout Mountain school, the Mount View school, or any other training school or facility, or any other disposition may be made that the department may determine as provided by law.

(3)(a) When a juvenile is committed to the department of human services, the court shall transmit, with the commitment order, a copy of the petition, the order of adjudication, copies of the social study, any clinical or educational reports, and other information pertinent to the juvenile's care and treatment.

(b) The department of human services shall provide the court with any information concerning a juvenile committed to its care that the court at any time may require.

(4)(a) When a court commits a juvenile to the state department of human services pursuant to this article 2.5, the court shall make the following specific determinations:

(I) Whether placement of the juvenile outside the home would be in the juvenile's and community's best interest; and

(II) Whether reasonable efforts have been made to prevent or eliminate the need for removal of the juvenile from the home; whether it is reasonable that such efforts are not made because an emergency situation exists that requires the immediate removal of the juvenile from the home; or whether such efforts are not required because of circumstances described in [section 19-1-115\(7\)](#).

(III) How to assist in the evaluation of the impact of Colorado's implementation of the federal "Family First Prevention Services Act" on the state's juvenile justice system and make a finding of whether the lack of available and appropriate congregate care placements is a contributing factor in committing a juvenile to the division of youth services.

(b) If a juvenile is making a transition from the legal custody of a county department of human or social services to commitment with the state department of human services, the court shall conduct a permanency hearing in combination with the sentencing hearing. The court shall consider multidisciplinary recommendations for sentencing and permanency planning. In conducting such a permanency hearing, the court shall make determinations pursuant to [section 19-2.5-1116\(4\)\(a\)](#).

(5)(a) The department of human services shall designate receiving centers for juveniles committed to the department.

(b) If the department of human services makes a change in the designation of a receiving center, it shall notify the juvenile courts at least thirty-five days prior to the date that the change takes effect.

(6)(a) Pursuant to [section 19-2.5-1103](#), commitment of a juvenile to the department of human services must be for a determinate period.

(b)(I) The juvenile court may commit any juvenile adjudicated as an aggravated juvenile offender pursuant to [section 19-2.5-1127](#) for an offense other than an offense that would constitute a class 1 or class 2 felony if committed by an adult to the department of human services for a determinate period of up to five years.

(II) The juvenile court shall commit any juvenile adjudicated as an aggravated juvenile offender pursuant to [section 19-2.5-1127](#) for an offense that would constitute a class 2 felony if committed by an adult to the department of human services for a determinate period of at least three but not more than five years.

(III) The juvenile court shall commit any juvenile adjudicated as an aggravated juvenile offender pursuant to [section 19-2.5-1127](#) for an offense that would constitute a class 1 felony if committed by an adult to the department of human services for a determinate period of at least three but not more than seven years.

(c) The juvenile court may commit any juvenile who is not adjudicated an aggravated juvenile offender pursuant to [section 19-2.5-1127](#) but who is adjudicated for an offense that would constitute a felony or a misdemeanor to the department of human services, and the determinate period of commitment must not exceed two years; except that, if the juvenile is ten or eleven years of age and is not adjudicated an aggravated juvenile offender pursuant to [section 19-2.5-1127](#), the juvenile may be committed to the department of human services only if the juvenile is adjudicated for an offense that would constitute a class 1, class 2, or class 3 felony if committed by an adult.

(7)(a) On or before January 1, 2021, the department of human services, in consultation with the juvenile justice reform committee established pursuant to [section 24-33.5-2401](#), shall develop a length of stay matrix and establish criteria to guide the release of juveniles from a state facility that are based on:

(I) A juvenile's risk of reoffending, as determined by the results of a validated risk and needs assessment adopted pursuant to [section 24-33.5-2402\(1\)\(a\)](#);

(II) The seriousness of the offense for which the juvenile was adjudicated delinquent;

(III) The juvenile's progress in meeting treatment goals; and

(IV) Other criteria as determined by the department and the juvenile justice reform committee.

(b) In making release and discharge decisions, the department of human services shall use the matrix and release criteria developed pursuant to this subsection (7).

(8) For all hearings and reviews concerning a juvenile who is committed to the department of human services, the entity conducting the hearing or review shall ensure that notice is provided to the juvenile and to any of the following persons with whom the juvenile is placed:

(a) Foster parents;

(b) Pre-adoptive parents; or

(c) Relatives.

(9) The department of human services may petition the committing court to extend the commitment for an additional period not to exceed two years. The petition must set forth the reasons why it would be in the best interest of the juvenile or the public to extend the commitment. Upon filing the petition, the court shall set a hearing to determine whether the petition should be granted or denied and shall notify all interested parties.

Appendix B: Data Inventory

The following pages contain a summary of the data collected by JES Work Group member agencies presented in two formats:

1. Summary tables by subject of the data collected;
2. Summary of information by data collection.

Justice Engaged Students Data: By Subject, Focus or Use

Subject: Attendance

Title/Collection	Owner	Connection	Data Collected	Reports	Notes
Student End of Year - Graduation/Completion	CDE	Indirect	Enrollment records for all students in CO public schools and detention centers, including entry/exit types to show status when they joined or left a LEP. Enrollment records are used alongside Anticipated Year of Graduation (AYG) to determine the graduation/completion cohort for a student.	Graduation Statistics Website	Could add a 'justice engaged' flag/cohort to determine a graduation/completion rates for students who were justice engaged at any point in 9th-12th grade. This could be used as a measure of graduation/completion success for students who were justice engaged at some point in their high school career. This would assume receiving a list of justice engaged students, their related setting, entry/exit dates to that setting, and believed exit scenario. Detention centers do not get graduation rates.

					Students are attributed back to their last district of attendance upon graduation.
Student End of Year - Dropout	CDE	Indirect	Enrollment records for all students in CO public schools and detention centers, including entry/exit types to show status when they joined or left a LEP. Enrollment records are used to determine 7th-12th grade membership base and dropout status.	Dropout Statistics Website	<p>Could add an annual 'justice engaged' flag/cohort to determine dropout rates for students who were justice engaged at any point during the school year. This could be used to determine dropout rates for this specific population. This would assume receiving a list of justice engaged students, their related setting, and entry/exit dates to that setting.</p> <p>Detention centers do not receive dropout rates.</p>
Student End of Year - Mobility Stability	CDE	Indirect	Enrollment records for all students in CO public schools and detention centers, including entry/exit types to	Mobility/Stability Statistics Website	Could add an annual 'justice engaged' flag/cohort to determine mobility/stability

			show status when they joined or left a LEP. Enrollment records are used to determine K-12 membership base and count of mobility instances for students.		<p>rates for students who were justice engaged at any point during the school year. Or, we could calculate the average number of mobility instances for a student who was justice engaged during the school year.</p> <p>Detention centers do not receive mobility/stability rates.</p>
Student End of Year - other	CDE	Indirect	Enrollment records for all CO public schools and detention centers, including entry/exit types to show status when they joined or left a LEP. Enrollment records along with demographic and various program participation flags can be used to determine counts of students who were in a K-12 LEP at some point during the year. This	Homeless Data Website ; Statutorily Required Reports Website	Could add an annual 'justice engaged' flag to allow for more complex data requests based upon SEY data for this population. Would make future investigation into enrollment history of this population more accessible.

			<p>doesn't necessarily mean they were enrolled on the last day of school, but does provide options for expanded counts of student groups beyond the official 10/1 count day. Any of the 'other' data counts based on this collection are either internal requests or due to a very specific statute or federal reporting requirement. Includes students indicated as receiving expelled education services.</p>		
October Count	CDE	Indirect	<p>Students attending a CO public school as of count day.</p>	<p>Student October file layout.</p>	<p>Could add an annual 'justice engaged' flag to allow for more complex data requests based upon SEY data for this population. Would make future investigation into enrollment history of this population more accessible.</p>

Attendance	CDE	Direct	Student level attendance information used to determine attendance rates, truancy rates, habitually truant student counts, and chronic absenteeism rates.	Attendance Statistics	Could add a 'justice engaged' flag to allow the possibility of creating rates based upon this group of students, but those rates would still be based upon the student's attendance within a school district. Detention centers are excluded from the publicly posted rates.
Credit Recovery	CDHS – DYS	Indirect	(Commitment population) Academic Proficiency, Academic Achievement, Academic Growth, College Readiness, Median Achievement Percentile, Graduation Status	Annual Education Outcomes Report	Available data points are condensed here for Credit Recovery discussions: Essential in the re-entry process, and transitioning youth back into their communities following court-mandated state secure placement. Data connected to Trails ID.
TRAILS	CDHS	Indirect	Name, DOB, race/ethnicity, address, custody	CDHS Community Performance Center Reports	

Subject: Academic Performance

Title/Collection	Owner	Connection	Data Collected	Reports	Notes
Student End of Year - Graduation/Completion	CDE	Direct	School exit type, grade, retention code may indicate academic performance in some scenarios	Graduation Statistics Website	Could add a 'justice engaged' flag/cohort to determine a graduation/completion rate for students who were justice engaged at any point in 9th-12th grade. This could be used as a measure of graduation/completion success for students who were justice engaged at some point in their high school career. This assumes receiving a list of justice engaged students, their related setting, entry/exit dates to that setting, and believed exit scenario, we could validate school entry/exit types for students in DYS locations, which would support LEAs with accurate

					data. Detention centers do not get graduation rates. Students are attributed back to their last district of attendance upon graduation.
Student End of Year - Dropout	CDE	Indirect	Dropout rates	Dropout Statistics Website	
Student End of Year - other	CDE	Indirect	School exit type, grade, retention code may indicate academic performance in some scenarios	Homeless Data Website ; Statutorily Required Reports Website	Could add an annual 'justice engaged' flag to allow for more complex data requests based upon SEY data for this population. Would make future investigation into enrollment history of this population more accessible.
Teacher Student Data Link (TSDL)	CDE	Direct	Course completion status		
Credit Recovery	CDHS – DYS	Indirect	Subject, Test Name, Tiered Goals (i.e., Data, Statistics, and Probability, Geometric Relationships, etc.), Rasch Unit (RIT), Standard Error,	Annual Education Outcomes Report	Available data points are condensed here for Credit Recovery discussions: Essential in the re-entry process, and transitioning youth back into their

			Percentile, Exam Duration, Achievement Percentile (Traditional Academic Setting Comparison Group), Achievement Quintile, Growth Percentile, Alternative Education Campus conversion growth calculations		communities following court-mandated state secure placement. Data connected to Trails ID.
TRAILS	CDHS	Indirect	Each county can collect this data how they choose	CDHS Community Performance Center Reports	

Subject: K-12 Matriculation

Title/Collection	Owner	Connection	Data Collected	Reports	Notes
Student End of Year - Graduation/Completion	CDE	Indirect	Determine which students graduated/completed before determining matriculation status.	Graduation Statistics Website	Could add a 'justice engaged' flag/cohort to determine a graduation/completion rates for students who were justice engaged at any point in 9th-12th grade. This could be used as a

					<p>measure of graduation/completion success for students who were justice engaged at some point in their high school career. This assumes receiving a list of justice engaged students, their related setting, entry/exit dates to that setting, and believed exit scenario, we could validate school entry/exit types for students in DYS locations, which would support LEAs with accurate data.</p> <p>Detention centers do not get graduation rates. Students are attributed back to their last district of attendance upon graduation.</p>
Student End of Year - other	CDE	Indirect	Military enlisted status and postsecondary program	Statutorily Required Reports Website	Could add an annual 'justice engaged' flag to allow for more

			<p>participation are used in state accountability frameworks based upon the student's status in the SEY collection for specific matriculation indicators.</p> <p>Retention code and grade level indicate students who progress through K-12 education in a typical fashion or have grade reassignments.</p>		<p>complex data requests based upon SEY data for this population. Would make future investigation into enrollment history of this population more accessible.</p>
October Count	CDE	Indirect	<p>Flags students who are repeating the same grade level in the current year as the prior year October count day.</p>	Student October file layout.	<p>Could add an annual 'justice engaged' flag to allow for more complex data requests based upon SEY data for this population. Would make future investigation into enrollment history of this population more accessible.</p>
Credit Recovery	CDHS – DYS	Indirect	<p>HSD/GED attainment</p>	Annual Education Outcomes Report	<p>Available data points are condensed here for Credit Recovery discussions:</p>

					Essential in the re-entry process, and transitioning youth back into their communities following court-mandated state secure placement. Data connected to Trails ID.
TRAILS	CDHS	Indirect	Each county can collect this data how they choose	CDHS Community Performance Center Reports	

Subject: Post-Secondary Enrollment

Title/Collection	Owner	Connection	Data Collected	Reports	Notes
Student End of Year - Graduation/Completion	CDE	Indirect	Graduation cohort for students retained to participate in postsecondary programs a student.	Graduation Statistics Website	Could add a 'justice engaged' flag/cohort to determine a graduation/completion rates for students who were justice engaged at any point in 9th-12th grade. This could be used as a measure of graduation/completion success for students who were justice engaged at some point in their high school career.

					<p>Assuming we receive a list of justice engaged students, their related setting, entry/exit dates to that setting, and believed exit scenario, we could validate school entry/exit types for students in DYS locations, which would support LEAs with accurate data. We do not currently have a way to support districts with verifying students in DYS locations or if this student has completed/graduated. Our detention center data is validated in this manner because LEAs provide the information to CDE through the normal SEY process.</p> <p>Detention centers do not get graduation rates. Students are</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					attributed back to their last district of attendance upon graduation.
Student End of Year - other	CDE	Direct	Enrollment records include postsecondary program participation and retention for the purpose of participating in a postsecondary program (ASCENT, PTECH, TREP) that is used to determine students who participate in postsecondary programs available to K-12 students.	Statutorily Required Reports Website	Could add an annual 'justice engaged' flag to allow for more complex data requests based upon SEY data for this population. Would make future investigation into enrollment history of this population more accessible.
October Count	CDE	Indirect	Students participating in postsecondary programs available to K-12 students are indicated in this collection.	Student October file layout.	Could add an annual 'justice engaged' flag to allow for more complex data requests based upon SEY data for this population. Would make future investigation into enrollment history of this population more accessible.
Academic Services	CDHS – DYS	Indirect	Services utilized by students	Division of Youth Services	

			discharged in FY of interest	publications and reports	
TRAILS	CDHS	Indirect	Each county can collect this data how they choose	CDHS Community Performance Center Reports	

Subject: Post-Secondary Persistence

Title/Collection	Owner	Connection	Data Collected	Reports	Notes
Academic Services	CDHS – DYS	Direct	Services utilized by students discharged in FY of interest	Division of Youth Services publications and reports	
TRAILS	CDHS	Indirect	Each county can collect this data how they choose	CDHS Community Performance Center Reports	

Subject: Employment

Title/Collection	Owner	Connection	Data Collected	Reports	Notes
Student End-of-Year other	CDE		Students indicated as 'have or will enlisted in Military' are indicated in this collection		
TRAILS	CDHS	Indirect	Each county can collect this data how they choose	CDHS Community Performance Center Reports	
Annual Statistical Report	CDHS	Direct	Employment metrics		Reported using discharge cohorts

Justice Engaged Students Data: By Collection

Colorado Department of Education (CDE)

Student End of Year – Graduation/Completion

Information Collected: Enrollment records for all students in CO public schools and detention centers, including entry/exit types to show status when they joined or left a LEP. Enrollment records are used alongside Anticipated Year of Graduation (AYG) to determine the graduation/completion cohort for a student.

ID Type: SASID

Updates: Annual

Notes: Could add a 'justice engaged' flag/cohort to determine a graduation/completion rate for students who were justice engaged at any point in 9th-12th grade. This could be used as a measure of graduation/completion success for students who were justice engaged at some point in their high school career. This assumes CDE receives a list of justice engaged students, their related setting, entry/exit dates to that setting, and believed exit scenario. This could validate school entry/exit types for students in DYS locations, which would support LEAs with accurate data. Detention centers do not get graduation rates. Students are attributed back to their last district of attendance upon graduation.

Data Sharing

Current DSAs: Connect with Kathryn Wright. There is a DSA based on a research project for students in DYS and their related graduation/completion outcomes. CDE has not received any report related to outcomes from this study yet.

Sharing Restrictions: Foster status is restricted because it is provided to CDE from CDHS. CDHS must approve any use of this status beyond the currently posted data.

Reports & Public Information

Sample Reports/Links: Graduation Rates

Public Website Access: <https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdereval/gradratecurrent>

Attendance

Relevance: Indirect

What is calculated or analyzed? Length of enrollment records

Academic Performance

Relevance: Direct

What is calculated or analyzed? Graduation/Completion Status

K-12 Matriculation

Relevance: Indirect

What is calculated or analyzed? Determine which students graduated/completed before determining matriculation status

Post-Secondary Enrollment

Relevance: Indirect

What is calculated or analyzed? Graduation cohort for students retained to participate in postsecondary programs

Student End-of-year - Dropout

Information Collected: Enrollment records for all students in CO public schools and detention centers, including entry/exit types to show status when they joined or left a LEP. Enrollment records are used to determine 7th-12th grade membership base and dropout status.

ID Type: SASID

Updates: Annual

Notes: Could add an annual 'justice engaged' flag/cohort to determine dropout rates for students who were justice engaged at any point during the school year. This could be used to determine dropout rates for this specific population. This assumes CDE receives a list of justice engaged students, their related setting, entry/exit dates to that setting, and believed exit scenario. It is possible a LEP marks a student as a dropout who in fact transferred to DYS due to lack of ability for CDE to validate the status of the student. Detention centers do not receive dropout rates.

Data Sharing

Sharing Restrictions: Foster status is restricted because it is provided to CDE from CDHS. CDHS must approve any use of this status beyond the currently posted data.

Reports & Public Information

Sample Reports/Links: Dropout rates

Public Website Access: [Dropout Statistics Website](https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdereval/dropoutcurrent)
(<https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdereval/dropoutcurrent>)

Attendance

Relevance: Indirect

What is calculated or analyzed? Length of Enrollment Records

Academic Performance

Relevance: Indirect

What is calculated or analyzed? Dropout status

Student End-Of-Year Mobility Status

Information Collected: Enrollment records for all students in CO public schools and detention centers, including entry/exit types to show status when they joined or left a LEP. Enrollment records are used to determine K-12 membership base and count of mobility instances for students.

ID Type: SASID

Updates: Annual

Notes: Could add an annual 'justice engaged' flag/cohort to determine mobility/stability rates for students who were justice engaged at any point during the school year. Or, CDE could calculate the

average number of mobility instances for a student who was justice engaged during the school year. Detention centers do not receive mobility/stability rates.

Data Sharing

Sharing Restrictions: Foster status is restricted because it is provided to CDE from CDHS. CDHS must approve any use of this status beyond the currently posted data.

Reports & Public Information

Sample Reports/Links: Mobility/Stability Rates

Public Website Access: [Mobility/Stability Rates](https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdereval/mobility-stabilitycurrent) (<https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdereval/mobility-stabilitycurrent>)

Attendance

Relevance: Indirect

What is calculated or analyzed? Length of enrollment records

Student End-of-Year Other

Information Collected: Enrollment records for all CO public schools and detention centers, including entry/exit types to show status when they joined or left a LEP. Enrollment records along with demographic and various program participation flags can be used to determine counts of students who were in a K-12 LEP at some point during the year. Includes students indicated as receiving expelled education services.

ID Type: SASID

Updates: Annual

Notes: Could add an annual 'justice engaged' flag to allow for more complex data requests based upon SEY data for this population. Would make future investigation into enrollment history of this population more accessible.

Data Sharing

Sharing Restrictions: Foster status is restricted because it is provided to CDE from CDHS. CDHS must approve any use of this status beyond the currently posted data.

Reports & Public Information

Sample Reports/Links: Federal reporting of migrant counts and homeless counts based upon final SEY data. Some legislative reports based upon SEY data as well.

Public Website Access: [Student Support Homelessness Data](https://www.cde.state.co.us/studentsupport/homeless_data) (https://www.cde.state.co.us/studentsupport/homeless_data)

Public Website Access: [CDE Statutorily Required Reports](https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdedepcom/requiredreports) (<https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdedepcom/requiredreports>)

Attendance

Relevance: Indirect

What is calculated or analyzed? Length of enrollment records

Academic Performance

Relevance: Indirect

What is calculated or analyzed? School exit type, grade, retention code may indicate academic performance in some scenarios

K-12 Matriculation

Relevance: Direct

What is calculated or analyzed? Military enlisted status and postsecondary program participation are used in state accountability frameworks based upon the student's status in the SEY collection for specific matriculation indicators. Retention code and grade level indicate students who progress through K-12 education in a typical fashion or have grade reassignments.

Post-Secondary Enrollment

Relevance: Direct

What is calculated or analyzed? Enrollment records include postsecondary program participation and retention for the purpose of participating in a postsecondary program (ASCENT, PTECH, TREP) that is used to determine students who participate in postsecondary programs available to K-12 students.

Employment

Relevance: Indirect

What is calculated or analyzed? Students indicated as 'have or will enlisted in Military' are indicated in this collection

Other

What is calculated or analyzed? Internal specific data requests based on enrollment records and the various student specific demographics or other flags found on the [Student End of Year file layout](https://www.cde.state.co.us/datapipeline/snap_eoy) (https://www.cde.state.co.us/datapipeline/snap_eoy). School entry and exit types are a large focus of many data requests.

October Count

Information Collected: Pupil enrollment information as of October count day. Information used for funding and for determining counts of students attending schools, regardless of funding status. Includes students indicated as receiving expelled education services.

ID Type: SASID

Updates: Annual

Notes: Detention center data is provided by districts. Special coding pattern for students receiving educational services while in a county jail who are eligible for funding is included in this collection. These students are not counted in the posted K-12 pupil membership data but could be included in a district's funding if the student were eligible per the audit resource guide. Could add a 'justice engaged' flag to allow for more complex data analysis if the definition of justice engaged includes students who are actively attending a school on count day, not just students who are in DYS or detention centers.

Data Sharing

Sharing Restrictions: Foster status is restricted because it is provided to CDE from CDHS. CDHS must approve any use of this status beyond the currently posted data.

Reports & Public Information

Sample Reports/Links: Pupil Membership, Various federal reports based upon this collection, some legislative reports based upon OCT data as well.

Public Website Access: [CDE Pupil Membership](https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdereval/pupilcurrent) (<https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdereval/pupilcurrent>)

Public Website Access: [CDE Statutorily Required Reports](https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdedepcom/requiredreports)
(<https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdedepcom/requiredreports>)

Attendance

Relevance: Indirect

What is calculated or analyzed? Students attending a CO public school as of count day.

K-12 Matriculation

Relevance: Indirect

What is calculated or analyzed? Flags students who are repeating the same grade level in the current year as the prior year October count day.

Post-Secondary Enrollment

Relevance: Direct

What is calculated or analyzed? Students participating in postsecondary programs available to K-12 students are indicated in this collection.

Other

What is calculated or analyzed? Internal specific data requests based upon October count data and the various student specific demographics or other flags found on the [Student October file layout](https://www.cde.state.co.us/datapipeline/snap_studentoctober) (https://www.cde.state.co.us/datapipeline/snap_studentoctober).

Attendance

Information Collected: Student level attendance information used to determine attendance rates, truancy rates, habitually truant student counts, and chronic absenteeism rates.

ID Type: SASID

Updates: Annual

Notes: Could add a 'justice engaged' flag to allow the possibility of creating rates based upon this group of students, but those rates would still be based upon the student's attendance within a school district. Detention centers are excluded from the publicly posted rates.

Reports & Public Information

Sample Reports/Links: Attendance

Public Website Access: [Attendance Statistics](https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdereval/truancystatistics) (<https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdereval/truancystatistics>)

Attendance

Relevance: Direct

What is calculated or analyzed? Attendance rate, truancy rate, habitually truant student count, chronically absent rate by District

Discipline/Behavior

Information Collected: Student discipline data on all students during the reporting year. Collection specifically includes students who had one or more discipline action during the school year.

ID Type: SASID

Updates: Annual

Reports & Public Information

Sample Reports/Links: Suspension/Expulsion

Public Website Access: [Suspension/Expulsion Statistics](https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdereval/suspend-expel)
(<https://www.cde.state.co.us/cdereval/suspend-expel>)

Teacher/Student Data Link (TSDL)

Information Collected: Grades 6-12 course information linking students to courses and instructors for the reported school year.

ID Type: SASID

Updates: Annual

Academic Performance

Relevance: Direct

What is calculated or analyzed? Course completion status

Division of Youth Services (DYS), Department of Human Service (CDHS)

Client Number

Information Collected: (Detention population) Student-level Identifier

ID Type: TRAILS

Updates: Other

Notes: Available in Monthly, Quarterly, Annual Updates; Can be used to identify students received by DYS, total population served by DYS, population served by School Districts for confirmation of CDE reach with population directed to DYS by LEP and Courts

Data Sharing

Current DSAs: see CDE

Sharing Restrictions: PII in disaggregate

Reports & Public Information

Sample Reports/Links: Used in aggregate counts of youth served by DYS in the Monthly Population Report

Public Website Access: [Division of Youth Services publications and reports](https://cdhs.colorado.gov/division-of-youth-services-publications-and-reports)
(<https://cdhs.colorado.gov/division-of-youth-services-publications-and-reports>)

What is calculated or analyzed?

Other

What is calculated or analyzed? Useful for confirming Justice Engaged youth.

Detaining Authority

Information Collected: (Detention population) Indication of detaining authority: Law Enforcement, Courts, Probation; associated to Trails ID

ID Type: TRAILS

Updates: Other

Notes: Available in Monthly, Quarterly, Annual Updates; Detaining Authority. Importantly, this is dynamic and recorded with time stamps. A youth may be initially detained by Law Enforcement, and the detaining authority transitions to the Courts following review.

Data Sharing

Sharing Restrictions: PII in disaggregate (associated w/ Client Number)

Reports & Public Information

Sample Reports/Links: Used in aggregate counts of youth served by DYS in the Monthly Population Report to distinguish between detention and commitment population.

Public Website Access: [Division of Youth Services publications and reports](https://cdhs.colorado.gov/division-of-youth-services-publications-and-reports)
(<https://cdhs.colorado.gov/division-of-youth-services-publications-and-reports>)

Other

What is calculated or analyzed? Useful for confirming Justice Engaged youth and detaining authority associated with the engagement.

Length of Stay

Information Collected: (Detention population) Time stamped admission and release

ID Type: TRAILS

Updates: Other

Notes: Available in Monthly, Quarterly, Annual Updates; Useful for narrowing the scope of population 'eligible' for public school system support (youth may be with DYS for brief weekend admission and release to parent/guardian). Similar to DAUTH, this is dynamic and recorded with time stamps. Most accurate measure is to date of release. Youth may have consecutive admissions and be released to Child Welfare, local Sheriff's Office, and other entities while awaiting court hearing, with a re-admission to DYS following service delivery (representing a new admission).

Data Sharing

Sharing Restrictions: PII in disaggregate (associated w/ Client Number)

Reports & Public Information

Sample Reports/Links: Included in the Monthly Population Report to distinguish between detention and commitment population.

Public Website Access: [Division of Youth Services publications and reports](https://cdhs.colorado.gov/division-of-youth-services-publications-and-reports)
(<https://cdhs.colorado.gov/division-of-youth-services-publications-and-reports>)

Other

What is calculated or analyzed? Useful for narrowing and identifying an accurate scope of records for review by Length of Stay in DYS.

Cross-system Matching Identifiers

Information Collected: (Detention population) First Name, Middle Name, Last Name, DOB, Reported School District

ID Type: TRAILS

Notes: Available in Monthly, Quarterly, Annual Updates; Without access to Trails, personal information is needed to match youth across data systems. Common identifiers used in the matching process by DYS when working with State Court Administrator's Office, Collaborative Management Program, and others.

Data Sharing

Sharing Restrictions: PII

Other

What is calculated or analyzed? Standard identifiers for matching youth across systems. Useful for confirming Justice Engaged youth when Trails ID is not available.

Credit Recovery

Information Collected: (Commitment population) Academic Proficiency, Academic Achievement, Academic Growth, College Readiness, Median Achievement Percentile, Graduation Status

ID Type: TRAILS

Updates: Annual

Notes: Available data points are condensed here for Credit Recovery discussions: Essential in the re-entry process, and transitioning youth back into their communities following court-mandated state secure placement. Data connected to Trails ID.

Data Sharing

Sharing Restrictions: PII in disaggregate (associated w/ Client Number)

Reports & Public Information

Sample Reports/Links: Reported in Aggregate in Annual Educational Outcomes Report to Colorado Legislature for students discharged from DYS care during prior FY (2024-25 report includes outcomes for youth discharged in 2023-24).

Public Website Access: [Division of Youth Services publications and reports](https://cdhs.colorado.gov/division-of-youth-services-publications-and-reports)
(<https://cdhs.colorado.gov/division-of-youth-services-publications-and-reports>)

Attendance

Relevance: Indirect

What is calculated or analyzed? Students attend school year-round

Academic Performance

Relevance: Direct

What is calculated or analyzed? Subject, Test Name, Tiered Goals (i.e., Data, Statistics, and Probability, Geometric Relationships, etc.), Rasch Unit (RIT), Standard Error, Percentile, Exam Duration, Achievement Percentile (Traditional Academic Setting Comparison Group), Achievement Quintile, Growth Percentile, Alternative Education Campus conversion growth calculations

K-12 Matriculation

Relevance: Direct

What is calculated or analyzed? HSD/GED attainment

Academic Services

Information Collected: (Commitment population) Career and technical education, Post-secondary education

ID Type: TRAILS

Updates: Annual

Notes: Available data points are condensed here for Credit Recovery discussions: Academic services and supports

Data Sharing

Sharing Restrictions: PII in disaggregate (associated w/ Client Number)

Reports & Public Information

Sample Reports/Links: Reported in Aggregate in Annual Educational Outcomes Report to Colorado Legislature for students discharged from DYS care during prior FY (2024-25 report includes outcomes for youth discharged in 2023-24).

Public Website Access: [Division of Youth Services publications and reports](https://cdhs.colorado.gov/division-of-youth-services-publications-and-reports)
(<https://cdhs.colorado.gov/division-of-youth-services-publications-and-reports>)

Post-Secondary Enrollment

Relevance: Indirect

What is calculated or analyzed? Services utilized by students discharged in FY of interest

Post-Secondary Persistence

Relevance: Direct

What is calculated or analyzed? Services utilized by students discharged in FY of interest

Colorado Department of Human Services

TRAILS

Information Collected: Name, DOB, race/ethnicity, address, custody

ID Type: TRAILS

Notes: TRAILS is a child welfare case management system

Data Sharing

Current DSAs: CDE, CDHE

Sharing Restrictions: We are governed by Title 19 confidentiality restrictions

Reports & Public Information

Sample Reports/Links: Results Oriented Management (ROM)

Public Website Access: [CDHS Community Performance Center](https://colorado.rom.socwel.ku.edu/reports)
(<https://colorado.rom.socwel.ku.edu/reports>)

Attendance

Relevance: Indirect

What is calculated or analyzed? Each county can collect this data how they choose

Academic Performance

Relevance: Indirect

What is calculated or analyzed? Each county can collect this data how they choose

K-12 Matriculation

Relevance: Indirect

What is calculated or analyzed? Each county can collect this data how they choose

Post-Secondary Enrollment

Relevance: Indirect

What is calculated or analyzed? Each county can collect this data how they choose

Post-Secondary Persistence

Relevance: Indirect

What is calculated or analyzed? Each county can collect this data how they choose

Employment

Relevance: Indirect

What is calculated or analyzed? Each county can collect this data how they choose

Judicial/Probation

Individual Case Information

Title (or short description): Individual Case Information

Information Collected: Name, DOB, Address, race/ethnicity, SSN, County, Court Location, Charge Date, Sentence Date, Parties to Case, Fines and Fees, School Location (if Present)

ID Type: ML

Updates: Real-Time

Notes: JPOD Case Management System

Data Sharing

Current DSAs: None

Sharing Restrictions: Juvenile Court Records are confidential

Reports & Public Information

Sample Reports/Links: No public reports available for unrestricted access

Public Website Access: None

Academic Performance

Relevance: Indirect

What is calculated or analyzed? Narrative notes may contain academic performance information

Employment

Relevance: Direct

What is calculated or analyzed? Narrative notes may contain academic performance information

Truancy Events/Annual Statistical Report

Information Collected: Truancy Events

Updates: Annual

Notes: JPOD Case Management System

Data Sharing

Sharing Restrictions: Public Report

Reports & Public Information

Sample Reports/Links: Page 86

Public Website Access: [2024 Annual Statistical Report](#)

(https://www.coloradojudicial.gov/sites/default/files/2024-09/FY2024%20Annual%20Statistical%20Report%20FINAL%20%28Final%29_0.pdf)

Juvenile Specific Case Information /Annual Statistical Report

Information Collected: Juvenile Specific Case Information

Updates: Annual

Notes: JPOD Case Management System

Data Sharing

Sharing Restrictions: Public Report

Reports & Public Information

Sample Reports/Links: Annual Statistical Report, Pages 77-91

Public Website Access: [2024 Annual Statistical Report](https://www.coloradojudicial.gov/sites/default/files/2024-09/FY2024%20Annual%20Statistical%20Report%20FINAL%20%28Final%29_0.pdf)
(https://www.coloradojudicial.gov/sites/default/files/2024-09/FY2024%20Annual%20Statistical%20Report%20FINAL%20%28Final%29_0.pdf)