
**Mobility Modification of the At-Risk Adjustment
to the Wyoming Cost-based Block Grant
Education Funding Model
October 1, 2003**

A Report Prepared by Ruth Sommers for the Wyoming Department of Education

BACKGROUND

Last year's review of the at-risk adjustment to the Cost-based Block Grant Education Funding Model began the process of answering the question of whether or not the proxy of limited English speaking and free and reduced lunch counts, referred to as the "unduplicated count," was inclusive, appropriate and accurate as an indicator for identifying the number of at-risk students for the purpose of financial compensation to districts.¹ That review found that use of a proxy was preferable to individual student identification accompanied by improvement/intervention plans, and that use of an accurate proxy could be an effective and efficient way to predict a school's general level of academically vulnerable children. Furthermore, the review reiterated that socioeconomic indicators (in this case, free and reduced lunch counts) are still one of the most accurate predictors of educational success or failure and are widely used by most states. Finally, the report importantly established that the current unduplicated count fairly represented the number of at-risk children being served in elementary grades.

However, last year's report did identify a few areas in which the proxy being used could be improved to more closely reflect the economic health of various student populations, thus directing at-risk funds to schools more effectively. Basically, problems were observed at the secondary level, as this is where free and reduced lunch counts become more inaccurate as students fail to fully utilize the program, particularly at the high school level. The current proxy appeared to underidentify the number of students reported by schools as being served in the middle grades; at the high school level, the proxy seemed to unfairly treat alternative schools.

The other significant finding in last year's report to the legislature was the strong correlation, particularly in the secondary grades, between mobility and proficient WyCAS scores. This report fulfills the legislated mandate to further explore the possibility of modifying the existent at-risk adjustment to the school funding model for student mobility.

¹ Ruth Sommers, Review of the At-Risk Adjustment to the Wyoming Cost-based Block Grant Education Funding Model, Cheyenne, Wy, November 2002.

Causes of Mobility and Impact on Student Academic Performance

Generally speaking in the education community, student mobility occurs when a student moves from one school to another for a reason other than promotion. Nationwide, between 30 percent and 40 percent of school changes are not associated with residential changes.² Sometimes schools encourage mobility through expulsion and suspension policies and the tendency to move out students with problems. Students themselves, particularly in the secondary grades, may elect to move to another school reactively, to avoid what they consider a negative school association. The increase in parental options in No Child Left Behind could in the future additionally contribute to student mobility.

But most frequently, moving to a new school is the result of a student change in residence. Families in urban areas with multiple school options may choose to move to a different school as a result of factors such as overcrowding, class size reduction, or the general academic or social climate. But in profoundly rural Wyoming, these types of choices are very limited. Moving as an option to choose a different school experience could occur only in a few larger communities within the state. Thus, one could conclude that generally, incidence of mobility in Wyoming is more tied to residential change that is not spurred by academic choice. Furthermore, move in residence when not an academic choice is many times related to socioeconomic status and/or changes in family situation.

U.S. Census Bureau data for 2000 shows that 15 to 18 percent of school-aged children moved in the previous year.³ It also tells us that single and divorced people are more likely to move than married people, and that lower income groups move more often than higher income groups. Indeed, some estimates indicate that poor families move 50 percent to 100 percent more frequently than families that are not poor.⁴ Moving to other residences is often the result of repeated job change or family disruption, such as divorce or separation.

Here are some things known about the effect moving to new schools has on students, and ultimately on student performance:

² Russell W. Rumberger, "Student Mobility and Academic Achievement," *ERIC Digest*, Champaign, IL, June 2002.

³ U.S. Census Bureau, "Moving Rates by Age: March 1999 to 2000," *Geographic Mobility*, Washington, D.C, March 2000.

⁴ David Wood, et al., "Impact of Family Relocation on Children's Growth, Development, School Function and Behavior," *Journal of the American Medical Association* 270, 1993.

- ◆ Mobile students seem to experience both social and academic adjustment problems. They report lower self-esteem and are more likely than other students to get into trouble at school.⁵
- ◆ Moving to another school oftentimes disrupts learning due to curricular differences and placement in inappropriate courses.
- ◆ Older mobile students are more likely to develop problems than younger ones.⁶
- ◆ In high school, mobility drastically diminishes the prospects for graduation. Students changing high schools *even one time* are less than half as likely to graduate.⁷
- ◆ Nationally, average test scores of mobile students are lower than non-mobile students. In Wyoming, this holds particularly true for secondary students. However, *research has shown lower test scores are often pre-existent to mobility and related to socioeconomic status.*⁸

The close link between mobility and socioeconomic status makes it difficult to isolate whether mobility itself is more of a symptom or a cause of poor school performance. In studies that do account for background differences, it has been found that mobile students generally come from poorer families and had lower academic performance *before* they were mobile.⁹ The disruption caused by moving to a new school only compounds this pre-existing achievement gap, leaving these students particularly vulnerable to falling behind even further, with each additional school change contributing to a cumulative academic lag.¹⁰

Because mobility and poverty are so closely associated, mobility can potentially be used as an indicator of socioeconomic status, particularly in the absence of other information, or when that information could be considered incomplete (i.e., free and reduced lunch counts in secondary). This report proposes using incidence of mobility in addition to free and reduced lunch counts as a means to more accurately reflect socioeconomic status in the secondary grades.

⁵ Russell W. Rumberger, et al, "The Educational Consequences of Mobility for California Students and Schools," *Policy Analysis for California Education Policy Brief, Vol. 1, No. 1*, Berkeley, Ca, May 1999.

⁶ Katherine A. Larson and Russell W. Rumberger, "Student Mobility and the Increased Risk of High School Dropout," *American Journal of Education, Vol. 107*, Chicago, Il, November 1998.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Russell W. Rumberger, "Student Mobility and Academic Achievement," *ERIC Digest*, June 2002.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Chester Hartman, "Chapter 16: High Classroom Turnover: How Children Get Left Behind," Rights at Risk: Equality in an Age of Terrorism, Citizens Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C, February 2002.

Review of Findings¹¹

To quickly review last year’s finding on the appropriateness of the at-risk proxy to the school funding model, there was evidence of a strong relationship at all three grades between free and reduced lunch and WyCAS test scores. The negative correlation shown below indicates that as free and reduced lunch counts increase, WyCAS scores tend to decrease.

Table 1: School level correlations between WyCAS test scores and free/reduced lunch participation of students:

Grade	School Demographic	WyCAS Mean Scores		
		Reading	Writing	Math
4	F&R Lunch	-0.442**	-0.497**	-0.298**
8	F&R Lunch	-0.362**	-0.425**	-0.274**
11	F&R Lunch	-0.630**	-0.564**	-0.693**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
 Excludes schools reporting 0% F&R Lunch
 Based on 3-year data

The secondary finding which is further explored in this report is that mobility also has a negative effect on WyCAS scores at the secondary level. Indeed, in middle school, mobility appears to be more affective than free and reduced lunch count on test scores, and as significant as free and reduced lunch count in high school.

Table 2: School level correlations between WyCAS test scores and mobility of students:

Grade	School Demographic	WyCAS Mean Scores		
		Reading	Writing	Math
4	New to Bldg	-0.087	-0.140	-0.152*
8	New to Bldg	-0.528**	-0.551**	-0.550**
11	New to Bldg	-0.550**	-0.509**	-0.626**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
 *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
 Excludes schools reporting 0% F&R Lunch
 Based on 3-year data

¹¹ Ruth Sommers, Review of the At-Risk Adjustment to the Wyoming Cost-based Block Grant Education Funding Model, Cheyenne, Wy, November 2002.

Also note in the table above that mobility has little discernible effect on WyCAS test scores at the elementary level. This is in keeping with findings cited by Larson and Rumberger that mobility has less effect on younger students than on older ones. This does not mean mobility has no effect on student performance in elementary grades, for certainly it does. But it appears, because of the postulated close association in Wyoming of mobility and the socioeconomic indicator of free and reduced lunch, the latter is serving well as a proxy in elementary. Additionally, last year's report concluded that in the elementary grades, the unduplicated count of free and reduced lunch participants and limited English speaking students was closely representative of the number of at-risk students reported as being served by schools surveyed. Thus, no modification for mobility is proposed to be made to the use of the current at-risk proxy at the elementary level.

WyCAS Mobility Data

Each year as students take the WyCAS, demographic data is also gathered about them. Students themselves complete questionnaires which ask about their study habits, television viewing, how subjects are taught in their classes, family education attainment level, etc. School personnel are to supply other data on test takers, such as ethnicity, sex, free and reduced lunch participation, and whether or not the student is new to the district and the school. This latter information is particularly important in light of new accountability requirements mandated in No Child Left Behind. The test scores of students considered new to the school can be omitted from the school's data for the purpose of determining Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Wyoming has chosen to define these students as those who came into the building after the annual October 1st enrollment count.

Because of the added emphasis this year of accurately accounting for new students for AYP, it was assumed WyCAS demographic data on this particular item would be more carefully reported by districts. Unfortunately, this was not the case. Twenty-eight middle schools were contacted, asking them to verify their "New to Building" WyCAS data. Of these, ten did not respond. Of the 18 that did, seven reported their WyCAS data was correct, and eleven changed their data, all increasing the count of new students. At the high school level, 18 schools were contacted, six of which did not respond. Of the 12 that did, only two reported their original information was accurate, and ten revised their data upward. The effect of this inaccurate reporting on AYP was not researched. When the state completes its data management system, it can be used to accurately replace a great deal of WyCAS demographic information. Until that system is in place, it is highly recommended to school officials that they devise some sort of information procedure within their own district and schools to ensure more careful attention to this particular part of test demographics.

Regardless of the accuracy of WyCAS, it was still necessary to use it to project the effect of modifying the current at-risk proxy for mobility. This was done by analyzing

student records from each school to ascertain how many students were reported by the school as being new. In order that students not be “double counted” as also taking part in free and reduced lunch, the number of new students was reduced by the number of students also reported in WyCAS as participating in free and reduced lunch. This yielded a “net” percentage of mobile (only) students. In the middle grades, it was found that 53 percent of the new students were not indicated as also being enrolled in free and reduced lunch, and in high school 75 percent of the new students were not reported as enrolled. Applying these “net” percentages to the total percentage of new students within a school will yield a count of mobile (only) students which can then be added to the current unduplicated count used in the at-risk adjustment. The effect of this calculation is demonstrated in Appendices A and B. These attachments list each secondary school, its current unduplicated percentage, the percent of students reported as new in WyCAS, and each school’s adjusted unduplicated percentage after modifying it for mobility.

Effect on the Proxy of the Proposed Mobility Modification

Please keep in mind the following discussion is predicated on the mobility modification as it is proposed. Management Analysis and Planning (MAP) must analyze this proposal and incorporate it into the current model in an appropriate and accurate way. Thus, the initial findings reported herein are subject to MAP’s final review and modification.

As it is proposed, adding mobile students to the current unduplicated count goes a long way in resolving some of the problems identified last year concerning the discrepancy between the current proxy and the number of at-risk students schools reported as serving. Last year’s report¹² identified a discrepancy in **junior high/middle schools** of 16.05 percent. The mobility modification to the current adjustment increases the number of students in junior high/middle schools by 466 individuals, and moves the unduplicated percentage from 30.76 percent to 33.08 percent, an increase of 7.54 percent. Considering the apparent high incidence of underreporting of mobility in WyCAS demographic data, the modification should increase in the future, perhaps even doubling. This would effectively negate the original discrepancy of 16.05 percent.

Another problem area specified by last year’s research pertained to the noticeable underidentification by the current proxy of at-risk students in **alternative schools**. Socioeconomic status is not well reflected in these schools by the current proxy primarily because most of the alternative schools are high schools, and free and reduced lunch participation drops noticeably at this level. The proposed mobility modification adds 181 students to the proxy for alternative schools and moves their unduplicated count from 33.94 percent to 52.22 percent, an increase of 53.86 percent. Of the fourteen alternative schools, three did not report any students as being new to the school, which is probably inaccurate. Again, as data becomes more reliable, this

¹² Ibid.

percentage should also increase. The debate left in the discussion of alternative schools is whether or not 100 percent of their students should be included in the proxy, as by association with an alternative school, they are likely at risk of failure.

Students potentially at risk of failure in **high schools** (when alternative schools are removed) versus the number of students reported as being served by high schools last year still deserves discussion beyond this report. Last year's analysis discovered that the number of students served by schools was actually 16.93 percent *less than* the number identified by the current unduplicated count. When adjustments are additionally made for mobility, this discrepancy increases even more. When counts for alternative schools are omitted, the current proxy identifies 19 percent of high school students as either participating in free and reduced lunch or being limited English proficient. When the mobility modification is incorporated into the adjustment, this percentage moves up 9.45 percent to 20.79 percent. This poses two issues. First, is 20.79 percent a reasonable indicator of at-risk students in high school? If so, are high schools providing supplemental services to a sufficient number of students?

Some general extrapolations can be made from current information. For instance, we know that the percentage of middle school students participating in free or reduced lunch or who are limited English speaking is 30.76 percent. The three-year average dropout event rates (1999-00 through 2001-02)¹³ for the four years of high school begin at 2.73 percent in ninth grade, then increase to 6.18 percent, 7.46 percent, and finally culminate at 7.67 percent in twelfth grade. Simply reducing the unduplicated percentage by each year's dropout event rate would yield a ninth grade at-risk percentage of 28.03, followed by 21.85 percent, 14.39 percent, and 6.72 percent in twelfth grade. Identifying 20 to 25 percent of high school students as potentially at risk of failure is probably not out of line with the number of students schools should be serving, which expectedly would be more than the number of students who ended up actually leaving school. The second question of whether or not a consistently sufficient number of high school students statewide are actually receiving compensatory education services still remains unanswered.

This proposed modification to the model will augment the model's at-risk funding by approximately \$630,000 the first year. This could potentially increase to \$1 million, dependent upon more accurate student demographic data. Half of the \$630,000 is directed to middle schools, and another half to high schools. At the high school level, the recipients are overwhelmingly alternative schools, with only \$90,000 directed to non-alternative high schools. Both these results are in keeping with correcting deficiencies noted in proxy counts the prior year.

¹³ Wyoming Department of Education, *Statistical Report Series No. 3, SY1999-00, SY2000-01 and SY2001-02*, Cheyenne, Wy, 2001 and 2003. From the Wyoming Department of Education web site at www.k12.wy.us/DATATECH/pub.

The Issue of Adequacy

Last year's report discussed the difficulty in answering the question of whether or not dollars directed to at-risk students adequately fund needed interventions. Vexatious questions were posed that still remain unresolved. First, there is no definition of adequate and/or inadequate student performance, and no shared vision of what an at-risk student is. Practice between districts varies greatly in when and how they intervene with students and the amount of resources they direct to this end; indeed they vary so greatly between districts that it is difficult to ascertain whether quality, equitable programs are being made available to all Wyoming students. Policy makers do not know if current compensatory programs are effective; unfortunately, dropout rates are not yet decreasing. Thus, it may not be prudent to conclude what schools currently do or spend on these programs is appropriate.

Compensatory education is becoming more and more critical in light of the implementation of higher state standards and graduation requirements, especially when coupled with the demands of No Child Left Behind, with its strict accountability mandate. Particularly now with these pressures, districts are adding new programs in their offerings to at-risk students each year, making the cost issue a moving target. At the same time, the funding model itself is being augmented. As proposed, the mobility modification to the at-risk adjustment is projected to add over \$630,000 to the model the first year, and could potentially become a million when demographic data is more reliable. The \$3.2 million dollars which has been directed to districts through the Reading Assessment and Intervention program "outside" the model will be increased to \$4.6 million and is proposed to be incorporated into the model itself, further identifying specific at-risk intervention funds within the cost-based block grant.

To illustrate these revenue/expenditure interactions more specifically, this report again refers to last year's analysis of the costs and revenues provided for at-risk programs within Laramie County School District #1. That district reported spending \$1.8 million on these interventions for FY01-02 (not including the additional expenses inherent with operating an alternative high school). The at-risk adjustment to the model provided approximately \$1 million for that same fiscal year, and the categorical reading funds were close to \$500,000. While the adjustment alone did not fully fund the district's expenditures in that year, some additional costs are built into the funding model's prototype, although an exact figure is not discernible. Now, changes proposed by incorporating a mobility modification to the at-risk adjustment and the increase to early literacy funds could add at-risk revenues to LCSD#1 of close to \$300,000. Meanwhile, the district has instituted even more at-risk intervention programs, increasing their expenditures by \$216,000 last school year.

It would appear that the issue of adequacy should at this point be focused more on equal treatment of students than on funding. This finding is consistent with what the American Institute of Research (AIR) discovered with the delivery of special education services throughout the state. To reiterate some of last year's findings on at-risk interventions and their cost, schools responding to proxy surveys reported serving

anywhere from 150 percent *more* to 89 percent *less* than their unduplicated count; district expenditures on “within-day” interventions varied from \$46 to \$5,475 per pupil; and extended-day program costs ranged from \$20 to \$3,566 per student. These wide expenditure differences hint at wide disparities between program offerings across the districts. Even more problematic was the discovery of the apparently extreme inconsistency between districts of when they initiate interventions with at-risk students. Some begin this process when student scores fall below the 74th percentile on district tests, while others took no action unless these scores fell below the 19th percentile. Thus, it is again recommended this year that compensatory programs offered throughout districts be reviewed to determine if intervention and/or remediation programs for students are effective, efficient, and equitably delivered to all Wyoming students.

Limited English Proficient Students

The latest reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act changed the way states must account for and deliver services to their limited English proficient (LEP), or Title III, students. Additional requirements have been placed on states to test all these students to determine their levels of proficiency, and to have specific plans in place to move them to higher proficiency levels within explicit time frames.

The state must establish English language development standards that align with state standards, and define performance indicators for the standards. Both these are now being developed and are anticipated to be implemented in September 2004. The Title III administrator must also collect LEP statistics and set forth annual measurable achievement objectives for the state and districts.

Last year the state tested 3,378 students for English proficiency; 2,896 students were deemed either limited English proficient (LEP) or non English proficient (NEP). Tests are usually administered in the fall (or when a new student enters a school). The tests used to date are not considered to be accurately aligned with Wyoming’s standards. Thus, the state has joined in a consortium of eleven other Western states in writing a new test which will be aligned with our standards. It is anticipated this test will be used next spring or fall, and once it is in place, will be the only instrument used throughout the state to assess the English fluency of all students.

Districts must put in place a plan for each tested student which sets forth goals for improvement and identifies methods to reach those goals. Parent involvement is a necessary component of these plans, and schools must include them in the decisions that affect their children. Even after a student achieves fluency, that student must still have a plan in place for two additional years to track his/her progress.

Wyoming receives the minimum \$500,000 federal grant amount to administer Title III. Last year, only thirteen districts were the recipients of these flow-through monies. Their

average per child allotment was \$150. Two reservation districts did not receive Title III flow-through funds last year because they were recipients of Title VII Bilingual Education program monies. Title VII is being phased out and replaced by Title III, but the funding levels will not be maintained. For instance, Fremont School District #14 has received \$446,750 in Title VII monies each of the last three years; when that district moves to Title III monies, it will receive approximately \$96,000 (at \$150/student). Likewise, Fremont #38 will go from \$386,004 under Title VII to approximately \$39,000 under Title III. Additionally, when these two districts are eligible for and receive Title III flow-through funds this year, fewer total resources will be available to other districts.

Currently, limited English speaking (LEP) students are included in the at-risk proxy for adjusting the block grant. If a child is LEP and also enrolled in free and reduced lunch, that child is only counted one time for inclusion in the proxy (the unduplicated count.) Again dependent upon the financial health of a district, they may or may not receive add-on LEP funding.

For instance, Teton County School District #1 reported to the State Department they had 213 LEP students in the prior school year. Their unduplicated count for the proxy resulted in only 58 students being added to their free and reduced lunch count. However, because the total unduplicated percentage still fell below or well below the 29% statewide average in all but one of their schools, the district received no additional funding for these students. Again, this is in keeping with MAP's assertion that an average concentration of at-risk students is funded in the prototype itself. Contrast this with Laramie County School District #1 which reported 230 LEP students to the State Department. Their LEP count increased their unduplicated proxy by over 200 students and added approximately \$165,000 to their at-risk reimbursement because the additional number of students either pushed a school above the 29% statewide average, or occurred in schools already above that average.

Interventions associated with educating children with limited English speaking proficiency are different from those associated with educating children who come from low socioeconomic backgrounds. These children face specific barriers to education. It is estimated to take "two years for students to acquire social language skills in English, and another six to nine years for the acquisition of academic language proficiency to achieve parity with native English language peers."¹⁴ Teachers need specific training in teaching English as a Second Language (ESL), and Wyoming currently has only ten ESL-trained teachers. The state is now in the process of trying to identify how many more of these specially trained educators they need to meet the mandates of Title III, as well as to ascertain the level of resources needed to attain annual achievement objectives.

Considering the new emphasis on the attainment of proficiency of limited English speaking students under Title III, it is recommended the legislature further study the

¹⁴ Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), Statement of Acquisition of Academic Proficiency in English, Alexandria, Va, October 1999.

effort and associated expense required to educate its LEP students to proficient levels and to ascertain whether or not this category of students should stand alone for at-risk funding.

Attachment A: High Schools and Multiple Grade Span Schools

School Name	School ID	10/1/02 Enroll	Original Undup Count	Undup %	% New in WyCAS	Count Adj for Mobility	% Undup Adj for Mobility
Laramie High School	101055	786	108	13.74%	2.78%	124	15.78%
Rock River High School	101056	57	10	17.54%	0.00%	10	17.54%
Whiting Alternative High	101057	49	17	34.69%	10.00%	21	42.86%
Burlington High School	201055	73	33	45.21%	0.00%	33	45.21%
Rocky Mountain High	201056	168	56	33.33%	0.00%	56	33.33%
Lovell High School	202055	217	70	32.26%	0.00%	70	32.26%
Greybull High School	203055	159	25	15.72%	0.00%	25	15.72%
Riverside High School	204055	110	40	36.36%	8.82%	47	42.73%
Campbell County High	301055	1528	150	9.82%	2.86%	183	11.98%
Wright Jr./Sr. High 7-12	301056	253	34	13.44%	0.00%	35	13.83%
Westwood High School	301057	110	42	38.18%	4.88%	46	41.82%
Little Snake River K-12	401049	176	34	19.32%	0.00%	34	19.32%
Rawlins High School	401056	506	69	13.64%	1.77%	76	15.02%
Cooperative School 8-12	401057	37	0	0.00%	33.33%	9	24.32%
Encampment High School	402055	54	12	22.22%	0.00%	12	22.22%
H.E.M. Senior High	402056	72	30	41.67%	0.00%	30	41.67%
Saratoga High School	402058	129	16	12.40%	0.00%	16	12.40%
Douglas High School	501055	562	102	18.15%	1.63%	109	19.40%
Glenrock High School	502055	247	70	28.34%	1.72%	73	29.55%
Hulett High School	601055	86	25	29.07%	4.76%	28	32.56%
Moorcroft High School	601056	171	26	15.20%	0.00%	26	15.20%
Sundance High School	601057	131	25	19.08%	2.94%	28	21.37%
Bear Lodge School 8-12	601058	22	8	36.36%	60.00%	18	81.82%
Lander Valley High School	701055	667	185	27.74%	3.16%	201	30.13%
Pathfinder Center 8-12	701056	35	26	74.29%	66.67%	35	100.00%
Dubois High School	702055	100	32	32.00%	4.55%	35	35.00%
Wind River Secondary 6-12	706055	241	111	46.06%	0.00%	111	46.06%
Wyoming Indian High	714055	171	171	100.00%	6.45%	171	100.00%
Shoshoni High School	724055	75	15	20.00%	0.00%	15	20.00%
Riverton High School	725056	817	246	30.11%	4.49%	273	33.41%
Southeast High School	801055	100	31	31.00%	3.85%	34	34.00%
Lingle-Ft Laramie High	801058	95	31	32.63%	0.00%	31	32.63%
Torrington High School	801059	434	125	28.80%	6.10%	145	33.41%
Hot Springs County High	901055	261	55	21.07%	10.00%	75	28.74%
Buffalo High School	1001055	365	70	19.18%	2.47%	77	21.10%
Kaycee High School	1001056	55	7	12.73%	0.00%	7	12.73%
Central High School	1101055	1178	200	16.98%	3.37%	230	19.51%
East High School	1101056	1611	228	14.15%	2.68%	260	16.14%
Triumph High School 8-12	1101057	253	84	33.20%	43.33%	168	66.40%
Albin Jr/Sr High 7-12	1102055	53	22	41.51%	0.00%	22	41.51%
Burns Jr/Sr High 7-12	1102056	223	56	25.11%	0.00%	59	26.46%
Pine Bluffs Jr/Sr High 7-12	1102057	173	55	31.79%	11.54%	67	38.73%
Kemmerer High School	1201055	228	37	16.23%	4.00%	44	19.30%
Cokeville High 6-12	1202055	102	37	33.92%	0.00%	37	36.27%
Star Valley High School	1202056	720	160	22.22%	1.85%	170	23.61%
Swift Cr Learning Ctr 9-12	1202057	14	5	35.71%	100.00%	14	100.00%
Midwest School K-12	1301049	148	82	55.41%	20.00%	93	62.84%
Kelly Walsh High School	1301055	1044	167	16.00%	0.72%	173	16.57%
Natrona County High	1301057	1514	238	15.72%	2.48%	266	17.57%
Roosevelt High 7-12	1301058	231	83	35.93%	14.29%	108	46.75%

Niobrara County High	1401055	144	37	25.69%	2.86%	40	27.78%
Powell High School	1501055	503	88	17.50%	0.75%	91	18.09%
Shoshone Learning Ctr	1501056	12	2	16.67%	0.00%	2	16.67%
Cody High School	1506055	819	89	10.87%	0.00%	89	10.87%
Meeteetse School K-12	1516049	142	65	45.77%	0.00%	66	46.48%
Chugwater High School	1601055	51	14	27.45%	7.69%	17	33.33%
Glendo High School	1601056	27	14	51.85%	0.00%	14	51.85%
Wheatland High School	1601057	310	12	3.87%	1.33%	15	4.84%
Guernsey-Sunrise High	1602055	77	16	20.78%	0.00%	16	20.78%
Big Horn High School	1701055	144	19	13.19%	5.13%	25	17.36%
Tongue River High School	1701056	161	47	29.19%	8.82%	58	36.02%
Fort Mackenzie	1702056	57	22	38.60%	30.00%	35	61.40%
Sheridan High School	1702057	730	105	14.38%	2.92%	121	16.58%
Arvada-Clearmont High	1703055	34	5	14.71%	0.00%	5	14.71%
Pinedale High School	1801055	202	34	16.83%	1.82%	37	18.32%
Big Piney High School	1809055	184	31	16.85%	0.00%	31	16.85%
Farson-Eden High School	1901055	47	2	4.26%	22.22%	10	21.28%
Rock Springs High School	1901056	840	87	10.36%	3.41%	109	12.98%
Independence High	1901057	100	27	27.00%	0.00%	27	27.00%
Green River High School	1902055	905	86	9.50%	1.41%	96	10.61%
Expedition Academy	1902056	41	14	34.15%	33.33%	24	58.54%
Jackson Hole High School	2001055	672	46	6.85%	0.68%	49	7.29%
Western Wyoming High	2001056	29	6	20.69%	0.00%	6	20.69%
Evanston High School	2101055	965	260	26.94%	2.33%	277	28.70%
Mountain View High	2104055	239	24	10.04%	0.00%	24	10.04%
Lyman High School	2106055	248	28	11.29%	1.67%	31	12.50%
Worland High School	2201055	448	119	26.56%	3.06%	129	28.79%
Ten Sleep High School	2202055	43	14	32.56%	10.00%	17	39.53%
Newcastle High School	2301055	303	46	15.18%	0.00%	46	15.18%
Upton High School	2307055	105	14	13.33%	5.41%	18	17.14%

Attachment B: Junior High/Middle Schools and K-8s

School Name	School ID	10/1/02 Enroll	Original Undup Count	Undup %	% New in WyCAS	Count Adj for Mobility	% Undup Adj for Mobility
River Bridge Elem K-8	0101014	3	0	0.00%	0.00%	0	0.00%
UW Laboratory School K-9	0101030	215	33	15.35%	0.00%	33	15.35%
Laramie Junior High School	0101050	770	186	24.16%	4.49%	204	26.49%
Rock River Junior High School	0101051	26	10	38.46%	0.00%	10	38.46%
Burlington Junior High School	0201050	39	24	61.54%	0.00%	24	61.54%
Rocky Mountain Middle School	0201051	101	51	50.50%	2.78%	52	51.49%
Lovell Middle School	0202050	150	62	41.33%	2.17%	64	42.67%
Greybull Middle School	0203050	115	34	29.57%	0.00%	34	29.57%
Cloud Peak Middle School	0204051	100	47	47.00%	9.68%	52	52.00%
Little Powder River K-8	0303010	18	3	16.67%	0.00%	3	16.67%
Recluse School K-8	0301014	34	8	23.53%	50.00%	10	29.41%
Twin Spruce Junior High	0301050	866	247	28.52%	4.95%	270	31.18%
Sage Valley Junior High	0301051	793	110	13.87%	2.99%	123	15.51%
Rawlins Middle School	0401050	369	105	28.46%	4.24%	113	30.62%
H.E.M. Junior High	0402050	41	20	48.78%	0.00%	20	48.78%
Saratoga Middle School	0402052	92	13	14.13%	3.33%	15	16.30%
Encampment Junior High	0402053	21	9	42.86%	0.00%	9	42.86%
Shawnee Elem K-8	0501006	7	4	57.14%	0.00%	4	57.14%
White Elem K-8	0501011	14	7	50.00%	20.00%	8	57.14%
Douglas Middle School	0501050	405	132	32.59%	2.92%	138	34.07%
Glenrock Middle School	0502050	129	44	34.11%	3.51%	46	35.66%
Hulett Junior High School	0601050	48	22	45.83%	4.17%	23	47.92%
Moorcroft Junior High School	0601051	73	23	31.51%	0.00%	23	31.51%
Sundance Junior High School	0601052	56	11	19.64%	0.00%	11	19.64%
Starrett Junior High School	0701050	299	108	36.12%	5.92%	117	39.13%
Dubois Elem/Middle K-8	0702001	154	77	50.00%	5.00%	79	51.30%
Wyoming Indian Middle	0714050	173	173	100.00%	9.09%	173	100.00%
Ft Washakie Middle School	0721050	53	53	100.00%	15.38%	53	100.00%
Shoshoni Junior High School	0724050	40	17	42.50%	9.09%	19	47.50%
Riverton Middle School	0725050	603	278	46.10%	10.47%	311	51.58%
Arapahoe Elementary K-9	0738001	277	263	94.95%	13.33%	268	96.75%
Ft Laramie Middle School	0801050	68	26	38.24%	0.00%	26	38.24%
Southeast Middle School	0801051	77	35	45.45%	7.41%	38	49.35%
Torrington Middle School	0801052	318	146	45.91%	7.00%	158	49.69%
Thermopolis Middle School	0901050	154	56	36.36%	5.56%	61	39.31%
Clear Creek Middle School	1001050	271	0	0.00%	2.44%	4	1.48%
Kaycee Junior High School	1001051	30	7	23.33%	5.56%	8	26.67%
Carey Junior High School	1101050	1092	312	28.57%	6.65%	350	32.05%
Johnson Junior High School	1101051	913	474	51.92%	10.03%	523	57.28%
McCormick Junior High	1101052	1113	240	21.56%	0.28%	242	21.74%
Kemmerer Middle School	1201050	189	59	31.22%	0.00%	59	31.22%
Star Valley Middle School	1202051	339	115	33.92%	2.96%	120	35.40%
Poison Spider Elementary K-8	1301020	170	36	21.18%	0.00%	36	21.18%
Woods Learning Center K-8	1301029	155	23	14.84%	0.00%	23	14.84%
Casper Classical Academy	1301038	103	14	13.59%	16.28%	23	22.33%
C Y Junior High School	1301050	641	153	23.87%	0.42%	154	24.02%
Dean Morgan Junior High	1301051	895	298	33.30%	1.39%	305	34.08%
East Junior High School	1301052	383	180	47.00%	11.61%	204	53.26%
Centennial Junior High	1301054	674	151	22.40%	4.17%	166	24.63%

Lusk Middle School	1401050	114	42	36.84%	5.26%	45	39.47%
Powell Middle School	1501050	415	153	36.87%	5.19%	164	39.52%
Cody Middle School	1506050	541	112	20.70%	6.55%	131	24.21%
Wheatland Junior High School	1601050	209	62	29.67%	2.08%	64	30.62%
Chugwater Junior High School	1601051	17	7	41.18%	11.11%	8	47.06%
Glendo Junior High School	1601052	15	6	40.00%	0.00%	6	40.00%
Guernsey-Sunrise Junior High	1602050	45	15	33.33%	0.00%	15	33.33%
Big Horn Middle School	1701050	99	19	19.19%	6.45%	22	22.22%
Tongue River Middle School	1701051	131	50	38.17%	0.00%	50	38.17%
Sheridan Junior High School	1702051	496	157	31.65%	3.81%	167	33.67%
The Wright Place	1702052	18	12	66.67%	14.29%	13	72.22%
Arvada-Clearmont Junior High	1703051	19	3	15.79%	9.09%	4	21.05%
Pinedale Middle School	1801050	161	34	21.12%	3.57%	37	22.98%
Big Piney Middle School	1809050	159	41	25.79%	0.00%	41	25.79%
Rock Springs East Junior High	1901050	473	94	19.87%	10.60%	121	25.58%
White Mountain Junior High	1901051	512	106	20.70%	0.62%	108	21.09%
Farson-Eden Middle School	1901054	35	7	20.00%	0.00%	7	20.00%
Lincoln Middle School	1902050	331	64	19.34%	2.78%	69	20.85%
Monroe Middle School	1902051	298	57	19.13%	9.18%	71	23.83%
Desert Middle 6-8	1901053	17	4	23.53%	20.00%	6	35.29%
Jackson Hole Middle School	2001050	545	65	11.93%	3.49%	75	13.76%
Davis Middle School	2101050	415	164	39.52%	4.26%	173	41.69%
Evanston Middle School	2101051	350	132	37.71%	7.96%	147	42.00%
Mountain View Middle School	2104050	164	39	23.78%	2.04%	41	25.00%
Lyman Middle School	2106050	155	36	23.23%	1.89%	38	24.52%
Worland Middle School	2201050	351	117	33.33%	4.39%	125	35.61%
Ten Sleep Middle School	2202050	18	7	38.89%	12.50%	8	44.44%
Newcastle Middle School	2301050	212	52	24.53%	4.71%	57	26.89%
Upton Middle School	2307050	70	12	17.14%	0.00%	12	17.14%