In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Colorado Department of Education administered the District and Charter Needs Assessment between March 27th and April 4th.

Superintendents, BOCES directors, and charter and approved facility school leaders were encouraged to complete the needs inventory to share the needs of schools and districts across the state, including support for learning at home and the general needs of the surrounding community.

The Colorado Education Initiative (CEI) staff provided data management, analysis, reporting, and follow-up support for the needs assessment effort.

Regional analyses of the needs assessment were conducted based on the eight CDE regions illustrated in the map to the right. **Needs assessment data summarized in this report reflect results as of Saturday, April 4th, at 4 pm, with updated priorities and key themes from brief regional follow-up interviews conducted by CEI staff on Friday, April 10th, added in.**
Respondents

- As of April 4th, there have been a total of 338 respondents to the needs assessment, with 161 of those representing districts or BOCES and 177 representing charter schools.

- The results in this report only reflect the school district or BOCES responses. The charter school responses continue to be shared with CDE’s Schools of Choice office for review and follow-up.

Nearly 85% of Colorado districts/BOCES have responded.

These districts/BOCES serve 88% of the state’s public school students.

79% of responding districts represent rural communities.
Education Needs
Top Education Supports Needed Across Colorado Districts

Percentage Selecting the Following Education Supports as Top Needs

- Student emotional support: 52%
- Technical supports for delivering remote learning: 47%
- Online instructional supports for teachers: 42%
- Family engagement practices: 38%
- Standards-aligned instruction in remote learning: 26%
- Supports for less virtual, more blended delivery, including paper resources: 25%
- Supports for HR practices for this year: 23%
- Draft communications for students/parents/families: 19%
- Supports for HR practices (hiring) for next year: 19%
- Other: 17%
- Instructional time support: 17%
- Support for Learning Management System(s): 11%
Education Supports by Region

▪ Four different education supports were named as top priorities by all regions of the state including:
  ▪ Family engagement practices,
  ▪ Student social emotional support,
  ▪ Online instructional supports for teachers, and
  ▪ Technical supports for delivering remote learning.

▪ Support with student social emotional needs was identified as the number one priority for 5 of the 8 (63 percent) regions.

▪ While supports for less virtual, more blended delivery, including paper resources and draft communications for students/parents/families were selected less frequently as top priorities, several districts have offered to share resources to support these areas of need.

▪ Follow-up calls with regional and district leaders on April 10th indicated consistent and elevated priority for student social emotional supports. Leaders emphasized this need in particular for elementary students, while they noted more needs for student engagement at the secondary level. Many also noted a growing need for family engagement supports, as shown on the next slide.
# Top Education Supports by Region: Detailed Data

Supports that were emphasized, corroborated, or named as emerging higher priorities on April 10th follow-up calls with regional leaders are bolded and underlined.

## Metro Region
- Family engagement practices: 47%
- Student emotional support: 47%
- Online instructional supports for teachers: 41%
- Technical supports for delivering remote learning: 41%
- Standards-aligned instruction in remote learning: 35%

## North Central Region
- Technical supports for delivering remote learning: 60%
- Student emotional support: 45%
- Online instructional supports for teachers: 40%
- Standards-aligned instruction in remote learning: 35%
- Family engagement practices: 30%

## Pikes Peak Region
- Student emotional support: 56%
- Technical supports for delivering remote learning: 48%
- Online instructional supports for teachers: 44%
- Family engagement practices: 41%
- Supports for less virtual, more blended delivery, including paper resources: 37%

## Southeast Region
- Student emotional support for delivering remote learning: 63%
- Online instructional supports for teachers: 54%
- Family engagement practices: 41%

## Northwest Region
- Student emotional support: 53%
- Technical supports for delivering remote learning: 47%
- Family engagement practices: 41%
- Online instructional supports for teachers: 41%
- Standards-aligned instruction in remote learning: 33%

## Southwest Region
- Student emotional support: 50%
- Technical supports for delivering remote learning: 40%
- Online instructional supports for teachers: 30%
- Family engagement practices: 33%
- Instructional time support: 30%
- Standards-aligned instruction in remote learning: 30%

## West Central Region
- Student emotional support: 78%
- Family engagement practices: 44%
- Technical supports for delivering remote learning: 33%
- Online instructional supports for teachers: 33%
- Supports for HR practices (hiring) for next year: 33%
- Supports for HR practices for this year: 33%

---

1 The Northeast region also named supports for HR practices as a top needed support on the follow-up call and deprioritized communications for students, parents, and families.
Preparedness to Support Student Subgroups

Preparedness to Meet Needs of the Following Student Groups during School Closures

Mean of Responses (1-5 scale, with 1 being least prepared and 5 being most prepared)

- Students experiencing trauma, immediate increased family needs: 2.3
- At-risk students who do not initially respond to virtual outreach: 2.3
- Highly mobile students moving in/out of district: 2.4
- Students experiencing homelessness: 2.4
- Students with special education needs: 2.8
- English language learners: 2.8
- Students in foster care: 2.9
- Early learners (PK): 3.0
- Students identifying as gifted: 3.2
- Early elementary learners (K-2): 3.2
- High school seniors: 3.7
Preparedness to Support Student Subgroups by Region

• Overall, the level of preparedness to support particular groups of students is fairly consistent across different regions in the state, with a few exceptions, detailed below.

• **Districts in the North Central and West Central regions report feeling slightly more equipped to support their students with special needs during remote learning than other parts of the state (means of 3.1 and 3.22, respectively).**

• **Respondents from the West Central region rated their preparation for supporting students experiencing homelessness and students in foster care especially low compared to other regions.**

• **Responses about supporting early childhood (PK) and early elementary students (K-2) reflected the most variability.** Districts in the West Central and Southwest regions reported relatively low levels of preparedness for both groups (means<3), while the Northwest and Metro area regions also indicated lower levels of preparedness for early childhood learners (PK). All other regions’ averages were higher than 3 for these groups.

• **In follow-up calls on April 10th, district and regional leaders noted elevated concerns about supporting students with special needs, as well as early elementary students. Some also raised emerging concerns for high school seniors and English language learners.**
# Preparedness to Support Student Subgroups by Region: Detailed Data

## Mean of Responses by Region (1-5 scale, with 1 being least prepared and 5 being most prepared)

*Subgroups emphasized as needing supports by district and regional leaders on April 10th follow-up calls are bolded and underlined.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Metropolitan</th>
<th>North Central</th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>Northwest</th>
<th>Pikes Peak</th>
<th>Southeast</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
<th>West Central</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students experiencing trauma, immediate increased family needs</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-risk students who do not initially respond to virtual outreach</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly mobile students moving in/out of district</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students experiencing homelessness</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with special education needs</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td><strong>3.10</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.63</strong></td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td><strong>2.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.22</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language learners</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td><strong>3.00</strong></td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in foster care</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early learners (PK)</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students identifying as gifted</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early elementary learners (K-2)</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td><strong>3.55</strong></td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td><strong>3.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.11</strong></td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td><strong>2.33</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school seniors</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td><strong>3.78</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.91</strong></td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Six respondents reported being very prepared (response option=5) to support English language learners, with five from the Northeast or North Central regions.

17 respondents (11 percent) rated their level of preparedness as 1, or least prepared, representing a variety of regions across the state.

No district’s responses specifically referenced English language learners, but one district shared that they provided information via packets, printed in multiple languages, at key pick-up points for materials due to concern about accessibility of information electronically due to either lack of internet access or language barriers.
High School Seniors

- Eighteen percent of respondents (29) reported feeling very prepared to support high school seniors during this time, while six (4 percent) shared that they are least prepared to support seniors.

References to High School Seniors in Open-Ended Responses:
- One rural district shared that their 11th and 12th graders are completing transition portfolios and activities through Everfi.
- One urban district highlighted one of their successes as keeping juniors and seniors on track for graduation.
Early Elementary Learners (K-2)

- Fifteen districts/BOCES (9 percent) responded that they feel very prepared to support early elementary learners.
- Eight (5 percent) reported feeling least prepared to support early elementary students, and half of those districts/BOCES are located in the Southwest region of the state.

References to Early Elementary or Elementary Students in Open-Ended Responses:
- Two rural districts shared their approach to supporting elementary students’ learning – teachers prepared hardcopy packets and book materials to last through the end of the school year (as opposed to their technology-based learning strategies with secondary students).
Community Needs
Community Needs

Percentage Selecting as One of Top Five Community Needs

- Internet connectivity: 55%
- Food: 48%
- Mortgage or rent: 45%
- Unemployment assistance: 44%
- Childcare and/or adult care: 39%
- Utilities assistance: 32%
- Mental health services for families: 32%
- Mental health services for students: 29%
- Essential household supplies and basic needs: 25%
- Technology: 23%
- Small businesses assistance: 22%
- Access to free school meals for students: 19%
- Healthcare access to services, medications: 12%
- Transportation for services, delivery of goods: 11%
- Shelter: 6%
- Information about COVID-19: 5%
- Transportation to meet educational needs: 4%
- Other: 2%
- Healthcare information: 2%
Community Needs by Region

- While there was variability in the top community need identified across regions, internet connectivity and food access were the two community needs that cut across all regions of Colorado. In addition to efforts to address urgent needs related to food access, some districts (19) noted that they are actively working to engage community stakeholders to more systematically identify and address needs.

- Mortgage and rent support was elevated by every region with the exception of one, Southeast Region.

- More than half of the regions (63 percent) indicated that unemployment assistance was an urgent community need, signaling the critical importance of the Colorado Department of Labor and Employment and Workforce Development Centers during this time.

- Mental health and counseling services for either students or families were prioritized in 50 percent of regions. Districts fully anticipate that there will be an increased need for mental health and counseling services and are concerned about the impacts of isolation on students and families. Moreover, districts raised concern around domestic violence and child abuse.

- Three regions (38 percent) named childcare and/or adult care as an important community need.

- Follow-up calls with regional and district leaders provided updated information about community needs. Generally, overall technology and access to devices is becoming less of a need as districts and schools worked to address that, to the extent possible, over the past few weeks. Connectivity continues to be an issue in rural communities. Additionally, leaders emphasized the need for mental health and counseling supports and elevated the needs related to food access and mortgage and rent support.
# Top Community Needs by Region: Detailed Data

Needs that were emphasized, corroborated, or named as emerging higher priorities on April 10th follow-up calls with regional leaders are bolded and underlined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Region</th>
<th>West Central Region¹</th>
<th>Southwest Region¹</th>
<th>Northwest Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health and Counseling Services for Families</td>
<td>Internet Connectivity (e.g., broadband and Wi-Fi access)</td>
<td>Unemployment Assistance</td>
<td>Mortgage or Rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health and Counseling Services for Students</td>
<td>Utilities Assistance (e.g., water, energy)</td>
<td>Internet Connectivity (e.g., broadband and Wi-Fi access)</td>
<td>Food (e.g., food pantry, served meals, WIC/SNAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Connectivity (e.g., broadband and Wi-Fi access)</td>
<td>Unemployment Assistance</td>
<td>Mental Health and Counseling Services for Families</td>
<td>Utilities Assistance (e.g., water, energy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food (e.g., food pantry, served meals, WIC/SNAP)</td>
<td>Mortgage or Rent</td>
<td>Food (e.g., food pantry, served meals, WIC/SNAP)</td>
<td>Internet Connectivity (e.g., broadband and Wi-Fi access)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage or Rent</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food (e.g., food pantry, served meals, WIC/SNAP)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Central Region</th>
<th>Pikes Peak Region¹</th>
<th>Southwest Region¹</th>
<th>Northeast Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food (e.g., food pantry, served meals, WIC/SNAP)</td>
<td>Internet Connectivity (e.g., broadband and Wi-Fi access)</td>
<td>Mortgage or Rent</td>
<td>Childcare and/or Adult Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage or Rent</td>
<td>Utilities Assistance</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>Mortgage or Rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Connectivity (e.g., broadband and Wi-Fi access)</td>
<td>Food (e.g., food pantry, served meals, WIC/SNAP)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>Internet Connectivity (e.g., broadband and Wi-Fi access)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health and Counseling Services for Students</td>
<td>Mortgage or Rent</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>Food (e.g., food pantry, served meals, WIC/SNAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Assistance</td>
<td>Childcare and/or Adult Care</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Utilities Assistance (e.g., water, energy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ In follow-up calls, West Central identified mental health and counseling services for families as a top need, along with internet connectivity. Pikes Peak call participants emphasized all needs except connectivity, which they deprioritized. Leaders from the Southwest region noted that childcare is now a lower priority, while connectivity and mental health and counseling services for families are greater needs.
Student Access to Technology, Internet, and Software
Student Access to Devices

Based on the responses from 161 districts/BOCES, the estimated number of students without access to a Wi-Fi-enabled device is 54,585 statewide, or approximately 7 percent of students in the represented districts/BOCES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Approx. Count of Students without Device</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pikes Peak</td>
<td>23,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan¹</td>
<td>13,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>10,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>2,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>2,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>1,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Central</td>
<td>1,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>54,585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ These data reflect the updated response from DPS to adjust their number to 0, reflecting the anticipated fulfilled needs of their students without devices once their next order of Chromebooks is received.
More Details about Access to Devices

As noted above, technical supports for delivering remote learning was ranked as the second highest education need among district/BOCES respondents, with 47 percent reporting that they need support.

Understanding Need
- Some districts indicated that they do not yet know the total number of devices needed, as their survey processes are currently underway, but anticipate that this will be their biggest need to address.
- In some cases, initial estimates for technology needs were inaccurate as families that have multiple children now need to use devices at the same time.

Differences Across Grade Levels
- Several districts reported not having devices for PK-2, while others questioned the appropriateness of online learning for early learners.

Outdated or Insufficient Devices
- Many districts had to use old computers that do not have the capability to update or run the software programs and platforms that students and teachers are using.
- Districts shared that cell phones are not appropriate for online learning, while also noting that phones may be some students only options for accessing learning.

District Troubleshooting
- Districts are working to implement after-hours technology distribution, prioritizing families working frontline jobs.
- Districts are now working to troubleshoot hardware issues, such as replacing chargers, batteries, and broken devices.
Based on the responses from 161 districts/BOCES across the state, the estimated number of students without access to internet at home is 64,355, or approximately 8 percent of students in represented districts/BOCES.

A number of districts mentioned that these needs will continue to evolve in the coming weeks, as they are able to provide more solutions to students but also as they learn more about students with inadequate or slow internet access (rather than students with no access).
More Details about Access to Internet

• As shown above, internet connectivity was the top community need identified by respondents, with 55 percent reporting that this is a key need.

Viable Solutions
• Some districts reported that they recently purchased hotspots to help provide internet access for students, though many rural districts noted that with limited cellphone service areas in their communities, hotspots are not a viable solution for all homes. Another respondent reported that the hotspots available from Sprint do not offer sufficient service for video lesson or group chatting functionalities. One rural superintendent noted that the 100 hotspots purchased for their students were lost in transit, further limiting their ability to provide internet access.
• On the other hand, a number of respondents shared that internet providers in rural areas cannot provide fast enough service to accommodate the network needs for providing distance learning. Some also noted that internet providers are offering lower cost – and sometimes free – internet access but that only free access would truly address their students’ needs. Many are also concerned about what they view as deceptive advertising and billing practices. One district shared that they are exploring prepaying for internet service for some of their families but are needing to coordinate across numerous providers to determine coverage.

Budget Concerns
• There is increasing concern among respondents about how budgets will absorb these unanticipated costs for providing technology and/or hotspots to students. In follow-up calls, superintendents and regional leaders emphasized the need for state support to help address ongoing budget issues into future fiscal years.
As shown in the graph below, hotspots were the most commonly selected solution for students facing connectivity problems, with nearly two-thirds reporting that they could be practical solutions for their students to access internet.
Access to Internet: Possible Solutions By Region

Percentage of Respondents who Reported that the Following Approaches Would Be Practical Solutions for Connectivity Issues by Region

- Hotspot
- Providing internet service in the student’s home
- Wi-Fi-enabled device
- A drop-in location to access Wi-Fi

Metropolitan: 88%
North Central: 75%
Northeast: 78%
Northwest: 76%
Pikes Peak: 56%
Southeast: 46%
Southwest: 55%
West Central: 67%
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Software Needs

• 48 percent of respondents reported they need Zoom, Teams, or some other technology.
  • In their open ended responses, many people reported that they need help navigating how to use Zoom and protect students’ privacy. A few also noted that they would prefer to use Zoom over Google Hangouts, but don’t have the budget for a paid version of Zoom.
• 9 percent reported needing Microsoft Office.
• 23 percent responded they have another software need.
  • A few respondents highlighted the need for Google Voice, Google Hangouts, or a Learning Management System.
  • Additionally, a handful of districts/BOCES shared their need for security, encryption, or content filtering software or functionality.
• 19 percent of respondents reported they don’t have any software needs at this time.¹

Other Themes:
• Some respondents noted that their issue is not software but access to technology.
• Another few respondents reported that they don’t need support to acquire software, but rather training on how to implement the software.

¹ Reporting no software needs was not an option, resulting in all respondents selecting a software need. However, 19 percent shared in their open-ended response that they actually do not have any software needs, and the data were recoded to reflect these answers. Note that percentage with software needs still might be inflated as a result.
Regional Successes
Statewide Successes: Themes

- Across all of the CDE Regions, common themes emerged from the success stories that districts shared.

  - Each region emphasized the incredible work that teachers are doing in service of our Colorado students and families. Teachers are leaning in to create and share engaging, meaningful learning opportunities, sometimes with tools and resources that teachers are learning for the first time themselves. Colorado teachers are demonstrating resilience, flexibility, grit, and dedication through incredibly stressful circumstances and in turn our students have the opportunity to practice and strengthen their own skills and competencies.

  - Community and district partnerships across Colorado have built food distribution systems that are meeting the basic needs of students and families and effectively designing and implementing innovative solutions to ensure that meals can be delivered to all of our families.

  - Our districts are working to build and strengthen relationships with students and families. There is clear recognition that prioritizing connection during this time is foundational to learning and development needs. Schools and districts are creatively leveraging staff to ensure that there are consistent touchpoints with students and families.

  - Several districts shared their willingness to offer supports, resources, and staff time to other districts across the state, reflecting solidarity and connection in our local control state.
Highlighting Successes: Metro Region

“We are also stressing that relationships come first, learning follows. We got a little caught up in ensuring evidence of learning the first week… This upcoming week we are stressing quality over quantity, relationships first, check in with students and families, and don’t be afraid to take risks.”

- Districts in the Metro Region quickly leveraged district and community infrastructure to put meal distribution systems in place.
- While there is still a need for additional devices, districts were able to assess student needs and distribute available devices in a short time period.
- Professional development supports were designed and launched to support a rapid transition to online learning. Districts that began remote learning early on have offered to share educator supports and resources that they are using.
- Districts emphasized their decision to step back and prioritize relationships with students above all else.
- There is deep recognition of the stress and change that students and families are navigating during this time.
Highlighting Successes: North Central Region

“The Early Childhood home visiting program, which launched remote visits on March 13, has helped us to connect with families. Clear guidance and information from the Federal Office of Head Start and the Colorado Preschool Program about funding continuity and remote learning expectations has also been very helpful…”

- North Central districts highlight the incredible resourcefulness of their teachers in creating engaging and meaningful learning opportunities for students.
- Early efforts to connect with families has resulted in high levels of participation from students and families in home learning opportunities.
- Districts have experienced an outpouring of support from all segments of the community - students, families, partners, government agencies – which has facilitated a relatively smooth transition during a challenging time.
- There has been strong collaboration district staff and teachers to build out remote learning curriculum and lesson plans which has enabled teachers to get a head start on planning, connecting and engaging with students, and establishing new classroom routines.
Highlighting Successes: Northeast Region

“Teacher to parent communication has been consistent and expansive at this time, and is our greatest strength. Teachers have made contact with higher risk/need students and families to ensure they have what resources are available to them, and support parents with transition to remote learning.”

- Communication channels with families and community partners has been critical during this time. Given the small community context, teachers and leaders have deep knowledge of student and family needs and have been able to provide more personalized support as a result.
- Districts in the Northeast Region have worked to activate food distribution networks and take a significant role in problem-solving around internet connectivity.
- District leaders noted the incredible compassion and flexibility of teachers in the Northeast Region during this time. There is also clear willingness to lean into their own learning curve at this time in effort to effectively support their students.
- Northeast Region has effectively leveraged Zoom and Google Classroom to transition into remote learning over the past few weeks.
Highlighting Successes: Northwest Region

“Our Instruction Department has done an amazing job working with school leaders to roll out virtual learning for our students. Every day teachers are sharing new resources with each other to better meet the needs of students.”

- The Coronavirus context has created new, meaningful opportunities for teacher collaboration within districts in the Northwest Region.
- School and district staff have been proactive and demonstrated immense dedication to supporting students and families through the transition to remote learning.
- Contacting families on a weekly basis has resulted in increased partnership, clear expectations around school work, and dissemination of resources and information.
Highlighting Successes: Pikes Peak Region

“Due to the unusually snowy winter, we already had all our schools develop e-learning plans as part of our strategy. We didn’t know we were planning for Coronavirus disruptions, but those plans have been the foundation of what we’re doing now...excellent learning and engagement is evident across all our schools and zones.”

- Educators have leveraged resources across multiple organizations and platforms including blended learning professional development resources from iLearn, Google Hangouts, Curriculum Associates, and Vizzle. Specifically, staff have used Google Hangouts and a safe version of Zoom Meetings for hosting IEP meetings and providing face-to-face direct instruction/therapies to students individually and in small groups.

- Continuity planning had already begun in certain districts and staff were able to leverage and build on those plans to quickly pivot and support students during this time.

- Pikes Peak districts prioritized helping meet the food and resource needs of students and families and focused on a slower and deliberate role out of remote learning. There has been a strong partnership between community partners and districts to carry out food distribution efforts.
Highlighting Successes: Southeast Region

“As always, the best resource is people. Our employees have ‘put on their game faces’ and are making this work. Our teacher aids are doing a fantastic job calling their assigned families (Sped students) and touching base every day and helping them find solutions to their new educational needs.”

- Districts in the Southeast Region have started to utilize repurposed para-professional time to increase and strengthen outreach to families to ensure that the districts are meeting educational needs of their students.

- In addition to increased collaboration within districts and schools, districts across the Southeast Region have been in communication and are sharing strategies and resources to support students and families.

- Educators have created different avenues for accessing learning that include both virtual opportunities and learning packets. They are working to meet students and families in the ways that they can most effectively access instruction.
Highlighting Successes: Southwest Region

“Reaching out personally and frequently to connect with staff, students, and parents during this difficult time has really helped to build relationships as well as trust and a sense of community.”

- Districts frequently mentioned the ways that they have been able to use Zoom to connect with students and families, support instruction, and provide special services. Efforts have led to 90-100% participation from students.
- Educators have made use of a wide variety of programs to deliver instruction and are working to research how to best support more hands on learning for courses like building trades.
- School and district staff are testing out different communications strategies to connect with the team and emphasize available supports. Communications have focused on topics such as tips for creating schedules, navigating different tools for instruction, sharing messages from the psychologist, underscoring the importance of internet safety; and entertaining videos to promote connection and relationships.
Highlighting Successes: West Central Region

“I am really proud of all that our technology staff, leadership team members, especially instructional leadership team, teachers, school leaders and other staff members, nursing and custodial staff [have done]. Tech has provided a full time help desk for parents, students, and staff...”

- West Central Region districts have created and disseminated resources and protocols to staff, families, and students to support the transition to remote learning. Districts have volunteered their staff to support other districts in problem-solving different aspects of this transition.
- Teachers have focused on relationships and connections with their students and have taken the lead and developed a system for checking in with students daily by capitalizing on other staff members availability.
- Staff have collaborated to create engaging learning opportunities for their students and family. One example is building out challenges for students and providing all of the supplies necessary for students that want to participate. Students who send a picture of their projects are entered into a weekly raffle to win prizes.
Local School District Foundation Support
Overall, 44 percent of responding districts/BOCES have a local foundation for their district(s), with the vast majority of those able to serve as a financial hub for the district(s).

However, as shown in the graph, districts and BOCES in the Metro Area and Northwest regions are substantially more likely to have local district foundations than any other region in the state.

1 Two district/BOCES respondents did not respond to these questions on the needs assessments.