Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Listening Tour Feedback

September 2016

Introduction

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) listening tour was initiated by the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) to provide a formal way to share initial information about ESSA and receive feedback from stakeholders across the state that will inform the development of Colorado's state ESSA plan. The official listening tour sessions were held in conjunction with a number of smaller events (with a variety of different stakeholders) CDE hosted or attended as a part of their initial phase of gathering stakeholder input before beginning work on the process of writing Colorado's ESSA state plan. These other stakeholder events represented a variety of constituents in both small and large districts and urban and rural areas[1]. Across the formal and informal listening events, CDE strove to engage stakeholders with a wide variety of interests and requests.

CDE officials chose official tour locations for their geographic diversity throughout the state. The official CDE listening tour was held in the following locations: Buena Vista, Durango, Grand Junction, Greeley, Limon, Pueblo, and Thornton. The seven locations where CDE held an official listening tour sessions are reflective of the diversity of schools, districts, and communities in Colorado. Some of the locations, such as Buena Vista and Durango, were attended by the staff, administration, and community members of rural districts. Other locations, such as Thornton and Greeley, had participants from the Denver metro area, larger school districts and members of the higher education community. CDE embarked on this tour throughout the late spring and early summer, with its last two events being a virtual webinar session as well as an internal session for CDE employees.

In total with the formal and informal listening events, CDE engaged in discussions regarding ESSA with approximately 1,500 people across Colorado. Participants in the listening tour sessions represented a wide range of demographics and included stakeholders from the State Board of Education, the Colorado Education Association, Colorado Association of School Boards (CASB), Colorado Association of School Executives (CASE), school and district administrators (including superintendents and district Board of Education members), school staff (principals, teachers, etc.), college and university administrators, parents, a few students, and members of the community, including those representing nonprofit organizations, advocacy groups, and other interested parties.

In most listening tour locations sessions were held from 1:00-4:00 p.m. and 5:30-7:30 p.m. during the same day in order to accommodate participants' schedules. Attendance between these two sessions seemed to overlap in stakeholder representation. For instance, representatives from schools and districts, parents, and community members attended both the earlier and later sessions across all locations. Many participants commented that they appreciated the evening sessions that were offered outside of the school day.

In order to engage as many stakeholders as possible across the state, CDE cast a broad net for public outreach to publicize the tour sessions. The tour sessions were advertised through various methods (press releases, emails, and website) by CDE's Communications Office. CDE staff members also personally called most district superintendents in the school district and surrounding areas where tours were being held. Local libraries and community centers were also contacted. All registrations were open to the public.

Each official and unofficial ESSA event was administered by 4-6 CDE staff members. The key presenters and organizers attended most, if not all, the listening tour sessions. These key members included Alyssa Pearson (Interim Associate Commissioner of Accountability/Performance), Patrick Chapman (Executive Director of Federal Programs), Brad Bylsma (Director of ESEA Programs), Colleen O'Neil (Executive Director of Professional Services and Educator Licensing), Nazanin Mohajeri-Nelson (Director of Data, Program Evaluation, and Reporting) and Lynn Bamberry (Director of Competitive Grants and Awards). Additional CDE staff that helped support the listening tour includes other offices across CDE, such as: ESEA Programs, Migrant Education, Grants Fiscal, and Communications.

---

[1] See Appendix A for a list of ESSA-related formal and information listening events.

This report reflects a qualitative analysis of stakeholder feedback received across all seven of the official listening tour locations and the virtual webinar session. The analysis contained in the following pages serves as a synopsis of feedback for each discussion question posed as part of the presentation given at every listening tour session. The questions were divided into two separate strands: "Standards, Assessment and Accountability" and "Quality Instruction and Leadership & Supports for Students." Responses for all questions in each strand were gathered on written feedback forms by individuals who wished to submit feedback in this manner. Feedback was also gathered by CDE staff members who electronically recorded publicly made comments during tabletop discussions and during large-group discussions throughout each listening session. Participants were also encouraged to submit any additional feedback using the CDE ESSA email or CDE's ESSA blog.

In total, CDE received more than 3,800 comments from the seven listening tour locations and virtual webinar session that are represented in this report. The number of responses varied widely from question to question and from location to location. Each of these comments were reviewed and analyzed and, to the extent possible, coded (categorized) according to their unique content. Codes/categories assigned to all comments were then ranked according to frequency. These frequencies were evaluated according to all comments for each location and all comments for each question.

Comments and corresponding codes/categories were analyzed to determine overall themes for responses to each question. Unless specifically noted, generally speaking, themes were consistent and prevalent for questions across all locations. Several of these major themes that were heard across questions are discussed below.

Major Themes
A handful of topics and concerns resonated with participants across the various questions. For the purpose of the discussion of major themes, references to the two strands will be as follows: "Standards" (for *Standards, Assessment, and Accountability*) and "Quality" (for *Quality Instruction and Leadership & Supports for Students*). The discussion questions posed to all participants were:

Standards, Assessments, and Accountability:
1. How should we measure student progress toward meeting the standards?
2. What measures of school quality or student success should be included in the school accountability system?
3. How should the state consider the 95% assessment participation requirement?
4. Should school improvement funds be awarded as formula or competitive grants?
5. What supports and services can CDE provide that would be helpful to districts with schools on improvement?
6. What is an appropriate length of time before more intensive interventions should be required for "consistently underperforming" schools/subgroups?

Quality Instruction & Leadership and Supports for Student Success:
1. What supports should CDE provide to help teachers, schools, and districts provide effective instruction to students with specific learning needs?
2. In addition to holding a license, should teachers be required to demonstrate competency in the subject area in which they teach?
3. How should CDE modify current English Learner (EL) Identification, Re-designation, and Exit guidance to meet the ESSA state plan requirements? What additional criteria should be considered?
4. What does well-rounded and healthy students mean to you?
5. Should CDE reserve 3% of Title I, Part A funds for direct student services grants?

The predominant themes across both strands, in no particular order, are: sharing of best practices, menu of supports and services, body of evidence, authentic assessments, non-academic focus, local control, special considerations for rural schools and districts, and concerns about equity across the state. The comments associated with these cross-question themes are summarized below.

Sharing of Best Practices
Many participants believed that it would be beneficial for CDE to share best practices for supporting teachers, schools and districts in myriad ways (from Standards questions #4 and #5; Quality questions #1 and #4). Many respondents were in favor of CDE publicizing best practices initiated by districts across the state in the form of a resource bank. Several respondents suggested that perhaps a way to synthesize and systematize this information at the state level would be to provide statewide guidance on best practices from districts and schools leading the charge around various aspects of education, such as educating well-rounded and healthy students (Quality question #4). To support the sharing of best practices and resources, many responses suggested that CDE encourage collaboration throughout the state with various entities, including community advocates. Some requested that CDE be the broker of information and the facilitator of collaborative relationships to build these best practices into a centralized resource in order to support the needs of local schools and communities.

Menu of Supports and Services
There was resounding agreement among many participants that CDE create and offer a menu of services and supports to be shared across the state. For example, participants felt that CDE should provide a centralized menu of supports and services for supporting schools on improvement (Standards question #5) as well as students with diverse learning needs (Quality question #1). Districts and schools would be able to select which supports and services from CDE would be most beneficial to them according to their unique needs. Many responses indicated that CDE should provide this menu online, which would include technical assistance and other services offered by the state, such as unified improvement plan (UIP) development support and supplemental grant writing training (Standards question #5). Other resources in the menu could include support for instruction, instructionally sound projects, and/or professional development/professional learning (Standards questions #4 and #5; Quality question #1). One response suggested that CDE provide "actual organization of trainings around strategies that actually work. Real training for real teachers that will benefit students."

Body of Evidence
When measuring students' progress and success or school quality, respondents suggested looking beyond test scores at perhaps a body of evidence that could include qualitative measures as well as attendance, growth, and graduation (Standards questions #1 and #2). Many respondents believe that using a body of evidence would help evaluate and support various disaggregated groups of students. For instance, it was suggested that a body of evidence could be used to identify, appropriately place, re-designate, and exit students from English language development classes, which could include a comprehensive body of evidence that includes, but is not exclusive to, test scores (Quality question #3).

Authentic Assessments
In terms of the assessment requirements, a large portion of respondents included words that denoted that assessments should be more authentic in order to measure student progress (Standards question #1). These comments included the concerted desire for assessments to be purposeful, engaging, developmentally appropriate and meaningful for schools, students and families alike, with timely results that can be used for guiding instruction and ultimately effectively gauging student success. Several respondents stated that timely results of student test scores needed to be made available to teachers and parents alike so that teaching and learning can be data-driven in order to be more effective in improving student success.

Responses indicated that there is a connection between meaningfully assessing student progress toward meeting the standards and the issue of students/parents opting out of assessments (Standards question #3). Several respondents also expressed concern that introducing or changing too many testing initiatives could result in initiative fatigue, with teachers and administrators being reluctant to test and students being hesitant to take tests. They also indicated that current testing requirements and schedules require a great amount of time and effort and may put too much burden on schools and students throughout the year.

Focus on Non-Academic
Many of the responses received for various questions drew the focus away from academic content, such as math or literacy, and instead focused on a large assortment of non-academic indicators. This could be attributed to the large amount of stakeholders in attendance across all sessions who represented non-academic interests such as health and wellness and the arts. Whether determining what constitutes student success or school quality (Standards question #2), a healthy and well-rounded education (Quality question #4), or what supports should be offered for schools and students (Standards question #5; Quality question #1), an overwhelming amount of responses pointed to non-academic indicators. These indicators were infused into the answers for several questions and included climate and culture factors, student engagement, health and wellness, behavior and discipline, mental health, social/emotional learning, and educating the "Whole Child" (Standards questions #1,#2, and #6; Quality questions #4). For example, based on responses, there is a strong correlation between the indicators respondents thought would constitute a healthy and well-rounded education (Quality question #4) and the indicators respondents thought should be considered as measures of school quality and student success in the school accountability system (Standards question #2).

Local Control
Colorado's designation as a "local control" state was also considered by participants when answering many of these questions (Standards questions #1, #2, and #5; Quality questions #2 and #5). Many respondents expressed their desire for more local control when it comes to assessments and the school accountability system (Standards question #2). This could mean a number of things, such as having the ability to create or continue using already created assessments that take individual needs, as well as personalized learning, into account. Additionally, some respondents thought that the determination of what educator competency would entail should be dictated by districts and local communities (Quality question #2). When determining what a demonstration of competency would look like, one respondent suggested: "I would leave this up to district and schools to define. With such a wide range of school sizes and locations you must trust that those in charge of hiring at those levels have the capabilities." Finally, a few of the respondents in favor of local formative or interim assessments discussed their desire for local control for educators and administrators.

Considerations of Rural Constituencies and Equity
Notably, comments reflecting considerations for rural schools and districts as well as considerations for equity across the state appeared in response to every single question. Even in the larger listening sessions, including Denver, the "rural voice" was considered important and relevant when answering questions. In smaller listening sessions, the rural voice was heard throughout, regardless of what questions were discussed. There was considerable overlap among answers pertaining to rural districts and the idea of equity. Equity of access, opportunities, resources, funds, and assistance were discussed in many responses. Equity was most prominently referenced when discussing ideas of student progress and success, school quality, educator credentials, English learners, CDE supports, and grants (Standards questions #1, #2, #3 and #4; Quality questions #1, #3, #6). Ideas of equity around ensuring the interests of all districts, but particularly smaller and rural districts, are considered when making decisions on the provided discussion questions. For example, CDE must consider "equity across the state – what will work in one area won't work in others because of access" when attempting to find a statewide measure of student success or school quality. For instance feedback suggested, "trying to find a measure that equally fits Delta and Denver is a challenge."

Following is a more thorough analysis of responses for each question asked during all listening tour sessions.

Standards, Assessments, and Accountability

Discussion Question #1: How should we measure student progress toward meeting the standards?

ESSA gives states the opportunity to review and revise their current standards and assessments. ESSA provides states flexibility in identifying statewide standards for math, science, and reading/language arts and how those standards are assessed. ESSA requires assessments that are aligned with statewide standards, which Colorado has already in place. Although there is flexibility provided in ESSA, Colorado state law determines how CDE approaches measuring student progress through standards and assessments.

The responses for this question were varied, given the open-ended nature of the question; however, the major recommendations were consistent across all locations. Although there were more responses to this question than any other, there were several ideas that appeared frequently throughout each session and across all sessions.

Assessments

Responses received for this question mentioned formative assessments far more than any other suggestion across all locations. There was a sizeable majority of responses regardless of location in favor of using formative assessments to measure student progress toward meeting the standards. Reasons for preferring formative assessments varied widely. Below are a few comments that are indicative of the major opinions regarding formative assessments, some of which are for purposes other than the state summative assessment(s):

- "Using formative/interim assessments for programming purposes. Because state assessments do not give timely or specific enough feedback to identify gaps and align services."
- "One day high stakes tests aren't the best measure. We use on-going local assessments to inform our instruction."
- "As formative as possible to drive improvement for the school year the assessment is taken."
- "Breaking it up will help teachers use test results better and allows students to take shorter tests."
- "Focus on formative assessment and the use that we really have in order to demonstrate progress towards proficiency."
- "Use benchmark assessments so we know what other interventions to take so kids can move forward. 3 to 4 times a year."
- "The only legitimate way to capture all of the diverse groups is something other than an end of the year snapshot. Formative assessments should be informative assessments."
- "Day to day evaluations by teachers and staff/testing on a smaller scale/shorter, a variety of question types/portfolio of ongoing tests and grades that follow the child."

Of the numerous respondents who referenced the CMAS/PARCC assessments in their feedback, most of these respondents either disapproved of CMAS/PARCC altogether or would like to use a revised version of CMAS/PARCC that would be broken into several interim and/or formative assessments throughout the school year. On the other hand, many responses seemed to support assessments such as MAPS, DIBELS, and TS Gold. A significant amount of respondents also mentioned using tests such as the PSAT, SAT, and ACT as alternatives to the established tests in certain grades.

A significant amount of respondents were concerned with obtaining timely results from whatever assessments are used. Many of these respondents pointed to the perception that results are not obtained by educators, parents, and students to make a positive impact on data-driven instruction. In fact, it appears that timely results are seen as a benefit of using formative tests, while this factor is a significant source of disapproval for the statewide standardized tests currently used. One respondent stated, "as a district, state assessments are of no use. It is written into legislation that these assessments are to be used as a diagnostic tool, but they can't serve

that function if the results are coming 6-8 months after the fact. This is why people are opting-out. NWEA, MAPS, DIBELS all offer immediate results that allow teachers to change your professional practice in the moment. We use these to progress monitor. We think these can meet the criteria of the statute. The amount of time it takes to administer the state assessment is too much as well."

Alignment Across Schools, Standards and the State
A large portion of responses featured the words *"align"* and *"alignment"* but these terms were used in several different ways. Most of these responses discussed the importance of having the measures to assess student progress parallel the content of classroom instruction—respondents would like what is on the assessment to mirror what is taught in classrooms. Rather than "teaching to a test", this alignment can be regarded as a two-way street: respondents who requested aligning the content of assessments to the content of curriculum also stressed the benefit of being able to use results from the assessments to guide and even tailor instruction. This way, districts and schools can "measure progress in a way that guides teachers in placement decisions and instructional decision-making."

Additionally, a number of respondents indicated that they would prefer there be some alignment for statewide standardized tests to local and/or interim assessments. Many other comments also reflected a desire for statewide tests to match federal assessment requirements. Comments pertaining to this alignment point to ensuring assessments are not burdensome, time-consuming or redundant for districts and schools across local, state, and federal requirements.

Many responses signified a strong desire to measure student progress using a local instrument and/or localized indicator or set of indicators. In these responses, a significant amount pointed to the challenge of establishing a statewide measure of progress given the diverse geographic regions and student populations throughout Colorado. In particular, the preference for providing more local control over measuring student progress was prevalent at the Durango and Limon listening sessions.

Body of Evidence Beyond the Test
When measuring student progress toward meeting the standards, many respondents believed the state should adopt a system that takes into account a body of evidence consisting of both qualitative and quantitative data. Instead of a single assessment or a series of tests, multiple respondents indicated we should be measuring student progress through a multitude of methods and measures using a body of evidence throughout the year. Relatedly, many responses reflect a preference for a series of competency-based or project-based evaluations, so that students may demonstrate their proficiency in a manner other than completing standardized assessments.

Comments in response to this question discussed above indicated that CDE should consider a more holistic and consistent approach to measuring student progress toward meeting the standards to incorporate into the ESSA state plan. A multitude of responses reflected a desire to instate a system that is more formative and that utilizes a body of evidence to measure student progress. These responses pertained to the idea of revising the current standardized assessment structure to take into account more localized input and even allow educators to contribute to the content of these assessments. A significant portion of comments were also concerned with a number of other factors such as the input and satisfaction of teachers and parents, the timing of assessments and the timely receipt of results, the time and effort required to assess, and the alignment of the chosen measure across federal, state, and local requirements.

Discussion Question #2: What measures of school quality or student success should be included in the school accountability system?

ESSA requires states to develop a system of accountability based on growth, achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency. The state must identify an additional indicator measuring school quality and student success. The additional indicator must allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance and must be valid, reliable, comparable and employed statewide.

The most widely suggested measurements of school quality or student success to include in the school accountability system were attendance and climate and culture factors, followed by metrics of student engagement and then student growth. These four indicators were particularly popular among the larger listening tour sessions.

Climate and Culture

Most responses to this question spoke to evaluating the climate and culture of a school as part of the school accountability system. Examples of climate and culture included an array of indicators such as teacher satisfaction, professional learning opportunities for staff and leadership, access to post-secondary readiness opportunities, student health and wellness, and parent and community engagement. One respondent underscored that "school climate does matter—a school ought to be able to point towards their positive climate as a way in which to show their effectiveness especially if they are a school serving a diverse set of students with challenges related to academic performance."

Many responses stated that measures of climate and culture could potentially be captured through teacher and student surveys. Nearly all comments suggesting the use of surveys saw them as beneficial. Examples of support for using surveys to gauge climate and culture include: "LEA's could also consider including student and staff survey results which could address culture and climate, engagement, etc." and "student and teacher perception survey data that evaluates school culture and climate." There were only a couple of comments that stated surveys should not be used.

A large portion of respondents mentioned utilizing the TELL survey as an instrument to measure teachers' perceptions of climate and culture in their schools. One respondent posits, "I believe this is about school culture and climate…can the TELL survey be expanded and used for this purpose?" Another respondent stated, "I always got great feedback when I did anonymous surveys of teachers. Teachers should be able to provide feedback regarding school quality from a teacher perspective."

Attendance

Attendance was mentioned as frequently as climate and culture, and in fact, these two indicators were often mentioned in conjunction with one another. An attendance indicator was perceived as reliable, easily quantifiable, and could be indicative of student success (such as student engagement) or school quality (such as climate and culture) overall. Several who suggested using attendance as an indicator qualified their statement that attendance should be measured for earlier grades (perhaps K-8) and student engagement be measured in high school. "Attendance seems to be an easy way to track for all grades, but concerned that at high school attendance may not be appropriate and may want to consider engagement through activities and programs," said one respondent.

Engagement

Engagement, particularly of students, was also mentioned frequently across all locations as a possible way to measure student success and school quality. Measurements range from student engagement in electives, athletics, extracurricular and after-school activities. A significant amount of responses about student

engagement seemed to draw parallels between student engagement and other possible indicators of school quality and student success, such as student attendance and school culture and climate. Engagement of parents, family, and community were also mentioned as being important indicators of school quality and student success. For instance, "parent involvement in a school is shown to really make a difference so perhaps this is measurable in some way."

Growth
Student growth was also another commonly cited idea for measuring student success and consequently school quality. Even though a growth indicator is currently being used in Colorado to measure student achievement, many participants underscored the importance of capturing growth as an ideal way to indicate students moving toward academic achievement. Respondents who supported using growth as an indicator stated that "growth is important, not all children are on grade level but still need to make growth" and "emphasis on growth and advancement (vs. proficiency) tracking individual growth."

Other Indicators to Consider
Across the listening tour locations, there were several other indicators suggested for consideration for the school accountability system. These indicators included non-academic factors such as health and wellness, social/emotional learning (SEL), and assessing the Whole Child. Others suggested evaluating student behavior and discipline (such as expulsion and referral rates). Concerning academically related indicators, graduation and completion rates as well as college and career readiness elements (such as dual enrollment or career and technical education offerings) were also considered by many to be potentially effective measures to include in the school accountability system.

Still others suggested using an indicator that CDE already employs to measure school quality and/or student success. These comments reveal hesitance of adding any additional assessment or evaluation as well as additional time and effort requirements on school and district staff. One respondent urged that, whatever indicator CDE chooses, it, "cannot/should not add another thing that is new for schools to administer. It absolutely cannot add another burden on the schools/district. Use something existing and repurpose what we are already collecting."

Notably, many responses in support of these four prominent indicators did not qualify their responses with much explanation or rationale for choosing these indicators. A substantial percentage of responses simply stated a running list of indicators when answering this question. Examples include: "Graduation rate. Attendance. Discipline. Teacher education levels. Programs available. Median growth. Poverty level of students" and "College prep. School climate. Chronic absenteeism. Electives."

Even so, for those respondents that did provide rationale for their preferences, there were commonalities in their comments that indicate the close interrelationship of indicators for measuring school climate and culture, student attendance and engagement and student growth as part of a revised school accountability system.

Discussion Question #3: How should the state consider the 95% assessment participation requirement?

Colorado's ESSA state plan must provide a clear and understandable explanation of how the state will factor 95% participation into our statewide accountability system. Currently, state law allows parents to excuse their child from state assessments. Furthermore, the state law requires districts to have policies in place for notifying parents of the option to excuse students from testing and procedures for parents to do so. Districts can neither encourage parents to excuse their children from participating, nor can districts penalize students who choose to do so. CDE does not withhold funding for districts who do not meet the 95% assessment participation requirement.

The responses to this question contained numerous pointed suggestions that reoccurred throughout multiple listening tour sessions. The majority of responses for this question discussed: making assessments more purposeful and meaningful for students, parents, teachers, and administrators; making participation requirements non-punitive, including not counting students who do not take assessments in participation data; and providing incentives for schools to increase assessment participation. Addressing these factors for the 95% participation requirement ultimately could cultivate more "buy-in" from students, parents, teachers, and administrators, which was the most frequent topic of concern among participants across all sites.

Purposeful Assessments

A large portion of responses noted that if assessments were made more meaningful to parents, students, teachers, and administrators, perhaps the state would not experience the current rates of non-participation in standardized assessments. Part of creating purposeful assessments is considering the amount of time for returning assessment results to schools, districts, students and parents, according to many responses. In fact, obtaining timely results was mentioned in several responses as a major factor for students opting out of assessments. One respondent requested "clarity of the purpose of the assessment – what are we trying to learn that we don't exactly know about students? How do the results help our students become more proficient (timely feedback)?" Many respondents also cited the lack of clarity around the purpose of assessments as another reason parents may be opting-out their students. The following responses reflect this lack of clarity:

- **"**If assessments were meaningful and their value understood by parents, maybe opt-outs would decrease quite a bit?"
- "How can we communicate the value and the impact on teaching and learning?"
- "What is the ultimate value of the assessment? Does this truly capture teacher or student success?"
- "How will it be used? Is it a question of we've done it for so long that this is how we do it."

"Don't Count Opt-Out"

One of the requests that was noted most often by participants was to not count the students who opt-out of assessments as part of a district's overall participation percentage. However, most participants who had this opinion gave little explanation. Those who did provide rationale suggested that it is unfair to penalize a district for parental and student choices. For instance, one respondent said, "I would think it would be very unfair if my school's rating dropped because kids were opting out. Do it in a way that doesn't punish those of us that are really trying to get kids to the test but they're just not showing up." Another respondent stressed that not counting opt-outs "is pivotal because when kids opt-out then it completely flaws the system – so we have to consider the fact that the majority will opt-out influences all the other accountability around it such as teacher evaluation and accountability."

Punitive Consequences

A large portion of respondents emphasized that districts and their schools should not be penalized for not reaching the 95% participation requirement. This is consistent with current state law and CDE policy so many

feel that measures that are not punitive should continue. Others indicated that the onus for participation should not be placed on districts because of the current state law allowances in opting out of assessments. Others warn of detrimental consequences on districts if punitive measures are instituted. For example:

- "We cannot force parents to participate so don't punish schools when parents exercise their right to opt-out."
- "Something we don't have control over should not impact accountability."
- "We can't be held accountable for telling people they can opt-out and then be penalized if people chose that option."

Incentives for Participation

Many responses proposed that CDE offer incentives to districts that are able to meet a 95% participation rate in an effort to encourage districts in their attempt to reach this threshold. Numerous responses suggested that assessment participation be encouraged but not required by CDE. One respondent stated that CDE "should not penalize districts who don't meet the participation rate – provide encouragement in order to meet the federal mandate but do not penalize schools or districts."

Several respondents believed that non-punitive and incentivizing measures go hand in hand when considering the 95% participation requirement. These respondents suggest:

- "Instead of penalize – bonus for those who achieve 95%."
- "Incentives/points when participation requirement is met (rather than penalty if it's not met)."
- "Use the 95% as an incentive rather than a punishment."

Stakeholder Support

The majority of responses indicated that participants believed the state must have buy-in for assessments from parents, students, and school staff across districts in order to meet the 95% participation requirement. The majority of responses who cited the need for stakeholder support discussed student "buy-in" for assessments. These respondents agreed that students must see the value and purpose behind taking assessments and how they are used for their ultimate benefit. For example, "students who are taking the local district assessments and see immediate benefits so are more encouraged to participate in those local assessments." One respondent also asked, "What would it take to get to 95% - should we go back and tie it to how this impacts future success; how does this have value for the student?"

Regarding buy-in from parents, one respondent said "helping parents understand the use, benefit, and purpose of assessments" may potentially increase parental support for, and thus student participation in, assessments. Many mentioned needing buy-in from parents and students simultaneously in order to positively impact the 95% participation rate. In regards to teachers, respondents suggested several ways the state can earn the support from teachers by not only having timely results to drive instruction but figuring out more effective methods of prepping and administering assessments that do not require as much time and effort.

Approaches to Reaching 95%

Numerous respondents believed that the 95% participation rate could be achieved if requirements are aligned across federal and state legislation and the State Board of Education policy. For example, one respondent urged that the 95% participation rate "is a huge problem for us because State law and the State Board motion totally contradict the federal requirement. We have a huge phenomenon of high performing student opt-out. If these students have to be considered non-proficient under ESSA, how will this impact our district? There is no way we will ever get 95% ever again." A significant amount of respondents also mentioned the importance of having consistency with state and federal law. Some of the respondents made statements like, "state testing should mirror the ESSA" and "if federal law requires 95% participation the state law should align with federal law."

Another participant also stated that, "participation rates should not be put on district's back. This puts district in between feds and states."

Another consideration that was reflected in the responses was looking at student demographics and/or district characteristics when determining the 95% participation rate. A few participants in the larger listening sessions mentioned that some schools' best students choose to opt-out of assessments, thus skewing not only participation rates but also achievement results for the district. Participation rates could also become skewed in rural districts due to small student populations, according to several respondents representing rural districts. As one respondent said, the participation requirement "is vastly unfair to rural students (i.e., 95% for a small schools could mean 5 students). In large schools it takes way more students to opt-out to get below 95%." These positions indicated that the 95% rate is on the minds of stakeholders across the state, representing both small and large districts and schools.

Most of the comments in response to this question across all locations indicated that CDE should continue its current policies and practices regarding the 95% participation requirement. In other words, many of the suggestions for how CDE should consider the participation requirement coincided with current policy.

Discussion Question #4: Should school improvement funds be awarded as formula or competitive grants?

Colorado must set aside 7% of the state's Title I allocation for school improvement activities. ESSA allows states to allocate those funds on either a formula or competitive basis. The approach for awarding these funds, either competitively or through a formula must be written into Colorado's state plan.

The majority of responses demonstrated that listening session attendees believe school improvement funds should be awarded on a formula basis. Notably, while there was a consensus among the listening tour locations for this question, some sites had almost all of their respondents express their desire for formula grants. For instance, both Denver and Limon participants overwhelmingly suggested formula grants. The second most frequent solution to how CDE should award school improvement funds was to do so through a hybrid approach: either through formula while requiring a plan or through two different pools of funds, one competitive and one formula. Very few responses reflected a desire for competitive grants across all listening tour sessions.

Competitive Grants

Only a handful of responses reflected a desire for school improvement funds to be awarded competitively. In fact, more responses reflected a request that these funds not be competed than responses that reflect a preference for competitive grants. The majority of the responses that were explicitly against competitive grants indicated the perceived disparity in capacity of small/rural districts versus larger districts.

Hybrid Grants

Many responses suggested that funds should initially be awarded through a formula based on needs but that those who receive formula funding should still submit a plan that reflects guidelines/parameters for use of funds in order to be held accountable for those funds. For instance, "all schools that meet the requirements for the formula should get the money but have to have a plan that covers what is best for students and has follow-through on how funds are spent." Still others cited that awarding formula funds and then requiring a plan is beneficial for predicting and sustaining budget and programmatic elements of improvement plans. In support of the hybrid approach, one response posited, "does it make sense that there is a blended model – every school that gets money needs a very clear plan, showing the critical need, and has an accountability plan to identify if the plan worked, didn't work, and what data was used?"

Another method for a hybrid model reflected in the responses is to make some school improvement funds available for formula-based grants and some for competitive awards. Most respondents who suggested this believed that this would benefit both large and small/rural districts and those with varying levels of need. One respondent, in support of a hybrid approach, stated that funds should be awarded by a "mix, formula first to identify who has need, then an invited RFP-type process."

Formula Grants

Of those who prefer awarding school improvement funds through a formula, a quarter of total responses supporting formula funds cited a lesser capacity of small and/or rural districts to compete for funds, given the limited resources (staff, time, etc.) small/rural districts may have. In fact, many responses supporting formula grants expressly mentioned the capacity and need of small and/or rural districts.

A significant amount of responses supporting both formula and/or hybrid grants were couched within a sense of equity in these approaches. These responses indicated that formula/hybrid grants can make funds more accessible across the state to "level the playing field" regardless of resources or geography. Several responses pointed to the idea that a formula approach seems fairer for all school districts in need to potentially obtain school improvement funds. These responses indicate that CDE should consider which approach to awarding school improvement funds will be most fair and equitable across the state.

Discussion Question #5: What supports and services can CDE provide that would be helpful to districts with schools on improvement?

In our state plan, CDE must describe the supports and services it will provide to districts with Title I schools that have been identified for Improvement. Under ESSA, Colorado must identify the lowest performing 5% Title I schools in the state for comprehensive support and Title I schools with subgroup achievement gaps for targeted support. For schools identified for comprehensive support, districts must develop and implement plans for each school. For schools identified for targeted support, each identified school must develop and implement a plan and the district must approve it.

Respondents across all listening tour locations indicated a general consensus on direct and indirect supports they would like CDE to provide districts with schools on improvement. Respondents suggested that CDE should act as a key collaborator that can either be more directly involved in or encourage the involvement of other stakeholders for school improvement processes.

Assistance with School Improvement Planning
The majority of responses indicated that participants would like CDE to play a more integral role, both directly and indirectly, in school improvement planning. First, respondents suggested that CDE can directly contribute to the various phases of school improvement planning. For example, "CDE can assist with performing root cause analysis at the district/schools with data analysis, help with writing UIP's and what data is allowable and how to analyze various data sets. Multi-year UIP's, how to modify, update." Additionally, several respondents requested that CDE to be onsite in schools in districts more frequently in order to gain more direct insight into school-level practices as part of the school improvement planning and implementation process. Examples of these responses include, "more hands-on in classroom - CDE should be present in schools!!" and "come visit – spend time in rural districts – come to understand our problems."

Collaboration for School Improvement Planning
Generally speaking, throughout the responses for this question, respondents indicated their desire for CDE to promote more stakeholder engagement on multiple levels for school improvement planning. For example, one respondent stressed the "need for CDE to be part of the team – practitioner and collaborator. Not an auditor." Other respondents believed CDE should encourage more collaboration between districts and schools and between educators and consultants. Numerous responses indicated that CDE should also encourage collaboration between different districts and schools, as well as their surrounding communities. For instance, CDE could help with "how to bring all stakeholders to table to discuss community led solutions not top down changes to schools." Still another said, "expertise from within the school should be listened to and have a more collaborative system to support schools." To support this collaboration many respondents, particularly in Greeley, discussed the potential benefits of having consultants such as implementation coaches to assist with SIPs. One respondent stated that CDE should "support systems change, including developing an understanding for coaches and implementation coach."

Professional Development and Professional Learning
Another frequently suggested form of support for schools on improvement was professional development and professional learning services from CDE. Respondents believed that in order to effectively implement changes as part of the school improvement process, administrators and school leaders could benefit from CDE-sanctioned professional development. Numerous other respondents who suggested more professional development and learning services echoed:

- "At the teacher level, supports and services for schools on improvement. Need schedules where teachers have to do learning, teach, collaborate, observe, grade/score but not totally in front of students."

- "Collaboration, planning, PD, observing and modeling with peers, grading/scoring."

Other Supportive Services
Some respondents stated that CDE should continue to offer direct services to districts in support of their school improvement efforts through a number of existing CDE initiatives, including the Turnaround Leadership Academy, Turnaround Network, and Connect for Success opportunities. In particular, the implementation coach model that Connect for Success utilizes seemed like an effective tool to a number of participants. Responses from participants who have been involved in Connect for Success, the Turnaround Leadership Academy, or Turnaround Network indicated a highly favorable sentiment toward these opportunities. Respondents who were aware of yet not involved in these opportunities still seemed to find value and benefit in these programs for schools on improvement. For example:
- "As a Turnaround school, the best support and professional development I've gotten has been from the Turnaround Network. The performance management tool has really helped a lot of principals."
- "Our Connect for Success implementation coach has been fantastic. It's someone who can be there with the school and monitor the implementation of the plan."

Other services requested included technical assistance for grant writing, particularly in some of the smaller listening sessions such as Buena Vista. Other respondents across all locations also suggested CDE maintain a menu of supports available to districts with schools on improvement. Regardless of the type of direct or indirect support that CDE will provide, it is clear that most respondents would like to see CDE increase their assistance in supporting schools on improvement.

Discussion Question #6: What is an appropriate length of time before more intensive interventions should be required for "consistently underperforming" schools/districts?

For those schools that have been identified for Improvement, CDE can determine the length of time before more intensive interventions would be required for these schools. This determination will be included in Colorado's ESSA State Plan.

The most frequent responses indicated that the appropriate length of time before more intensive intervention should be required is 3-5 years, with answers varying from 3 years, to 3-5 years, to 5 years. The next most frequent lengths of time suggested were two years or less and 2-3 years. Although different lengths of time were fairly evenly represented, reasons for choosing a particular timeframe aligned. These reasons included allowing adequate time for systemic change and allowing a plan to be fully developed and implemented.

The majority of respondents indicated 3-5 years is a sufficient amount of time for implemented changes to manifest and to gather enough data to measure and analyze student growth. Several of these individuals would like the state to have systems to regularly monitor the progress of these districts. Some of the responses included, "should give 3 years, but with regular check-in's to make sure it is working. Depending on circumstances, it can be year 5 that you are finally figuring out what works. Struggle with students coming through in the meantime," and "3-5 years with yearly assessments/prelims for trends/ID improvement but clearly defining 'consistently underperforming' to address what is within/outside school/district control."

Other Requested Lengths of Time
Very similar rationale was given for 5-7 years as for 3-5 years from respondents, including having enough time to measure the data to see actual progress and implement lasting changes in a school's culture. Those respondents who suggested a timeframe of 2-3 years indicate that this is an appropriate length of time to help schools implement a plan and focus on systems change.

For respondents who indicated a preference for a timeframe of less than two years, the majority of responses stated that more intensive interventions should occur in 12-18 months. A few responses stated that CDE needs to take immediate action to require more intensive interventions.

No Timeline Preference
There were a few participants who did not agree with any timeline proposed. Some of these respondents disagreed with having a timeline all together. For instance, one respondent stated, "as long as the distinction of low performing is tied to state assessments (if we are truly low performing, my community is going to fix it), then no amount of time is appropriate."

Student-centric Responses
Many responses focused on the impact of interventions on students. The student-centric responses varied in their identified length of time, but agreed that the impact on students should be considered when choosing the timeline and any associated efforts, interventions, programs, and so forth. Some of those responses stated:
- "2-3 consecutive years of underperforming. However, keep in mind that is 2-3 years of a student's education that may be lacking – what does that do to that learning?"
- "3 years – long enough for changes to hold, short enough for students not to be shuffled through a failing high school."
- "Shorter than 5 years – by the time five years goes by an entire cohort of students have gone through, potentially, without experiencing any improvement."
- "I think having 5 years would give the school enough to work with a group of students and see actual progress."

Of note is the fact that this question was added to the feedback forms after the Grand Junction and Pueblo listening tour events occurred, so responses to this question from these two locations were not captured. As such, responses were captured at only the Buena Vista, Limon, Durango, Greeley, and Denver listening tour events. Consequently, this was the question with the fewest number of responses. Suggestions for actual lengths of times varied among locations. For example, Durango responses reflected more general comments about interventions rather than prescribing a timeframe, whereas almost every response from Greeley participants indicates a specific length of time (although timeframes varied) with few general comments provided. Responses from Buena Vista, Limon, and Denver contained a diverse mixture of lengths of times and accompanying justifications.

Discussion Question #1: What supports should CDE provide to help teachers, schools, and districts provide effective instruction to students with specific learning needs?

In our state plan, Colorado must describe how Title II funds will be used to support state-level strategies to improve the quality and effectiveness of teachers and principals who in turn will increase student achievement. These supports may be targeted at improving the quality and effectiveness of teachers who have students with specific learning needs such as English Language Learners, students with disabilities, dually identified students, students in Gifted and Talented programs, etc.

The suggestions for CDE support ranged from offering more professional development and professional learning to assistance with implementing a model for Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) to simply offering more funding and access to services and CDE staff. The frequency of these requests was relatively consistent among all listening tour locations.

Professional Development and Professional Learning

The most frequent response suggested that CDE support professional development and/or professional learning. A large majority of respondents suggested that CDE create and/or enhance state offerings of professional development and learning opportunities as a form of support. Some participants also suggested CDE supporting more time, stipends, and other incentives for teachers to be able to participate in ongoing professional development.

The suggestions for topics of professional development and learning were widely varied. A significant amount of responses indicated that CDE can help provide guidance on how to shape and differentiate curricula to effectively teach the most students possible. In addition, when mentioning professional development and learning, a large portion of respondents suggested that CDE support training for general education teachers on diverse learning needs. Many other respondents stated that CDE should provide schools with supplementary training and guidance on how to teach diverse learners, including students with disabilities, English learners, Gifted and Talented students, low-income students, and students with special needs. One respondent suggested, "better practical professional development. What special needs – especially moderate needs in classroom – need techniques and sensitivity to diversity." Another respondent echoed many other comments when stating CDE could support "multicultural education for all teachers, Native language instructional strategies and English language acquisition" as examples for professional development/learning topics.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)

The second most frequent request was for CDE to offer support for the MTSS model. While CDE already supports the implementation of MTSS throughout the state, responses indicated that CDE could improve, augment, or enhance its universal support for MTSS in schools and districts in order to help support teachers educating students with specific learning needs. Several respondents suggested that CDE continue to help implement the MTSS model in schools and districts that may have yet to adopt this model, and/or provide additional supports such as professional development and training related to MTSS implementation.

Supporters of the MTSS model pointed to its numerous benefits. One respondent emphasized "support for fully funded, building-wide MTSS systems; which would include ELs and disaggregated groups." Another respondent stressed that the "MTSS model—the structure of this system—could help all of us. This system supports the Whole Child and also addresses what teachers are doing in the classroom." Still another respondent looked at the larger picture of MTSS benefits: "MTSS is a proactive model instead of reactive. Having building leaders and teachers understand that this model can transform a school proactively instead of reactively helps tremendously."

Funding and Other Resources

A large amount of respondents suggested that rather than having CDE provide support in the form of structured and/or statewide offerings, CDE should simply provide more funds for various supports and services. These included hiring more teachers to relieve high student-teacher ratios, educator endorsements and credentials, student interventions, helping rural districts with recruiting and retaining teachers, parenting classes, paraprofessionals or specialists and other support staff. As one respondent said, "Everything I think of costs money: more paraprofessionals for special education departments, smaller classroom sizes, language supports and more efforts for parent involvement, better before/after care opportunities for working parents, full-day kindergarten for working communities." Several other responses suggested that CDE provide both money and access to various resources, including simply "funding and resources according to student population needs."

Other Supports

Many other respondents suggested that CDE encourage districts to allow for more time to adequately receive training and support focused on supporting students with diverse needs. Similarly, a number of responses also asked that CDE reduce the administrative burden on schools so that teachers and administrators may focus on actually supporting students with specific learning needs and monitoring progress of students. Examples of these comments include:

- "At many districts there is not enough FTE to have adequate support for the students. Educators working in these areas are overworked and under paid."
- "Reduction of red tape, reduce the workload and paperwork that is necessary (IEP, 504, literacy plan), etc. to do jobs."
- "Teachers are overwhelmed by rules, regulations and procedures and they just keep adding on and there is no extra time."
- "Simplify the compliance pieces and focus more on serving the students better. The compliance seems to get in the way. Current special education, specific professional development is more focused on compliance than on instruction."
- "Need to provide adequate support for teachers who are serving a dual role for SPED students. Find a way to support how to manage the work load for those teachers."

Some rural participants suggested CDE conduct more onsite school visits in order to gain understanding what happens at a more local level to consequently provide better, locally focused support and collaboration. One response reflected several viewpoints, stating: "we had a lot of energy behind that CDE representatives need to be in the rural communities more. We have great local plans for the needs that we have here, but we also need resources for those local needs."

Overall, responses pointed to the need for CDE to increase the quantity and quality of supports offered statewide and in person. For example, one respondent wanted, "access to a point person at CDE who has expertise in supporting students with learning needs." Another respondent noted, "would like current supports to increase, such as MTSS. We need to find more supports; feels like these have decreased including access to CDE staff."

While the responses to this question varied, participants generally requested that CDE extend themselves and their services as tools of support to districts and schools on a greater scale. Respondents overwhelmingly suggested that CDE offer more professional development and learning to teachers and leaders and, in particular, teachers of students with specific learning needs. While these responses outlined the ways in which CDE can supply professional development and learning (whether CDE provides it directly or provides districts with the resources to execute them on their own, participants did not indicate a clear preference for either option.

Discussion Question #2: In addition to holding a license, should teachers be required to demonstrate competency in the subject area in which they teach?

ESSA eliminates the "Highly Qualified" requirement of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Under ESSA, teachers must meet state licensure requirements in order to teach. In lieu of enforcing the "Highly Qualified" provision, CDE posed this question to stakeholders to see if the state should require teachers to demonstrate competency in the subject area they teach in addition to holding a license.

The majority of participants that responded to this question believed teachers should be required to demonstrate competency in the subject area they teach in addition to holding a license.

In Favor of Demonstrating Competency in Addition to a License

Many respondents who answered "yes" to this question seemed to value content knowledge and suggested including knowledge in particular content areas as part of the requirements for demonstrating competency. However, examples of how to demonstrate this knowledge were so varied it was difficult to determine whether a consensus exists as to how participants wish to measure or evaluate content knowledge. Several notable examples included using existing PLACE and PRAXIS tests, degrees held, additional coursework, and/or professional development/professional learning. One respondent summed up this sentiment by stating: "It is reasonable to expect that teachers demonstrate grade level competency in the subject area that they are teaching. If it's not a federal requirement, then it should be a state requirement. How it should be measured is up for debate."

Of those who answered "yes," many suggested that subject area competency should be considered in addition to degree requirements and/or educator effectiveness evaluations (established by Senate Bill 10-191). These respondents preferred using degrees or evaluations to determine competency over specialized endorsements, the PLACE and PRAXIS tests, etc. Still others in this group suggested that only certain educators such as secondary teachers or special education teachers should be required to demonstrate their competency beyond a license.

An overwhelming majority of those who answered "yes" and who mentioned endorsements thought positively about endorsements as a way to demonstrate competency in addition to holding a license. All of those in favor of endorsements in this group indicated that endorsements are a way to ensure teachers have the content knowledge in the area they are teaching.

A number of responses in favor of additional requirements thought competency should be measured using bodies of evidence or through multiple measures and opportunities. For example, when answering this question, one respondent stated, "yes, teachers should have multiple pathways to demonstrate competency in the subject area in which they teach (i.e., coursework, test results, on the job experience)."

Against Demonstrating Competency in Addition to a License

Of those who answered "no" to this question, many believed this requirement would exacerbate the current issues around employing teachers. These respondents believed it is already difficult to attract talent to the teaching profession, especially in rural areas. Most of those who responded "no" to this question believed demonstrating competency should be a part of, rather than in addition to, teacher licensure requirements. This rang especially true for respondents who also voiced concerns over the teacher shortage and the inability for small/rural districts to attract talent. Several others who responded "no" pointed to the burden of time and effort that would be a result of requiring additional demonstrations of competency. These responses speculated that additional requirements would be unnecessary because teachers acquire and demonstrate competency through other existing avenues.

Responses indicated that the state should consider the effects that adding more requirements would have on recruiting and retaining teachers—especially in light of the statewide (and nationwide) teacher shortage.

Others who responded "no" thought that demonstrating competency is apparent in not only holding a license but through the current educator effectiveness evaluation system established by SB 10-191. The several responses against endorsements, particularly from rural areas, cited that endorsements may be too burdensome or time-consuming for teachers and may exacerbate districts' issues of recruiting and retaining qualified teachers with endorsements. A number suggested changing endorsement requirements so they are less restrictive and more flexible.

Content and Instruction
In responding to this question, participants in all locations introduced the consideration of demonstrating competency through either content knowledge, instructional practice or both. A large portion of respondents believed competency in a subject area (content knowledge) is only one element of a well-rounded teacher. Numerous participants suggested that pedagogical practices such as classroom management or instructional design should be considered in evaluating competency because many instructional practices are just as important or valuable as content knowledge. A considerable amount of respondents went so far to say that instructional practices are more important than solely having content knowledge. For example, one respondent hypothesized that, "the biggest instructional problems result from teachers who have good content knowledge and have worked in the field but don't work well with kids and don't have pedagogical skills, classroom management, creating lesson plans around content knowledge, etc."

"Highly Qualified" requirements
A considerable number of responses indicated that participants across locations are still in favor of keeping the requirements for "Highly Qualified" (HQ) teachers or maintaining equivalent qualifications for HQ since CDE is no longer required to enforce the rules surrounding HQ. In fact, only one response to this question was explicitly in favor of removing the HQ requirements. On the other hand, responses in favor of HQ reflected how much of an impact HQ can have on ensuring that teachers have and are able to demonstrate competency. As the opinions in favor of demonstrating competency above showed, many participants thought that elements of the "Highly Qualified" requirement should be maintained including 24 hours of courses, by degree, or by passing content assessment.

Teacher Preparation
A significant number of respondents mentioned that teacher prep programs, particularly traditional higher education programs, should be changed to align with the state-mandated requirements of competency, including the current educator effectiveness evaluation system.

Relatedly, quite a few responses were in favor of alternative licensure programs that could potentially provide more flexibility for teacher prep programs, allow for more preparation of teachers (particularly special education teachers), and help address the teacher shortage.

The majority sentiment that teachers should demonstrate competency existed among all listening tour sessions as a whole. In most locations, this was the majority sentiment among participants (Grand Junction, Pueblo, Greeley and Denver) while two locations (Limon and Buena Vista) were split on the matter and only one location's majority was against the additional demonstration of competency (Durango). Notably, there were responses that indicated several participants were unsure of how to answer this question because they either felt more information needed to be given regarding what a demonstration of competency would look like and whether any requirements for competency currently exist.

Discussion Question #3: How should CDE modify current English learner (EL) Identification, Re-designation, and Exit guidance to meet the ESSA state plan requirements? What additional criteria should be considered?

ESSA requires states to establish standard exit and entrance criteria. Recently, Colorado has issued entrance and exit criteria through guidance as well as revised EL re-designation guidance. USDE regulations will determine if Colorado's current practices will meet state plan requirements under ESSA.

A slight majority of respondents suggested modifications to the current criteria and corresponding guidance for EL identification, re-designation, and/or exit processes. However, there was also a significant amount of participants across all locations that did not desire any modifications or additions to the current EL identification, re-designation, and exit criteria. Some of these respondents believe the current criteria are already clear and effective and requested that CDE maintain their current methods concerning identification, re-designation, and exit processes for EL students. Several comments reflected a desire to keep the current EL identification, re-designation, and exit criteria to maintain local control of these processes:

- "No additional criteria that could possibly minimize local control."
- "Keep as is. CDE guidance with local control."
- "Current guidance works well. Need to maintain the local control in that regard."
- "Current guidance works very well locally."

Identification Criteria

The need for accurate identification of EL students was mentioned many times in the responses. Several respondents requested additional guidance from CDE regarding accurate identification and consequently appropriate placement of ELs. A large number of responses from Durango participants reflected a need for accurate identification of Native American students. Many other responses captured across locations reflect a need to provide more criteria/guidance for properly identifying dually identified and bilingual students.

Numerous respondents indicated they would like CDE to establish a system that allows currently identified students to move among all districts in the state without burdening the school to re-evaluate these students. One respondent suggests that CDE "consider mobility and translation between schools and districts" while another respondent underscores the "need to address the Interrupted Formal Education situations."

Re-designation Criteria

Some respondents appreciated that CDE has established re-designation criteria; however, almost all responses that mentioned re-designation suggested changing the criteria. Suggestions included re-assessing students throughout the school year or allowing more time for re-designation. A few other responses pointed to the time and effort it takes to identify EL students.

There were a significant number of responses that suggested changing identification and re-designation criteria/guidance for dually identified students ("English Learner" and "Student with Disability", for example) and bilingual students. For example, one respondent asserted, "we do need to look at current identification and designation—current system does not address students who are dually identified/designated such as EL and SPED." Another respondent, "loves that Colorado has re-designation criteria, wants guidance on multi-designated students who are proficient but have a learning disability but don't get proficient scores." Still another respondent asserted that the current guidance "doesn't address immerging bilingual and students with disabilities. Should look at how this overlaps to form new guidance."

Exit Criteria

For the currently established exit criteria, there were no positive reactions but a number of negative reactions and uncertainties were stated in the responses. The majority of responses that mentioned exit criteria requested modifications. Some of those modifications include:

- "Make sure the exit criteria is not linguistically, geographically and culturally biased."
- "Exit criteria needs to loosen for students with disabilities."
- "Should be a way for students identified as EL to be exited early on if misidentified, given how hard it is to exit through academic and ACCESS measures later on."

Some respondents believed the exit process should contain additional criteria while others felt the existing criteria is too burdensome. Still others believed it would be beneficial for students to be exited earlier while several respondents voiced their concerns with exited students' English language acquisition without having acquired content knowledge or academic proficiency.

Additional Considerations
Relatedly, many respondents desired using a body of evidence in evaluating ELs through the identification, re-designation, and exit processes, which aligns with current CDE requirements. Several suggestions on what to include in the body of evidence were:

- "Multiple measures of successes. Demonstrate what they know and are able to do without paper/pencil; ACCESS test (emphasize local assessment)."
- "Reclassification should be based on multiple measures of linguistic criteria (not academic)."
- "3 bodies of evidence: 1 reading, 1 writing, 1 ACCESS testing 5 (or close to) overall and literacy."

Many responses also reflected a desire to attain specific guidance on current statewide requirements for these processes. Several of the comments that support statewide guidance requested that CDE conduct research and use data to support this guidance. For example:

- "There is a need for research on the current needs of ELs within districts before deciding on common criteria."
- "We discussed the possibility of having common statewide criteria. There is a need for having a research based method of identifying students. That research needs to be conducted before common criteria is established."

It is important to note that this question had the most variance in amount and content of responses; while also being the second least answered question among all sites. In some sessions, respondents left this question completely blank. Other sites received a decent amount of responses depending on the number of attendees in a session. This question was also reworded after the Grand Junction and Pueblo listening sessions to contain more accurate phrasing regarding CDE's current state of criteria and guidance offered for EL identification, re-designation, and exit processes.

Discussion Question #4: What does well-rounded and healthy students mean to you?

The term "well-rounded" is frequently referenced throughout ESSA with the purpose of allowing schools to provide all students with an enriched curriculum and educational experience. Title IV in particular has been repurposed in ESSA to improve student achievement by providing all students with access to a well-rounded education. CDE asked this question to participants to gauge whether a consensus could be made among stakeholders statewide as to what a well-rounded and healthy student looks like.

The concept of a well-rounded and healthy student was interpreted in many different ways among all of the listening tour participants. Responses were varied yet consistent regardless of geographic region or participant demographics. Individual responses often contained both academic and non-academic indicators, but there seemed to be a much larger portion of non-academic indicators that respondents suggested for subject matter. Regarding particular subject matter, physical education and activity was the most suggested, followed by electives, health and wellness, and finally the arts. As far as overarching topics of concern, social-emotional learning (SEL) was the most frequent response, followed by access and engagement, and finally educating the whole child.

Healthy Students

Across all locations, most respondents underscored that a healthy and well-rounded education should include more physical education and activity, including outdoor education. Physical education and activity can be regarded as an element of overall student health and wellness. Health and wellness indicators were repeatedly mentioned across all locations as well. Specific areas of health and wellness included having basic needs met, access to routine health services (including school nurses and psychologists), learning in healthy school environments, eating nutritious meals, and learning about and practicing the skills needed for healthy lifestyles.

Many respondents noted the significance of incorporating social/emotional learning (SEL), including character development, into other aspects of education in order to create healthy and well-rounded students. For example, one respondent suggested that a healthy and well-rounded education should feature, "social/emotional learning, whole child, whole school, whole community, resilient, perseverance." Another common area of concern was the concept of educating the Whole Child. This concept encompasses several of the preceding topics of concern, including physical, social, emotional, and mental health and wellness of students. When discussing mental and physical health, one respondent said that currently, "many students don't have access to adequate care/supports in these areas. I think it definitely is an impact to student success."

Well-Rounded Students

Concerning a well-rounded education, the words "access," "exposure," "choice," and "engaged" were common among respondents. Respondents felt it was important for students to have access to a wide variety of educational opportunities and exposure to a whole range of subject matter, including the arts, music, language, financial literacy, and so forth. The respondents also highlighted the importance of choice. This includes students having the ability to choose various subject matters and content areas. One respondent suggested that a well-rounded education included "the arts, vocational education, electives for life skills, community service – in addition to academics and athletics."

Multiple respondents stated that content areas that may not be measured, tested, assessed, and so forth should be considered in a well-rounded education. For example, one respondent suggested that districts "hold their priorities above scoring on state assessments. Achievement is important but achievement is evidenced in so many other ways than assessment."

Still others mentioned that a well-rounded and healthy education would be indicative of a student being engaged in his or her education. A large amount of responses implied that by allowing students access and

exposure as well as choice to a variety of academic and non-academic content in their school, students will become more engaged. Engagement, as one respondent asserted, means "diversifying to meet kid's needs and aptitudes. Getting kids to like school and want to be there."

It is important to note that few responses to this question contained actual academic subject matter. Some responses mentioned students having 21st century skills, career and technical education, college and career (not just focused on college) readiness, vocational preparedness, life skills, and so forth. Several respondents believe that having the opportunity to connect with the community, learning about civics, being an active citizen who is globally conscious and culturally aware are all important factors when identifying well-rounded and healthy students. For example, well-rounded education features "students who love to learn, who see learning as an asset, who are 21st century trained to be ready to succeed as citizens in our society." Notably, a significant number of participants, especially from the Denver metro area, suggested that promoting a well-rounded and healthy education for students starts with well-rounded and healthy adults.

Question #5: Should CDE reserve 3% of Title I, Part A funds for direct student services grants?

Colorado has the option to reserve an additional 3% of Title I, Part A funds for a total reservation of 10%. The 3% reservation would be allocated to districts with low-performing schools in order to provide direct student services to meet student needs. This would be a decrease of the overall Title I funds distributed to LEAs; the fiscal impact would vary among districts.

There were twice as many responses against the 3% reservation than in favor of the 3% reservation. The reasons for opposing the reservation were primarily about local control, administration, and the perception that the amount of funds would be negligible and/or ineffective. The reasons for supporting the reservation encompassed student-centric responses such as expanding student services in high school or providing more direct services for students most in need. There was also a considerable amount of responses indicating that participants were unsure whether CDE should reserve the funds.

Those Against Reserving 3%

The responses against CDE reserving the 3% contained only a few pointed reasons opposing the reservation. An overwhelming majority of responses against reserving the 3% pointed to concerns of relinquishing local control over how funds are spent as well as use for administrative costs. There is also correlation in the responses of those who think the percentage is insignificant and concerns about local control and administrative costs. One respondent noted, "3% is not very much money. It seems like it would be eaten up by administrative costs. Keep the money local." Another response stated that direct student services, "are the kinds of things that should remain local control because of the individual needs of each district and 3% is not very much money."

Many responses suggested that 3% may be an insignificant and thus inconsequential amount of funds to set aside for direct student services. Examples of these responses include: "it would be such a little amount that it doesn't make sense" and "that's not enough money to do anything." Other responses underscored the sole importance of having these funds remain local and go directly to districts or even schools. Relatedly, a significant amount of responses reflected a concern with ensuring the funds directly impact and benefit students. For instance, this comment echoes many other responses in favor of direct student services, "Yes, this will accelerate funds in area of highest need and benefit students across the K-12 grade levels."

Those in Favor of Reserving 3%

For those responses in favor reserving the 3%, the reasons provided varied greatly. Of the respondents who stated that CDE should reserve the 3%, many perceived that the reservation will directly benefit schools and students that are the most in need of direct student services. Several of the respondents would like the funds to be used in the form of support from CDE to improve their already existing efforts of direct student services. For instance, "Yes, CDE can identify areas that can make a specific difference and allocating more funds to the most at risk areas can really make a difference."

Several responses indicated that reserving the 3% may be a good opportunity to fund direct student services at the high school level. Activities such as concurrent enrollment, AP/IB classes, and Career and Technical Education were cited as suggested possibilities for use of funds if CDE reserved the 3%.

Those Unsure of Reserving 3%

There were a number of responses that denoted participants were "unsure" how to respond to this question (almost as many as "yes" responses). Uncertainty encompassed how the funds were to be used, who would receive or benefit from the funds (e.g., SEA-run activities versus district-run activities), whether they would be released competitively or as a formula, what activities were to be deemed a direct student service, and what impact these funds would have. Several comments that reflected this include:

- "Depending on what it is – if it is to better all students then yes."

- "Unsure at this time – depends on many factors – may have to "try it and see" before knowing what serves students best."
- "It depends on the impact on the districts who would not be eligible for participating in the 3% grants - if the impact is not large, then yes."
- "In the past has the SIG money made a significant difference? If not, keep the money at the local level. If it has we can try it."
- "Difficulty is that there is no specific clarity on how to use those funds."
- "Can this be for schools to receive services they could not otherwise receive?"
- "Can't offer an informed opinion without knowing how LEAs would use targeted funds and what the impact would be of removing that 3% from what schools could expect predictability."
- "Mixed feeling about retaining the funds and whether it's going to yield results."

Regardless of whether CDE decides to reserve 3% of Title I, Part A funds for direct student services grants, clarification and specific guidance should be communicated to the field. Clarification needs to include how much exactly the state projects it would reserve in total and/or per LEA, whether the SEA or LEA can reserve any part of the funds for administrative costs, which LEAs would be eligible for these funds, whether the activities will be state-run or locally dictated, and allowable costs and activities.

Summary & Next Steps

As mentioned, the Colorado Department of Education was able to interact with approximately 1,500 people across the state to provide data for this report. Now that the report has been completed, the focus will be shifting to developing a draft of the ESSA state plan and the corresponding committee, vetting and continued stakeholder engagement work that will support it.

To develop Colorado's ESSA state plan, the Department will be working within a hub/spoke structure. The idea is to create a formal, central hub committee that will have an oversight role in the development of a draft of our state plan to be submitted to the State Board in early 2017, and ESSA topical spoke committees that will be responsible for developing and appropriately vetting sections of the state plan with the nimbleness and flexibility to get the work done in a timely manner. In accordance with the vision and direction of the State Board of Education the hub/spoke committee process and membership details are described below as well as practices for continued stakeholder involvement.

ESSA Hub Committee
The purpose of ESSA hub committee is to provide oversight of the ESSA state plan development and act in an advisory capacity to the State Board of Education. The goal of the committee is to review and revise proposed state plan drafts that reflect a final consensus of the committee, the constituencies the members represent, and is aligned with the vision of the State Board of Education.
At this time the ESSA hub committee includes the following membership:

- Steve Durham — State Board of Education
- Angelika Schroeder — State Board of Education
- Rep. Brittany Pettersen — State Legislature
- Rep. Jim Wilson — State Legislature
- Evy Valencia — Governor's Office
- Jim Earley — Parent Representative
- Ross Izard — Independence Institute
- Luke Ragland — Colorado Succeeds
- Jeani Fricky — Stand for Children
- Kirk Banghart — Moffat School District, President of Rural Alliance
- Dan Schaller — League of Charter Schools
- Ken DeLay — Colorado Association of School Boards
- Lisa Escárcega — Colorado Association of School Executives
- Linda Barker — Colorado Education Association
- Don Anderson — Colorado BOCES Association
- Diane Duffy — Colorado Department of Higher Education
- Jesús Escárcega — Colorado ESEA Committee of Practitioners
- Sean Bradley — Urban League of Metropolitan Denver
- Ernest House — Colorado Commission on Indian Affairs
- Carolyn Gery — Goal Academy

ESSA Spoke Committees
The goals of each spoke committee will be to consider and respond to feedback from ESSA listening tour; address state plan requirements in their respective section of the draft; thoroughly vet drafts with constituency groups as needed and appropriate; and provide updates to, and review plans with, the ESSA hub committee throughout the submission process. The Colorado Department of Education will designate as many members as required to adequately staff and participate in the spoke committee structure.

The spoke committees will be organized around the proposed USDE rules for state plan requirements:

- Standards Committee
- Assessment Committee
- Accountability Committee
- Effective Instruction and Leadership Committee
- School Improvement Committee
- Title Program Plans/Assurances Committee
- Stakeholder Consultation/Program Coordination Committee

Each spoke committee will be led by a team of CDE staff members and will utilize existing committees and groups as needed with the option to add new members as appropriate and necessary.

Critical Vetting Partnerships for Plan Development

CDE's goal is to develop an ESSA plan that is understood and can be publicly supported by all. In addition to the organizations listed in the Hub Committee, CDE will vet plans as they are developed with a variety of groups that have a broad array of perspectives.

CDE will continue to communicate important news and updates regarding the ESSA plan development through the CDE update, The Scoop, email, ESSA Blog, ESSA website, and press releases. As part of our efforts for continued engagement, CDE encourages stakeholders to stay connected as we develop our ESSA state plan in the coming months.

Appendix A

ESSA Listening Tour Calendar

CDE staff attended all of the following events to gather broad-based public input on how Colorado could implement key areas of the nation's new federal education law, the Every Student Succeeds Act. School district/BOCES personnel, teachers, parents, students, and community members were in attendance at these events in order to gain an understanding of the opportunities created by the new legislation, transition timelines, and how they can contribute to the development of Colorado's ESSA state plan.

Date	Meeting	Topic	Lead	Audience	CDE Staff in Attendance
February 22	Accountability Work group	In-depth Discussion of accountability and assessment requirement of ESSA.	Accountability and Performance	Stakeholder group, consisting of regional superintendent representatives, school and district leadership and CASE, CASB, and CEA leaders	Alyssa Pearson Nazie Mohajeri-Nelson
April 6	Regional ESEA Consolidated Application Workshop Metro – Jeffco Boardroom	ESSA overview, transition timeline, and ESSA plan development. Applications for funding and use of funds.	Federal Programs	School district and BOCES personnel	Brad Bylsma Colleen Brooks Jeff Klein Kirsten Carlile Sarah Cohen Stacy Goodman Anna Young
April 7	Regional ESEA Consolidated Application Workshop Durango Durango 9R Boardroom	ESSA overview, transition timeline, and ESSA plan development. Applications for funding and use of funds.	Federal Programs	School district and BOCES personnel	Brad Bylsma
April 8	Alamosa SLV BOCES	ESSA overview, transition timeline, and ESSA plan development. Applications for funding and use of funds.	Federal Programs	School district and BOCES personnel	Brad Bylsma
April 12	Front Range Title I Directors Westminster 50 Administration Offices	Changes to Title I, transition timeline, ESSA state plan development	Federal Programs	Local Title I program directors from front range school districts and BOCES	Brad Bylsma Jeff Klein
April 18	Accountability Work Group	Further discussion of accountability and assessment requirements of ESSA.	Accountability and Performance	Stakeholder group, consisting of regional superintendent representatives, school and district leadership and CASE, CASB, and CEA leaders	Alyssa Pearson Nazie Mohajeri-Nelson
April 19	SHAPE America	Colorado's implementation of key areas of ESSA in regards to physical education.	Federal Programs	PE Educators and advocates	Brad Bylsma Jennifer Simmons Colleen Brooks Kristen Carlile

Appendix A

Date	Meeting	Topic	Lead	Audience	CDE Staff in Attendance
April 20	Regional ESEA Consolidated Application Workshop Longmont Learning Services Center	ESSA overview, transition timeline, and ESSA plan development. Applications for funding and use of funds.	Federal Programs	School district and BOCES personnel	Jennifer Simmons Stacy Goodman Kirsten Carlile DeLilah Collins Colleen Brooks
April 21	ESEA Committee of Practitioners	ESSA overview, transition timeline, decision points. The CoP's role in plan development.	Federal Programs	ESEA oversight committee comprised of school district and BOCES personnel, board members, parent, private school rep	Patrick Chapman Brad Bylsma Jeff Klein Lynn Bamberry
April 21	ESSA Community Conversation Panel (Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Education Academy)	ESSA overview and discussion of changes, transition timeline, and impact on English Learners	Federal Programs	Local English learner educators and administrators from school districts and BOCES	Colleen Brooks
April 27	Regional ESEA Consolidated Application Workshop Steamboat NW BOCES Conference Room	ESSA overview, transition timeline, and ESSA plan development. Applications for funding and use of funds.	Federal Programs	School district and BOCES personnel	Jennifer Simmons Colleen Brooks DeLilah Collins
April 27	Grand Junction Basil T. Knight Staff Dev. Center	ESSA overview, transition timeline, and ESSA plan development. Applications for funding and use of funds.	Federal Programs	School district and BOCES personnel	Stacy Goodman Kirsten Carlile Sarah Cohen
May 3	PEBC ESSA Study Group	Determine implications of ESSA on the work of PEBC with their partners.	Federal Programs Educator Licensing	PEBC	Patrick Chapman Colleen O'Neil Karen Martinez
May 4	ESSA Listening Tour Pueblo - El Pueblo History Museum Two sessions: 1-4 pm, 5:30-7:30 pm	Colorado's implementation of key areas of ESSA.	Federal Programs	School/District/BOCES personnel, teacher, parents, community members	Patrick Chapman Lynn Bamberry Jennifer Simmons Nazie Mohajeri-Nelson David Schneiderman Tomas Mejia
May 4	ESSA Listening Tour Grand Junction - Central Library Two sessions: 1-4 pm, 5:30-7:30 pm	Colorado's implementation of key areas of ESSA.	Federal Programs	School/District/BOCES personnel, teacher, parents, community members	Alyssa Pearson Anna Young Brad Bylsma Colleen O'Neil Robert Hawkins Noemi Aguilar

Appendix A

Date	Meeting	Topic	Lead	Audience	CDE Staff in Attendance
May 5	Regional ESEA Consolidated Application Workshop Pueblo Pueblo City Schools Admin Bldg.	ESSA overview, transition timeline, and ESSA plan development. Applications for funding and use of funds.	Federal Programs	School district and BOCES personnel	DeLilah Collins Stacy Goodman Jennifer Simmons
May 6	Regional ESEA Consolidated Application Workshop Lamar Lamar Community Building	ESSA overview, transition timeline, and ESSA plan development. Applications for funding and use of funds.	Federal Programs	School district and BOCES personnel	DeLilah Collins Stacy Goodman Jennifer Simmons
May 10	Front Range Title I Directors Westminster 50 Administration Offices	Changes to Title I, transition timeline, ESSA state plan development	Federal Programs	Local Title I program directors from front range school districts and BOCES	Brad Bylsma Jeff Klein Anna Young
May 12	ESSA Listening Tour Durango - School District Board Room Two sessions: 1-4 pm, 5:30-7:30 pm	Colorado's implementation of key areas of ESSA.	Federal Programs	School/District/BOCES personnel, teacher, parents, community members	Patrick Chapman Lynn Bamberry Jennifer Simmons Nazie-Mohajeri Nelson David Schneiderman Tomas Mejia
May 12	Early Childhood Leadership Commission	The impact of ESSA on early childhood education policy, practice, resources, and supports.	Federal Programs and Teaching and Early Childhood	Members of the Early Childhood Leadership Commission	Brad Bylsma
May 12	Teach Plus – Virtual Session	Impact of ESSA on teachers, resource equity, teacher quality, teacher leadership	Federal Programs	Teachers – Professional Learning Community	Jennifer Simmons
May 16	ESSA Listening Tour Greeley - UNC University Center Two sessions: 1-4 pm, 5:30-7:30 pm	Colorado's implementation of key areas of ESSA.	Federal Programs	School/District/BOCES personnel, teacher, parents, community members	Alyssa Pearson Anna Young Brad Bylsma Colleen O'Neil Robert Hawkins Noemi Aguilar
May 17	State Advisory Council for Parent Involvement in Education	Overview of ESSA with particular emphasis on opportunities and requirements related to parent, family, and community engagement. Discussion of SACPIE's role in ESSA state plan development.	Improvement Planning with Federal Programs	Representatives from CPTA, Statewide Parent Coalition, legislators, and other organizations with an interest in effective parent engagement practices.	Patrick Chapman

COLORADO
Department of Education

Appendix A

Date	Meeting	Topic	Lead	Audience	CDE Staff in Attendance
May 17	Changes in Federal Education Laws Impacting Foster Children – ESSA	An overview of ESSA provisions regarding key protections for students in foster care.	Dropout Prevention, hosted by the Casey Foundation and the American Bar Association	Foster Care education stakeholders	Jennifer Simmons Colleen Brooks
May 18	ESSA Listening Tour Buena Vista - Best Western Vista Inn Two sessions: 1-4 pm, 5:30-7:30 pm	Colorado's implementation of key areas of ESSA.	Federal Programs	School/District/BOCES personnel, teacher, parents, community members	Patrick Chapman Lynn Bamberry David Schneiderman Noemi Aguilar Donna Morganstern
May 19	Regional ESEA Consolidated Application Workshop Sterling Valley RE-1 School District	ESSA overview, transition timeline, and ESSA plan development. Applications for funding and use of funds.	Federal Programs	School district and BOCES personnel	Jeff Klein Jennifer Simmons DeLilah Collins
May 20	ESSA Listening Tour Limon - East Central BOCES 9am-12pm	Colorado's implementation of key areas of ESSA.	Federal Programs	School/District/BOCES personnel, teacher, parents, community members	Patrick Chapman Lynn Bamberry Jennifer Simmons David Schneiderman
May 23	ESSA Listening Tour Thornton - Adams 12 Conference Center Two sessions: 1-4 pm, 5:30-7:30 pm	Colorado's implementation of key areas of ESSA.	Federal Programs	School/District/BOCES personnel, teacher, parents, community members	Alyssa Pearson Lynn Bamberry Brad Bylsma Anna Young Robert Hawkins Noemi Aguilar Patty Gleason
May 25	CLDE Stakeholder Meeting	Colorado's implementation of key areas of ESSA and English Learners	Federal Programs	School/District/BOCES personnel, Higher Education	Morgan Cox Nazie Mohajeri-Nelson Brad Bylsma Rebekah Ottenbreit Lulu Buck Georgina Owen Lindsay Swanton Doris Nguyen Pat Chapman
June 1	ESSA Listening Tour – webinar 9:00-noon	Colorado's implementation of key areas of ESSA.	Federal Programs	School/District/BOCES personnel, teacher, parents, community members	Pat Chapman Alyssa Pearson

COLORADO
Department of Education

Appendix A

Date	Meeting	Topic	Lead	Audience	CDE Staff in Attendance
June 9	Colorado Digital BOCES CO Digital BOCES HQ – Greenwood Village	Colorado's implementation of key areas of ESSA.	Federal Programs	Colorado Digital BOCES personnel	Brad Bylsma
June 14	Colorado Education Initiative Showcase – Snowmass 10:30 -12	Colorado's implementation of key areas of ESSA in regards to teachers.	Federal Programs	A group of approximately 50 teachers from throughout the state	Brad Bylsma
June 21	Gifted Education State Advisory Committee (GE-SAC) Retreat	Colorado's implementation of key areas of ESSA in regards to Gifted Education.	Federal Programs with ESSU (Office of Gifted Education)	GE-SAC	Patrick Chapman
June 21	Denver Areas Superintendents Council (DASC) Meeting	ESSA accountability requirements, the proposed regulations, and how to develop Colorado's state plan.	Office of the Commissioner	Denver Areas Superintendent Council (DASC)	Katy Anthes Alyssa Pearson
June 22	Urban League – Coalition of Advocacy Groups	Colorado's implementation of key areas of ESSA in regards to the special groups.	Federal Programs	Various Advocacy Groups (30 participants)	Katy Anthes Patrick Chapman Barbara Hickman Alyssa Pearson
June 27	Think 360 Arts for Learning 1:00-3:00 p.m.	Colorado's implementation of key areas of ESSA in regards to the Arts.	Federal Programs	Colorado Arts in Education Coalition	Patrick Chapman
June 28	Internal ESSA Listening Tour 1560 Broadway, 19th floor, Denver 9-12	Colorado's implementation of key areas of ESSA and highlights of what was learned during the ESSA Listening Tour.	Federal Program	CDE Staff	Patrick Chapman Alyssa Pearson

COLORADO
Department of Education