

## Community & Student Engagement Performance Evaluation 2016-17

	<b>Campus</b>
	<b>District</b>

### Summary of CaSE Ratings by Program and Overall CaSE Rating - 2016-17 (Word Ratings)

	2016-17 Score	2016-17 Word Rating	Applicable Letter Grade (Preview of 2017-18)
Fine Arts			
Wellness and Physical Education			
Community and Parental Involvement			
21st Century Workforce Development			
Second Language Acquisition			
Digital Learning Environment			
Dropout Prevention Strategies			
Gifted and Talented			
<b>OVERALL</b>			

### Summary of CaSE Ratings and Overall CaSE Rating Based on 3 Selected Programs - PREVIEW of 2017-18

*(enter a 1, 2 or 3 in the column immediately to the left of the Program Area to indicate the 3 selected programs)*

	2016-17 Score	2016-17 Word Rating	Applicable Letter Grade (Preview of 2017-18)
↓			
Fine Arts			
Wellness and Physical Education			
Community and Parental Involvement			
21st Century Workforce Development			
Second Language Acquisition			
Digital Learning Environment			
Dropout Prevention Strategies			
Gifted and Talented			
<b>OVERALL</b>			

# Community & Student Engagement Performance Evaluation 2016-17

Campus  
District

## Fine Arts

Indicators		0	1	2	3	4	Score
1	Did the campus provide regular opportunities for students to participate in fine arts curriculum? <i>Examples: exhibits, open houses, band concerts, musicals, plays, talent shows, art shows or other fine arts events or activities. This is a campus-wide determined total.</i>	No opportunities for students	1 opportunity for students	2 opportunities offered for students	4 opportunities offered for students	5 or more opportunities offered for students	
2	Did the campus offer and encourage student involvement in co-curricular fine arts activities? <i>Examples: UIL, One Act Play, special assemblies, clubs, student art exhibits, field trips, guest speakers, musicians, artists, speakers, or art shows</i>	No opportunities for students	1 to 2 opportunities for students	3 opportunities offered for students	4 opportunities offered for students	5 or more opportunities offered for students	
3	What percentage of students participating in fine arts curriculum were involved in fine arts competitions? <i>Examples: UIL, One Act Play, special assemblies, clubs, student art exhibits, field trips, guest speakers, musicians, artists, speakers, or art shows</i>	No participating FA students involved in FA competitions	1% to 5% of participating FA students involved in FA competitions	6% to 9% of participating FA students involved in FA competitions	10% to 15% of participating FA students involved in FA competitions	More than 15% participating FA students involved in FA competitions	
4	Did the campus host Fine Arts events to which the community or parents were invited to attend? <i>Examples: UIL, One Act Play, special assemblies, clubs, student art exhibits, field trips, guest speakers, musicians, artists, speakers, or art shows</i>	No FA events	1 or 2 FA events	3 FA events	4 FA events	5 or more FA events	
<b>Overall Program Score</b>							
A: ≥ 3.5   B: ≥ 2.5 and < 3.5   C: ≥ 1.5 and < 2.5   D: ≥ 0.5 and < 1.5   F: < 0.5							<b>Overall Program Letter Grade (for use in 2017-18)</b>
Exemplary = A   Recognized = B   Acceptable = C   Unacceptable = D or F							<b>Overall Program Rating (for use in 2016-17)</b>

# Community & Student Engagement Performance Evaluation 2016-17

Campus  
District

## Wellness and Physical Education

Indicators		0	1	2	3	4	Score
1	<p>Did the campus participate in the Coordinated Approach to School Health program through PE, cafeteria, classroom and building wide efforts?</p> <p><i>Examples: Morning announcements, featuring "slow", "go" and "whoa" foods, having a CATCH team on the campus, participating in daily recess</i></p>	No building wide efforts	1 building wide effort	2 building wide efforts	3 building wide efforts	4 or more building wide efforts	
2	<p>Did the campus provide opportunities for students and parents to attend events that focused on wellness, emotional health, or overall wellbeing for students?</p> <p><i>Examples: Speakers such as SROs, counselors, or other speakers, PTO events, video presentations, clubs, campus initiatives</i></p>	No opportunities for students	1 opportunity for students	2 opportunities for students	3 opportunities for students	4 or more opportunities for students	
3	<p>Did the campus provide opportunities for active employee wellness?</p> <p><i>Examples: Fitness challenges, weight loss programs, notification of Employee Assistance Programs</i></p>	No opportunities for employees	1 opportunity for employees	2 opportunities for employees	3 opportunities for employees	4 or more opportunities for employees	
		<b>Overall Program Score</b>					
A: ≥ 3.5   B: ≥ 2.5 and < 3.5   C: ≥ 1.5 and < 2.5   D: ≥ 0.5 and < 1.5   F: < 0.5		<b>Overall Program Letter Grade (for use in 2017-18)</b>					
Exemplary = A   Recognized = B   Acceptable = C   Unacceptable = D or F		<b>Overall Program Rating (for use in 2016-17)</b>					

# Community & Student Engagement Performance Evaluation 2016-17

Campus  
District

## Community and Parental Involvement

Indicators		0	1	2	3	4	Score
1	Did the campus offer opportunities for parents and community volunteers to work in the school in roles or activities that support the needs of the district?	No opportunities	1 to 2 opportunities	3 opportunities	4 opportunities	5 or more opportunities	
2	Were community or parent representatives encouraged to serve as active participants in campus-level planning such as involvement on the Parent Advisory Committee?	No opportunities	1 to 2 opportunities	3 opportunities	4 opportunities	5 or more opportunities	
3	Did the campus use a variety of communication tools to inform parents of school news and information? <i>Examples: Facebook, twitter, eBlasts, email, Skyward email, program related emails, teacher communication, communicated schedules</i>	No communication tools	1 communication tool	2 communication tools	3 communication tools	4 or more communication tools	
4	Did the campus provide parents and community members with opportunities to be involved in classrooms or school events? <i>Examples: Back-to-School night, parent volunteer opportunities, parent meetings, parent read alouds, community volunteer programs</i>	No opportunities	1 to 2 opportunities	3 opportunities	4 opportunities	5 or more opportunities	
		<b>Overall Program Score</b>					
A: ≥ 3.5   B: ≥ 2.5 and < 3.5   C: ≥ 1.5 and < 2.5   D: ≥ 0.5 and < 1.5   F: < 0.5		<b>Overall Program Letter Grade (for use in 2017-18)</b>					
Exemplary = A   Recognized = B   Acceptable = C   Unacceptable = D or F		<b>Overall Program Rating (for use in 2016-17)</b>					

# Community & Student Engagement Performance Evaluation 2016-17

Campus  
District

## 21st Century Workforce Development

Indicators		0	1	2	3	4	Score
1	Did the campus host or participate in college/career activities or opportunities during the current academic year?	No activities or opportunities	1 activity or opportunity	2 activities or opportunities	3 activities or opportunities	4 activities or opportunities	
2	Were technology applications integrated and blended into teacher instruction?	No teachers were observed using technology applications	Up to 25% of teachers were observed using technology applications	26% to 50% of teachers were observed using technology applications	51% to 75% of teachers were observed using technology applications	> 75% of teachers were observed using technology applications	
3	Did the campus give students the opportunity to participate/have access to 21st century learning tools to enhance student engagement/learning? <i>Examples: I-Pads, Chrome Books, Laptops, Computer Lab</i>	Students do not have access to technology for learning	Up to 25% of students have access to technology for learning	26% to 50% of students have access to technology for learning	51% to 75% of students have access to technology for learning	> 75% of students have access to technology for learning	
4	Were students offered the opportunities to participate in Career and Technology Education courses, project-based learning opportunities, or other instructional activities reflecting the needs of 21st century learners? <i>Examples: Project-based learning, labs, Dual Credit, AP courses, MakerSpaces, Collaboration Spaces</i>	Students were not offered opportunities	Up to 25% of students participated in opportunities	26% to 50% of students participated in opportunities	51% to 75% of students participated in opportunities	> 75% of students participated in opportunities	
<b>Overall Program Score</b>							
A: ≥ 3.5   B: ≥ 2.5 and < 3.5   C: ≥ 1.5 and < 2.5   D: ≥ 0.5 and < 1.5   F: < 0.5							<b>Overall Program Letter Grade (for use in 2017-18)</b>
Exemplary = A   Recognized = B   Acceptable = C   Unacceptable = D or F							<b>Overall Program Rating (for use in 2016-17)</b>

# Community & Student Engagement Performance Evaluation 2016-17

Campus  
District

## Second Language Acquisition

Indicators		0	1	2	3	4	Score
1	Did English Language Learners (ELLs) on campus meet or exceed progress on STAAR?	0% met or exceeded progress	1% to 20% met or exceeded progress	21% to 40% met or exceeded progress	41% to 60% met or exceeded progress	> 60% met or exceeded progress	
2	Did campus staff participate in yearly LPAC training and Sheltered Instruction training?	0% trained in Sheltered Instruction	1% to 20% trained in Sheltered Instruction	21% to 40% trained in Sheltered Instruction	41% to 60% trained in Sheltered Instruction	> 60% trained in Sheltered Instruction	
3	Did ELL students on campus demonstrate progress in developing English language proficiency (as measured by their Composite TELPAS Rating)?	Less than 10% of students increased at least 1 level (or remained at Advanced High)	10% to 15% of students increased at least 1 level (or remained at Advanced High)	16% to 20% of students increased at least 1 level (or remained at Advanced High)	21% to 25% of students increased at least 1 level (or remained at Advanced High)	More than 25% of students increased at least 1 level (or remained at Advanced High)	
<b>Overall Program Score</b>							
A: ≥ 3.5   B: ≥ 2.5 and < 3.5   C: ≥ 1.5 and < 2.5   D: ≥ 0.5 and < 1.5   F: < 0.5							<b>Overall Program Letter Grade (for use in 2017-18)</b>
Exemplary = A   Recognized = B   Acceptable = C   Unacceptable = D or F							<b>Overall Program Rating (for use in 2016-17)</b>

# Community & Student Engagement Performance Evaluation 2016-17

Campus

District

## Digital Learning Environment

Indicators		0	1	2	3	4	Score
1	Did the campus provide digital learning professional development opportunities for teachers?	No teachers participated in at least 3 hours of instructional technology PD	1% to 20% of teachers participated in at least 3 hours of instructional technology PD	21% to 40% of teachers participated in at least 3 hours of instructional technology PD	41% to 60% of teachers participated in at least 3 hours of instructional technology PD	> 60% of teachers participated in at least 3 hours of instructional technology PD	
2	Do parents have access to online resources to monitor student learning and progress?	No parents report accessing online resources to monitor learning	0% to 20% of parents report accessing online resources to monitor learning	21% to 40% of parents report accessing online resources to monitor learning	41% to 60% of parents report accessing online resources to monitor learning	> 60% of parents report accessing online resources to monitor learning	
3	Do teachers regularly integrate use of technology and digital learning resources during classroom instruction?	No teachers were observed integrating technology and digital learning resources	1% to 20% of teachers were observed integrating technology and digital learning resources	21% to 40% of teachers were observed integrating technology and digital learning resources	41% to 60% of teachers were observed integrating technology and digital learning resources	> 60% of teachers were observed integrating technology and digital learning resources	
4	Do all students have access to technology for learning in the classroom?	No students have access to technology for learning in the classroom	1% to 20% of students have access to technology for learning in the classroom	21% to 40% of students have access to technology for learning in the classroom	41% to 60% of students have access to technology for learning in the classroom	> 60% of students have access to technology for learning in the classroom	
<b>Overall Program Score</b>							
A: ≥ 3.5   B: ≥ 2.5 and < 3.5   C: ≥ 1.5 and < 2.5   D: ≥ 0.5 and < 1.5   F: < 0.5							<b>Overall Program Letter Grade (for use in 2017-18)</b>
Exemplary = A   Recognized = B   Acceptable = C   Unacceptable = D or F							<b>Overall Program Rating (for use in 2016-17)</b>

# Community & Student Engagement Performance Evaluation 2016-17

Campus  
District

## Dropout Prevention Strategies

Indicators		0	1	2	3	4	Score
1	Does the campus offer clubs/organizations for students?	No clubs/organizations offered	1 to 2 clubs/organizations offered	3 to 4 clubs/organizations offered	5 to 6 clubs/organizations offered	7 or more clubs/organizations offered	
2	Does the campus offer multiple opportunities for students to participate in college/career readiness activities? <i>Example: career day, career explorations, college days</i>	No students participated in a CCR activity	1% to 20% of students participated in at least 1 CCR activity	21% to 40% of students participated in at least 1 CCR activity	41% to 60% of students participated in at least 1 CCR activity	> 60% of students participated in at least 1 CCR activity	
3	Does the campus actively review campus attendance data? <i>Data Sources: Skyward, eSPED, individual student documentation with pattern of absences</i>	No regular reviews	At the end of the semester	At the end of each grading period	Monthly	Weekly	
4	Does the campus attempt to schedule conferences with parents/students who are having attendance issues?	No regular attempts	At the end of the semester	At the end of each grading period	Monthly	Weekly	
		<b>Overall Program Score</b>					
A: ≥ 3.5   B: ≥ 2.5 and < 3.5   C: ≥ 1.5 and < 2.5   D: ≥ 0.5 and < 1.5   F: < 0.5		<b>Overall Program Letter Grade (for use in 2017-18)</b>					
Exemplary = A   Recognized = B   Acceptable = C   Unacceptable = D or F		<b>Overall Program Rating (for use in 2016-17)</b>					



# Community & Student Engagement Performance Evaluation 2016-17

**Campus**  
**District**

## Gifted and Talented

Indicators		0	1	2	3	4	Score
1	Do teachers on campus meet minimum state GT training requirements?	GT teachers did not meet minimum state GT training requirements	< 100% GT teachers met state requirements of 12 hours of training	100% of GT teachers met state requirements of 12 hours of training	100% of GT teachers met state requirements plus 6 or more additional hours of training	100% of GT teachers met state requirements plus 12 or more additional hours of training	
2	Do parents of GT students have opportunities to learn about the GT program during the school year?	The campus did not provide information about the GT program to parents	1 or 2 identified opportunities were provided to parents	3 or 4 identified opportunities were provided to parents	5 or 6 identified opportunities were provided to parents	7 or more identified opportunities were provided to parents	
3	Is the GT curriculum designed to meet the social, emotional, and learning needs of the gifted including opportunities such as project-based learning, collaborative team-work, learning perseverance, time management, organization, and goal setting?	No identified types of opportunities were provided to students	1 to 2 identified types of opportunities were provided to students	3 to 4 identified types of opportunities were provided to students	5 to 6 identified types of opportunities were provided to students	More than 7 identified types of opportunities were provided to students	
		<b>Overall Program Score</b>					
A: ≥ 3.5   B: ≥ 2.5 and < 3.5   C: ≥ 1.5 and < 2.5   D: ≥ 0.5 and < 1.5   F: < 0.5		<b>Overall Program Letter Grade (for use in 2017-18)</b>					
Exemplary = A   Recognized = B   Acceptable = C   Unacceptable = D or F		<b>Overall Program Rating (for use in 2016-17)</b>					