

Community & Student Engagement Performance Evaluation 2016-17

Campus	Louise Elementary School
District	Louise ISD

Summary of Ratings by Program

	2016-17 Score	2016-17 Rating	Letter Grade that WOULD BE ASSIGNED IF this were 2017-18
Fine Arts	3.4	Recognized	A
Wellness and Physical Education	3.0	Recognized	B
Community and Parental Involvement	3.0	Recognized	A
21st Century Workforce Development	2.0	Acceptable	B
Second Language Acquisition	2.9	Recognized	A
Digital Learning Environment	3.2	Recognized	A
Dropout Prevention Strategies	3.0	Recognized	B
Gifted and Talented	2.3	Acceptable	B

Fine Arts							
Indicators		0	1	2	3	4	Score
1	Participation in UIL events or activities <i>UIL Academic Competition 2nd - 6th grade</i>	0	1-25%	25-50%	50-74%	> 74%	3
2	Opportunities to participate in various competitions	0	1-2 opportunities	3 opportunities	4 opportunities	5 or more opportunities	4
3	Opportunities to exhibit various fine art talents	0	1-2 opportunities	3 opportunities	4 opportunities	5 or more opportunities	3
4	Opportunities to participate in field trips to enhance culture/fine arts	0	1-2 opportunities	3 opportunities	4 opportunities	5 or more opportunities	3
	Course Offerings Percent of students taking a fine arts course	0	1-25%	25-50%	50-74%	> 74%	4
		Overall Program Score					3.4
A: ≥ 3.5 B: ≥ 2.5 and < 3.5 C: ≥ 1.5 and < 2.5 D: ≥ 0.5 and < 1.5 F: < 0.5		Overall Program Letter Grade (for use in 2017-18)					B
Exemplary = A Recognized = B Acceptable = C Unacceptable = D or F		Overall Program Rating (for use in 2016-17)					Recognized

Wellness and Physical Education							
Indicators		0	1	2	3	4	Score
1	Participation in the Coordinated Approach to School Health program through PE, cafeteria, classroom and building wide efforts?	No building wide efforts	1 building wide effort	2 building wide efforts	3 building wide efforts	4 or more building wide efforts	3
2	Did the campus provide opportunities for students and parents to attend events that focused on wellness, emotional health, or overall wellbeing for students?	No opportunities for students	1 opportunity for students	2 opportunities for students	3 opportunities for students	4 or more opportunities for students	3
3	Did the campus provide opportunities for active employee wellness?	No opportunities for employees	1 opportunity for employees	2 opportunities for employees	3 opportunities for employees	4 or more opportunities for employees	3
	Did the campus engage in the fitnessgram.	below 50%	70%	80%	90%	100%	3
	Did the campus provide district wide awareness of student participation in clubs and organization participation in extracurricular activities?	below 50%	70%	80%	90%	100%	3
		Overall Program Score					3.0
A: ≥ 3.5 B: ≥ 2.5 and < 3.5 C: ≥ 1.5 and < 2.5 D: ≥ 0.5 and < 1.5 F: < 0.5		Overall Program Letter Grade (for use in 2017-18)					B
Exemplary = A Recognized = B Acceptable = C Unacceptable = D or F		Overall Program Rating (for use in 2016-17)					Recognized

Community and Parental Involvement							
Indicators		0	1	2	3	4	Score
1	Did the district campus offer oportunes for extracurricular events that include and encourage community involvement?	No opportunities	1 Opportunity	2 opportunities	3 opportunities	4 or more opportunities	3
2	Were community members/parents encouraged to attend end of year programs (highlighting students' successes)	No opportunities	1 Opportunity	2 opportunities	3 opportunities	4 or more opportunities	3
3	Communication with parents via Facebook, Twitter, parent portals, social media apps, newsletters, emails/calls websites conferences etc	No opportunities	1 Opportunity	2 opportunities	3 opportunities	4 or more opportunities	3
4	Were students given opportunities to particpate in community service projects	No opportunities	1 Opportunity	2 opportunities	3 opportunities	4 or more opportunities	3
5	Participation in County Shows/Fairs						3
		Overall Program Score					3.0
A: ≥ 3.5 B: ≥ 2.5 and < 3.5 C: ≥ 1.5 and < 2.5 D: ≥ 0.5 and < 1.5 F: < 0.5		Overall Program Letter Grade (for use in 2017-18)					B
Exemplary = A Recognized = B Acceptable = C Unacceptable = D or F		Overall Program Rating (for use in 2016-17)					Recognized

21st Century Workforce Development							
Indicators		0	1	2	3	4	Score
1	Financial Literacy opportunities	0	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	75%-100	2
2	College Connections	0	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	75%-100	2
3	Career Explorations	0	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	75%-100	2
4	Programs that promote Character Education	0	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	75%-100	2
		Overall Program Score					2.0
A: ≥ 3.5 B: ≥ 2.5 and < 3.5 C: ≥ 1.5 and < 2.5 D: ≥ 0.5 and < 1.5 F: < 0.5		Overall Program Letter Grade (for use in 2017-18)					C
Exemplary = A Recognized = B Acceptable = C Unacceptable = D or F		Overall Program Rating (for use in 2016-17)					Acceptable

Second Language Acquisition							
Indicators		0	1	2	3	4	Score
1	Did campus LPAC committee participate in yearly LPAC training	0%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100% trained	4

2	Did campus staff participate in sheltered instruction?	0%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100% trained	4
3	Open house opportunities are offered for ELL parents	0	1 offered	2 offered	3 offered	4 offered	3
	Home language surveys are distributed and completed	0%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100% trained	4
		0	1 offered	2 offered	3 offered	4 offered	
		Overall Program Score					2.9
A: ≥ 3.5 B: ≥ 2.5 and < 3.5 C: ≥ 1.5 and < 2.5 D: ≥ 0.5 and < 1.5 F: < 0.5		Overall Program Letter Grade (for use in 2017-18)					B
Exemplary = A Recognized = B Acceptable = C Unacceptable = D or F		Overall Program Rating (for use in 2016-17)					Recognized

Digital Learning Environment							
Indicators		0	1	2	3	4	Score
1	Do the staff have access to professional development opportunities for Digital Learning	No teachers participated in at least 3 hours of instructional technology	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	3
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
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	3
4	Do all students have access to technology for learning in the classroom? <i>Flip Classroom, 21st century classroom, mobile labs, ipads, computer labs,</i>	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	4
	Students regularly use 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	3
		Overall Program Score					3.2
A: ≥ 3.5 B: ≥ 2.5 and < 3.5 C: ≥ 1.5 and < 2.5 D: ≥ 0.5 and < 1.5 F: < 0.5		Overall Program Letter Grade (for use in 2017-18)					B
Exemplary = A Recognized = B Acceptable = C Unacceptable = D or F		Overall Program Rating (for use in 2016-17)					Recognized

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	3
2	Does the campus offer multiple opportunities for students to participate in college/career readiness activities?	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
3	Campus, student incentives are provided to acknowledge attainment of various education goals	No incentives offered	1 offered per year	1-2 offered per semester	1-2 each 6 weeks	1-2 Weekly	3
4	Does the campus attempt to schedule conferences with parents/students who are having attendance or grade issues?	No regular attempts	At the end of the semester	At the end of each grading period	Monthly	Weekly	3
5	Mentor programs provided for at risk students	0	Occasionally	Each Semester	Monthly	Weekly	2
6	Percent of students participating in extra curricular classes	0	10%	11-25%	26-40%	41-50%	4
		Overall Program Score					3.0
A: ≥ 3.5 B: ≥ 2.5 and < 3.5 C: ≥ 1.5 and < 2.5 D: ≥ 0.5 and < 1.5 F: < 0.5		Overall Program Letter Grade (for use in 2017-18)					B
Exemplary = A Recognized = B Acceptable = C Unacceptable = D or F		Overall Program Rating (for use in 2016-17)					Recognized

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	3
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	2
3	Do GT students have opprtunities for student leadership roles, field study and or competitions?	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	2
4	Texas Performance Standards Project - Do all studenst Participate in TPSP	None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	>75%	2
		Overall Program Score					2.3
A: ≥ 3.5 B: ≥ 2.5 and < 3.5 C: ≥ 1.5 and < 2.5 D: ≥ 0.5 and < 1.5 F: < 0.5		Overall Program Letter Grade (for use in 2017-18)					C
Exemplary = A Recognized = B Acceptable = C Unacceptable = D or F		Overall Program Rating (for use in 2016-17)					Acceptable