# Craig County Public Schools Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix for FFY2019 (Compliance)

Reference the Local Determinations Scoring Rubric for additional details.

#### Results-Driven Accountability (RDA) and Determination

Total Points Available	Total Points Earned	Total Performance
40	36	90%

# Craig County Public Schools Meets Requirements

### **Results and Compliance Overall Scoring**

Determination	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	17	85%
Compliance	20	19	95%

### **Part B Compliance Indicators**

Part B Compliance Indicators	Performance	Met State Target	Score (0-2)
<b>Indicator 4B</b> : Division identified with Significant Discrepancy by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and			
expulsion, and policies, procedures, or practices that	Yes/No	Yes	2
contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.			
Indicator 9: Division identified with Disproportionate Representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Yes/No	Yes	2
<b>Indicator 10</b> : Division identified with Disproportionate Representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Yes/No	Yes	2
<b>Indicator 11</b> : Division met Timeline for Initial Eligibility	100	Yes	2
<b>Indicator 12</b> : Division met Timeline for Part C to Part B eligibility by third birthday	≤ 10 Students	Yes	2
Indicator 13: Division met Postsecondary Goal Requirements	100	Yes	2

Part B Compliance Indicators	Performance	Met State Target	Score (0-2)
General Supervision: Division has no uncorrected noncompliance (i.e., state complaints, due process hearings, and on-site monitoring)	Yes/No	Yes	2
<b>Accurate Data Submission</b> : Division accurately submitted all indicator data	Yes/No	No	1
<b>Timely Data Submission</b> : Division submitted all indicator data in a timely manner	Yes/No	Yes	2
<b>Fiscal Audit</b> : Division had no outstanding audit findings in regard to the use of Part B funds	Yes/No	Yes	2

#### **Comments:**

Inaccurate: 2020 December 1 Child Count

Additional information and specific criteria related to LEA determinations are available through the Local Determinations Scoring Rubric.

### **Reading Components Elements**

Reading Components Elements	Performance	Met State Target	Score (0-4)
Indicator 3B: Percentage of Students with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessments (Target ≥95%) − FFY 2018	100	Yes	4
<b>Indicator 3C</b> : Performance of Students with Disabilities on Statewide Assessments (Target ≥46%) – FFY 2018	41.56	No	3

## **Mathematics Components Elements**

<b>Mathematics Components Elements</b>	Performance	Met State Target	Score (0-4)
Indicator 3B: Percentage of Students with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessments (Target ≥95%) − FFY 2018	100	Yes	4
<b>Indicator 3C</b> : Performance of Students with Disabilities on Statewide Assessments (Target ≥48%) – FFY 2018	40.48	No	2

### **Graduation Components Elements**

Graduation Components Elements	Performance	Met State Target	Score (0-4)
Indicator 1: Percentage of Students with Disabilities Graduating with a Standard or Advanced Studies Diploma (Target ≥61%)	≤ 10 Students	Yes	4