# Caroline County Public Schools Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix for FFY2017 (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	35	87.5%	

## **Caroline County Public Schools**

## **Meets Requirements**

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

Determination	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	18	90%
Compliance	20	17	85%

#### **Part B Compliance Indicators**

Part B Compliance Indicators	Performance	Met State Target	Score (0-2)
Indicator 4B: Division identified with Significant Discrepancy by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	Yes/No	Yes	2
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
Indicator 10: 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	95.29	No	1
<b>Indicator 12</b> : Division met Timeline for Part C to Part B eligibility by third birthday	≤ 10 Students	Yes	2
<b>Indicator 13</b> : Division met Postsecondary Goal Requirements	100	Yes	2

Part B Compliance Indicators	Performance	Met State Target	Score (0-2)
General Supervision: Division has uncorrected			
noncompliance (i.e., state complaints, due process hearings,	Yes/No	Yes	2
and on-site monitoring)			
Accurate Data Submission: Division accurately submitted	Yes/No	No	1
all indicator data	163/10	140	1
Timely Data Submission: Division submitted all indicator	Yes/No	No	1
data in a timely manner	res/No	110	1
Fiscal Audit: Division had no outstanding audit findings in	Yes/No	Yes	2
regard to the use of Part B funds	1 es/No	108	<u> </u>

#### **Comments:**

Late: 2016-2017 Excess Cost Calculation; Inaccurate: 2016-2017 IDEA Maintenance of Effort (MOE)

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%)	99.64	Yes	4
Indicator 3C: Performance of Students with Disabilities on Statewide Assessments (Target ≥41%)	37.41	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%)	97.95	Yes	4
Indicator 3C: Performance of Students with Disabilities on Statewide Assessments (Target ≥43%)	38.33	No	3

### **Graduation Components Elements**

<b>Graduation Components Elements</b>	Performance	Met State Target	Score (0-4)
Indicator 1: Percentage of Students with Disabilities Graduating with a Standard or Advanced Studies Diploma (Target ≥56.00%)	59.46	Yes	4