# Charles City County Public Schools Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix for FFY2016 (Compliance)

Reference the <u>Local Determinations Scoring Rubric</u> for additional details.

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

Total Points Available	Total Points Earned	Total Performance
40	30	75%

## **Charles City County Public Schools**

## **Needs Assistance**

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

Determination	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	12	60%
Compliance	20	18	90%

## **Part B Compliance Indicators**

Part B Compliance Indicators	Performance	Met State Target	Score (0-2)
Indicator 4B: Division Identified with Significant			
Discrepancy by race and 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.			
<b>Indicator 9</b> : Division Identified with Disproportionate			
Representation of racial and ethnic groups in special	Yes/No	Yes	2
education and related services that is the result of	1 65/110	168	2
inappropriate identification.			
<b>Indicator 10</b> : Division Identified with Disproportionate			
Representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific	Yes/No	Yes	2
disability categories that is the result of inappropriate	1 65/110	168	2
identification.			
<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	No students	No students	
eligibility by third birthday	referred from	referred	2
	Part C	from Part C	
<b>Indicator 13</b> : Division met Postsecondary Goal Requirements	0	No	0

Part B Compliance Indicators	Performance	Met State Target	Score (0-2)
General Supervision: Division has uncorrected noncompliance (i.e., state complaints, due process hearings, and on-site monitoring)	Yes/No	Yes	2
Accurate Data Submission: Division accurately submitted all indicator data	Yes/No	Yes	2
<b>Timely Data Submission</b> : Division submitted all indicator data in a timely manner	Yes/No	Yes	2
<b>Fiscal Audit</b> : Division had not outstanding audit findings in regard to the use of Part B funds	Yes/No	Yes	2

#### **Comments:**

N/A

Additional information and specific criteria related to LEA determinations is 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%)	100	Yes	4
Indicator 3C: Performance of Students with Disabilities on Statewide Assessments (Target ≥66%)	28	No	0

## **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%)	100	Yes	4
<u>Indicator 3C</u> : Performance of Students with Disabilities on Statewide Assessments (Target ≥65%)	34	No	0

## **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 ≥52%)	61.54	Yes	4