Anson County Schools

LEA or Charter Name/Number: Anson County Schools - 040
Department Name/Number:
School Address: 320 Camden Road, Wadesboro, NC 28170
Plan Year(s): 2014-2017
Date prepared: 10.2.2014, Revised - 11.6.2015, FINAL - 12.14.2015

Superintendent Signature: *Michael H. Freeman*   12/14/15
                                                             Date

Local Board Approval Signature: *Bobbie Little, Ed.D.*   12/14/15
                                                             Date

Anson County Schools Membership

From GS §115C-105.27: *"The principal of each school, representatives of the assistant principals, instructional personnel, instructional support personnel, and teacher assistants assigned to the school building, and parents of children enrolled in the school shall constitute a school improvement team to develop a school improvement plan to improve student performance. Representatives of the assistant principals, instructional personnel, instructional support personnel, and teacher assistants shall be elected by their respective groups by secret ballot....Parents serving on school improvement teams shall reflect the racial and socioeconomic composition of the students enrolled in that school and shall not be members of the building-level staff."*

Committee Position*	Name	Committee Position*	Name
Associate Superintendent	Howard McLean		
Administrator: Curriculum and Instruction	Jennifer McLaurin		
Administrator: Assessment and Accountability	Sheri High		
Administrator: Exceptional Children	Nancy Diggs		
Administrator: Student and Administrative Services	Mary Ratliff		
Administrator: Career and Technical Education	Steven Dutton		
Administrator: Secondary Education	Deborah Davis		

* Add to list as needed. Each group may have more than one representative.

Anson County Schools Vision and Mission Statements

Vision:

All means All.

Mission:

We will ensure that **all** students acquire skills and knowledge necessary to be successful and responsible citizens.

Anson County Schools Data and Summary Analysis

Use data identified on the Data Sources tab (or from other sources) as the basis for understanding the school and identifying priority areas for improvement.

Guiding Questions: Review school data and consider a variety of perspectives including overall school/student performance, sub-group performance, attendance, teacher satisfaction, instructional practice (from walk-throughs/observations), and student learning (also from walk-throughs/observations as well as data).

1. What does the analysis tell you about your district's strengths and data?

Anson County Schools has six elementary schools [Ansonville Elementary School (AES), Lilesville Elementary School (LES), Morven Elementary School (MES), Peachland-Polkton Elementary School (PPES), Wadesboro Elementary School (WES) and Wadesboro Primary School (WPS)]; one middle school [Anson Middle School (AMS)];and four high schools [Anson Academy (AA), Anson County Early College (ACEC), Anson High School (AHS), and Anson New Tech High School (ANTHS)]. The total student population for Anson County Schools is 3,441: African American - 57.6%, White - 34.4%, Hispanic - 4%, Multi-Racial - 2.6%, Asian - 1.6%, and Native American - <1%. The student population at each high school is as follows: AA - 91 students (African American - 84.6% and White - 9.9%); ACEC - 214 students (African American - 36.4% and White - 54.2%); AHS - 634 students (African American - 66.2%, White - 24.9%, and Hispanic - 3.1%); and ANTHS - 137 students (African American - 44.5%, White - 46.7%, Asian - 4%, and Hispanic - 4%). The student population at Anson Middle School is 562 students (African American - 53.2%, White - 35.6% and Hispanic - 5.9%). The student population at each elementary school is as follows: AES - 187 students (African American - 40%, White - 54% and Hispanic - 3%); LES - 309 students (African American - 54%, White - 38.5% and Multi-Racial - 3.9%); MES - 208 students (African American - 86.1%, Hispanic - 9.2% and White - 7.2%); PPES - 451 students (African American - 31.7%, White - 58.1% and Hispanic - 4.7%); WES - 122 students (African American - 82.8%, White - 10.7%, and Multi-Racial - 3.3%); and WPS - 522 students (African American - 72.6%, White - 20.5%). The Exceptional Children's program serves 560 students or 16.27% of our student population, which is above the state average of 12%. The Anson County Schools District is a participant in the universal breakfast and lunch program (CEP).

The following information are Teacher Turnover Percentages for each school for the last three years: Ansonville Elementary School (2012-2013 - 13.0%; 2013-2014- 23.3%; 2014-2015 - 5.6%); Lilesville Elementary School (2012-2013 - 5.0%; 2013-2014- 4.7%; 2014-2015 - 13.5%); Morven Elementary School (2012-2013 - 6.0%; 2013-2014- 29.8%; 2014-2015 - 0.0%); Peachland-Polkton Elementary School (2012-2013 - 9.0%; 2013-2014- 13.3%; 2014-2015 - 9.2%); Wadesboro Elementary School (2012-2013 - 27.0%; 2013-2014- 23.1%; 2014-2015 - 17.1%); Wadesboro Primary School (2012-2013 - 15.0%; 2013-2014- 20.0%; 2014-2015 - 10.6%); Anson Middle School (2012-2013 - 28.0%; 2013-2014- 28.3%; 2014-2015 - 29.1%); Anson Academy (2012-2013 - 0.0%; 2013-2014- 81.8%; 2014-2015 - 0.0%); Anson County Early College (2012-2013 - 22.0%; 2013-2014- 0.0%; 2014-2015 - 20.3%); Anson High School (2012-2013 - 27.0%; 2013-2014- 24.6%; 2014-2015 - 29.0%); Anson New Tech High School (2012-2013 - 7.0%; 2013-2014- 6.4%; 2014-2015 - 24.0%). The principals at Morven ES, Wadesboro ES, Wadesboro PS, Anson High School, Anson Academy, Anson New Tech High School, Lilesville ES and Ansonville ES have been the building leaders for the last three years. The Principal at Peachland-Polkton ES and Anson Middle School have been the building leaders for the last two years. The principal at Anson County Early College was a first year building leader. For 2015-2016, the principals at Anson High School, Anson New Tech High School and Anson Academy are new building leaders.

Highly Qualified Teachers Percent	2012-2013	99.62%	2013-2014	100%	2014-2015	97.51%		
Teacher Years of Experience	0-3 Years	47	4-10 Years	55	11+ Years	155		

The data shows that teachers in some cases (teacher turnover and highly qualified status) have had a negative impact on student achievement. In looking at specific areas where there have not be highly qualified teachers and areas where there is high teacher turnover the data shows lower student performance.

Student Attendance Data 2013-2014: ANTHS - 92.72%, LES - 95.35%, AES - 95.87%, AMS - 94.02%, WPS - 94.09%, PPES - 95.47%, AHS - 91.74%, ACEC - 96.02%, MES - 95.19%, WES - 94.24%, AA - 70.38%

Student Attendance Data 2014-2015: ANTHS - 93.10%, LES - 94.39%, AES - 95.31%, AMS - 93.94%, WPS - 88.05%, PPES - 94.52%, AHS - 92.13%, ACEC - 96.19%, MES - 94.52%, WES - 96.20%, AA - 66.33%

Student attendance rates over two years showed growth at ANTHS, AHS, ACEC, and WES. There was a slight decline in rates at LES, AES, AMS, and PPES. At WPS (6.04 points) and AA (4.05 points), rates declined significantly and may have contributed negatively on student achievement. Additionally, both are significantly lower than state averages.

Office Referrals	American Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic	2 or More	White		Total
2013-2014	24	1	2106	23	37	215		2335
2014-2015	18	1	1775	15	85	148		2042
OS Suspensions	American Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic	2 or More	White		Total
2013-2014	16		341			13		370
2014-2015	12		312		19	19		362

Office referrals and suspension data shows a disproportionate rate when comparing schools and ethnicity.

Student Suspension Data 2013-2014: MES - 87 (66 OSS and 21 Bus Suspension), AA - 364 (352 OSS and 12 Bus Suspension), ACEC - 1 (1 OSS), AES - 0, AHS 407 (401 OSS and 6 Bus Suspension), AMS - 356 (336 OSS and 20 Bus Suspension), ANTHS - 9 (9 OSS), LES - 46 (4 OSS and 42 Bus Suspension), PPES - 23 (23 OSS), WES - 159 (149 OSS and 10 Bus Suspension), WPS - 254 (249 OSS and 5 Bus Suspension), ACEC - No Data

Student Suspension Data 2014 - 2015: AA - 386 (361 OSS and 25 Bus Suspension), AHS 404 (383 OSS and 21 Bus Suspension), AMS - 273 (207 OSS and 66 Bus Suspension), ANTHS - 14 (14 OSS), AES - 17 (17 OSS), LES - 34 (34 OSS), MES - 52 (52 OSS), PPES - 33 (33 OSS), WES - 144 (135 OSS and 9 Bus Suspension), WPS - 230 (230 OSS)

Student Referrals Data 2013-2014: MES - 87, AA - 389, ACEC - 1, AES - 72, AHS 407, AMS - 407, ANTHS - 9, LES - 47, PPES - 23, WES - 406, WPS - 254

Student Referrals Data 2014-2015: AA - 406, AHS - 407, AMS - 341, ANTHS - 14, AES - 17, LES - 34, MES - 52, PPES - 33, WES - 407, WPS - 231, ACEC - No Data

District Performance Composite GLP	Female	Male	Black	Hispanic	White	EDS	LEP	SWD
2012-2013	26.4	22.4	14.3	17.6	40.7	19.3	5.6	<5
2013-2014	39.2	34.4	24.7	27.5	55.3	30.0	12.5	11.5
2014-2015	40.8	33.3	24.9	29.2	56.8	29.9	11.0	9.9

District Performance Composite GLP data when disaggregated by gender, ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, limited English proficient and students with disabilities shows achievement gaps growing between females and males, White students and Hispanic and Black students, and total student population and economically disadvantaged, limited English proficient and students with disabilities.

Anson County Schools aligned curriculum documents with the NCSCOS during the summers from 2011 to 2013. The core instructional program was implemented in December 2013. Growth analysis data from the 2012-2013 school year shows that 9 schools met or exceeded expected growth. District Reading 3D growth measures show that all schools' MOY overall reading proficiency increased from 2011-2012 to 2013-2014. The following data analysis shows DIEBELS growth from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013 by comparing MOY Benchmark Assessment data across years for students at or above benchmark as AES - 64%-75%, LES 57%-72%, MES 44%-59%, PPES 64%-69%, WPS 63%-69%. The following Text Reading Comprehension (TRC) data analysis shows TRC growth from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013 by comparing MOY Benchmark Assessment data across years for students at or above benchmark as AES 41%-52%, LES 32%-49%, MES 24%-33%, PPES 38%-38%, WPS 38%-45%. According to the 2012 - 2013 EVAAS data in reading for grades 3-8, five out of six schools met or exceeded growth. At the secondary level three out of four schools met or exceeded growth. Also, for 2012 - 2013 school year four out of four high schools met the goal for math course rigor.

Reading EOG/EOC 2013-2014: Grade 3 - 48.3 (+11.3), Grade 4 - 42.5 (+17.2), Grade 5 - 36.3 (+14.4), Grade 6 - 42.3 (+13.1), Grade 7 - 36.4 (+5.1), Grade 8 - 38.7 (+20.5), English II - 40.1 (+5.7). AES improved in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; LES improved in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; MES improved in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; PPES improved in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; WES improved in grades 5 and 6; WPS improved in grade 3; AMS improved in grades 7 and 8; AA improved in English II by 6.1 points; ACEC dropped in English II by 5 points; AHS improved in English II by 5.3 points; ANTHS improved in English II by 10.4 points. **Reading EOG/EOC 2014-2015:** Grade 3 - 49.2 (+0.9), Grade 5 - 38.8 (+2.5), Grade 6 - 42.5 (+0.2), Grade 7 - 38.5 (+2.1). AES improved in all grades; LES improved in grades 3 and 5; MES improved in grades 3, 4 , and 5; PPES improved in grades 5 and 6; WES improved by 20 points in grade 5 and slightly in grade 6; ACEC improved in English II by 8.9 points. **Mathematics EOG/EOC 2013-2014:** Grade 3 - 35.1 (+0.5), Grade 4 - 36.7 (+13.0), Grade 5 - 35.0 (+12.4), Grade 6 - 41.6 (+16.9), Grade 8 - 26.1 (+16.8), Math I - 26.0 (+15.9). AES improved grades 4, 5, and 6; LES improved in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; MES improved in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; PPES improved in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; WES improved in grades 5 and 6; WPS improved in grade 3; AMS improved in grade 8; ACEC improved by 40.4 points; AHS improved by 17.1 points; ANTHS improved by 10.4 points. **Mathematics EOG/EOC 2014-2015:** Grade 3 - 42.4 (+7.3), Grade 4 - 40.3 (+3.6), Grade 5 - 36.0 (+1.0), Grade 7 - 27.9 (+6.6), Grade 8 - 29.3 (+3.2), Math I 33.1 (+7.1). AES improved in grades 3 and 5; LES improved in grade 6; MES improved in grades 3 and 5; PPES improved in grades 3 and 4; WES improved in grade 6; WPS improved in grade 3; AMS improved in grades 7 and 8; AHS improved by 8.4 points; ANTHS improved by 1.2 points; ACEC improved by 37 points.

The following information is EVAAS growth data for each school for the last three years: Ansonville Elementary School (2012-2013 - Met Expected Growth; 2013-2014 - Exceeded Expected Growth; 2014-2015 - Exceeded Expected Growth); Lilesville Elementary School (2012-2013 - Met Expected Growth; 2013-2014 - Exceeded Expected Growth; 2014-2015 - Met Expected Growth); Morven Elementary School (2012-2013 - Exceeded Expected Growth; 2013-2014 - Exceeded Expected Growth; 2014-2015 - Met Expected Growth); Peachland-Polkton Elementary School (2012-2013 - Exceeded Expected Growth; 2013-2014 - Exceeded Expected Growth; 2014-2015 - Met Expected Growth); Wadesboro Elementary School (2012-2013 - Did Not Meet Expected Growth; 2013-2014 - Exceeded Expected Growth; 2014-2015 - Met Expected Growth); Wadesboro Primary School (2012-2013 - Not Applicable; 2013-2014 - Did Not Meet Expected Growth; 2014-2015 - Did Not Meet Expected Growth); Anson Middle School (2012-2013 - Met Expected Growth; 2013-2014 - Did Not Meet Expected Growth; 2014-2015 - Did Not Meet Expected Growth); Anson Academy (2012-2013 - Exceeded Expected Growth; 2013-2014 - Did Not Meet Expected Growth; 2014-2015 - Met Expected Growth); Anson County Early College (2012-2013 - Exceeded Expected Growth; 2013-2014 - Met Expected Growth; 2014-2015 - Met Expected Growth); Anson High School (2012-2013 - Met Expected Growth; 2013-2014 - Met Expected Growth; 2014-2015 - Did Not Meet Expected Growth); Anson New Tech High School (2012-2013 - Met Expected Growth; 2013-2014 - Did Not Meet Expected Growth; 2014-2015 - Did Not Meet Expected Growth).

2. What does the analysis tell you about your schools gaps or opportunities for improvement?

A review of Reading 3D data across years 2011-2012 to 2012-2013 reveals that many students are not showing adequate growth. This data suggests that not all groups of students are being targeted strategically. District Text Reading Comprehension (TRC) Data shows the following MOY district data for 2011-2012 to 2012-2013: 2011 - 2012 with 34% Far Below Proficiency and 30% Below Proficiency; 2012 - 2013 with 28% Far Below Proficiency and 29% Below Proficiency. District DIEBELS Data shows the following MOY district data for 2011-2012 to 2012-2013: 2011 - 2012 with 22% Far Below Proficiency and 17% Below Proficiency; 2012 - 2013 with 20% Far Below Proficiency and 12% Below Proficiency. The percentage of students within the district whose scores were at or above grade level on the 2012 - 2013 reading EOGs at grades 3-8 are as follows: 3rd grade - 37%, 4th grade - 25.3%, 5th grade- 21.9%, 6th grade - 29.2%, 7th grade - 31.3% and 8th - 18.2% and for English II EOC - 34.4%. The percentage of the students within the district whose scores were at or above grade level of the 2012 - 2013 math EOGs at grades 3-8 are as follows: 3rd grade - 34.6%, 4th grade- 23.7%, 5th grade - 22.6%, 6th grade - 24.7%, 7th grade - 22.5%, 8th - 9.3% and for Math I EOC - 10.1%.

The 2013-2014 EOG/EOC data showed that the district and schools made significant growth in most areas [Districtwide: Grade 3 - 48.3 (+11.3), Grade 4 - 42.5 (+17.2), Grade 5 - 36.3 (+14.4), Grade 6 - 42.3 (+13.1), Grade 7 - 36.4 (+5.1), Grade 8 - 38.7 (+20.5), English II - 40.1 (+5.7)]; [Schools: AES improved in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; LES improved in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; MES improved in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; PPES improved in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; WES improved in grades 5 and 6; WPS improved in grade 3; AMS improved in grades 7 and 8; AA improved in English II by 6.1 points; ACEC dropped in English II by 5 points; AHS improved in English II by 5.3 points; ANTHS improved in English II by 10.4 points.]; however, in many instances the starting point was so low that even exceeded expected growth left the district and school numbers far below the state average. In 2014-2015, the EOG/EOC data was even more inconsistent between "met expected growth" and "not met expected growth." Gains in reading from 2013-2014 did not continue, and in too many instances there was a negative, i.e., Districtwide: Grade 4 (-0.1) and 8 (-8.7); Schools: LES - Grade 4 (-9.9) and 6 (-9.3); MES - Grade 6 (-2.6); PPES - Grade 3 (-1.0) and Grade 4 (-1.0); WPS - Grade 3 (-6.6) and Grade 4 (-9.5); AMS - Grade 8 (-9.2); AA(-3.4); ANTHS (-7.5) and AHS (-14.4). Likewise the gains in math were inconsistent and loses included: Districtwide: Grade 6 (-3.0); Schools: AES - Grade 4 (-1.7) and Grade 6 (-2.4); LES - Grade 3 (-14.2), Grade 4 (-14.8), and Grade 5 (-5.0); MES - Grade 4 (-4.3) and Grade 6 (-29.2); PPES - Grade 5 (-2.5) and Grade 6 (-7.0); WES - Grade 5 (-9.1); WPS - Grade 4 (-5.9); AA unchanged at 0.0. Even where there is growth in reading and math, the numbers are still far below state average; the sub groups data is even lower which creates additional gaps. Based on 2012-2013 data, ACS implemented a reading program in Grades K-6; however, continued issues in Grade 7-12 also impact other content areas. ACS will develop and implement a reading and writing strategies program beginning in second semester (January 2016). Using the 2013 -2014 and 2014-2015 data, ACS purchased a math program for grades K-8 which will begin in August 2015, and for Grades 8-12 which will be implemented in January 2016.

3. What is data is missing, and how will you go about collecting this information for future use?
The Reading 3D data suggests that further analysis is needed by school, grade, and teacher levels. The Reading Wonders PD Plan includes ongoing teacher support and monitoring of program implementation. While a positive correlation can be drawn from the adoption of Reading Wonders and MOY growth across years, comprehensive data analysis is needed to draw conclusions or identify gaps and problems in the implementation process at certain low performing schools within the district. Additional Reading Wonders PD and scheduled monitoring visits are the first steps in identifying and targeting additional PD support needed for Reading Wonders. The district needs to collect K-2 math assessment data which will be available from the state. Data is also needed that could be provided via a core math curriculum and assessments. A universal screener and a diagnostic tool for reading and math are needed at the middle and high school levels.
ACS continues to need a universal screener for reading and math at the secondary level. With the implementation of a reading program at the elementary level and a math program at the elementary and middle school levels, ACS will have more data to use to inform instruction if used appropriately at both the district and school levels. At AHS, the math coach scheduled weekly formative assessments to inform instruction and the strategy needs to occur at AA and ANTHS. During the 2015-2016 school year, ANTHS will be on the AHS campus and the math coach will have better access for support. The discipline data is incomplete and therefore the targets for 2016 will be best guess estimates. The district has not been entering or tracking all referrals and corresponding discipline; therefore, 2015-2016 will be a baseline year.

4. Based upon the analysis conducted, what 3-5 top priorities emerge for the school?
Cite relevant evidence from your analysis to support these priorities.
Top three priorities are: **1.** Continued implementation of MTSS, Reading Foundations and Reading Wonders in Grades K-6 and the development and implementation of reading and writing strategies in grades 7-12; **2.** The implementation of MTSS, Math Foundations and a core math program in grades K-8 and the development and implementation of a core math program in grades 8-12; and **3.** The implementation of a behavior modification model in Grades K-12.

Priority Goal 1 and Associated Strategies

Area for improvement and supporting data:

Area for Improvement: English Language Arts Student Achievement District TRC Data shows the following MOY district data for 2011-2012 to 2012-2013 as 2011 - 2012: 34% Far Below Proficiency and 30% Below Proficiency; 2012 - 2013: 28% Far Below Proficiency and 29% Below Proficiency. District DIBELS Data shows the following MOY district data for 2011-2012 to 2012-2013 as 2011 - 2012: 22% Far Below Proficiency and 17% Below Proficiency; 2012 - 2013: 20% Far Below Proficiency and 12% Below Proficiency. The percentage of students within the district whose scores were at or above grade level on the 2012 - 2013 reading EOGs in grades 3-8 are as follows: 3rd grade - 37%, 4th grade - 25.3%, 5th grade - 21.9%, 6th grade - 29.2%, 7th grade - 31.3% and 8th - 18.2%, and English II EOC - 34.4%.

Reading EOG/EOC 2013-2014: Grade 3 - 48.3 (+11.3), Grade 4 - 42.5 (+17.2), Grade 5 - 36.3 (+14.4), Grade 6 - 42.3 (+13.1), Grade 7 - 36.4 (+5.1), Grade 8 - 38.7 (+20.5), English II - 40.1 (+5.7). AES improved in improved in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; LES improved in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; MES improved in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; PPES improved in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; WES improved in grades 5 and 6; WPS improved in grade 3; AMS improved in grades 7 and 8; AA improved in English II by 6.1 points; ACEC dropped in English II by 5 points; AHS improved in English II by 5.3 points; and ANTHS improved in English II by 10.4 points.

Reading EOG/EOC 2014-2015: Grade 3 - 49.2 (+0.9), Grade 4 - 42.4 (-0.1), Grade 5 - 38.8 (+2.5), Grade 6 - 42.5 (+0.2), Grade 7 - 38.5 (+2.1), Grade 8 - 30.0 (-8.7), English II - 32.9 (-7.2). AES improved in all grades; LES improved in grades 3 and 5 and had significant drops in grades 4 and 6; MES improved in grades 3, 4 , and 5 and had a 2.6 point drop in grade 6; PPES improved in grades 5 and 6 and dropped in grades 3 and 4; WES improved by 20 points in grade 5 and slightly in grade 6; WPS had significant drops in grade 3 (-6.6) and 4 (-9.5); AMS improved by 1.9 points in 7th grades and declined by 9.2 points in 8th grade; AA dropped in English II by 3.4 points; ACEC improved in English II by 8.9 points; AHS dropped in English II by 14.4 points; and ANTHS dropped in English II by 7.5 points.

Priority Goal 1:	Anson County Schools will provide support and resources to improve instruction to increase student achievement in ELA as measured by ELA EOG and English II EOC. (See target data at the bottom of the Goal 1 document.)
Supports this district goal:	All Anson County Schools' students will meet or exceed state and community academic learning standards.
Target:	See target data attached at the bottom of the Goal 1 document
Indicator:	English Language Arts End of Grade Assessment, English II End of Course Assessment
Milestone date:	30-Jun-16

MTSS (RtI and PBIS): ACS will provide support and resources to implement a core academic and behavioral model in all Anson County Schools for all students.

Action steps:

Plan/Do	**Strategy 1:**	1. Develop a plan to implement MTSS (Rtl and PBIS), including persons responsible and a timeline. January 15, 2016; ILC - Liaison Nancy Diggs, Jennifer McLaurin, Deborah Davis and Angie Beachum	4. Monitor/Measure the MTSS (Rtl and PBIS) Plan and Professional Development Plan through classroom observations/walkthroughs and PLC meetings (monthly at the school level and quarterly at the district level). June 30, 2016; District and School Leadership
		2. Plan and deliver professional development to increase teacher understanding and capacity to teach reading using MTSS (Rtl and PBIS). January 15, 2016; ILC - Liaison Jennifer McLaurin, Nancy Diggs, Deborah Davis, Angie Beachum	5. Correct/Adjust the MTSS (Rtl and PBIS) Plan and/or Professional Development Plan based on the data from monitoring and measuring. Ongoing from August 25, 2014; District and School Leadership
		3. Implement the MTSS (Rtl and PBIS) Plan with fidelity. June 30, 2016; District and School Leadership	6. Review and reflect on current core reading instruction to identify instructional gaps. June 30, 2016 and Ongoing; Instructional Leadership Council-Liaison Jennifer McLaurin, Deborah Davis, Nancy Diggs and Lawanda McLendon

Learning to Read - Reading Foundations: ACS will provide support and resources to increase K-6 teacher capacity to teach reading effectively through research-based professional development.

Action steps:

	Strategy 2:	1. Implement the Reading Foundations Plan with fidelity. June 30, 2016 and Ongoing; District and School Leadership	4. Review and reflect on current core reading instruction to identify instructional gaps. Ongoing and June 30, 2016; Instructional Leadership Council-Liaison Jennifer McLaurin, Nancy Diggs and Lawanda McLendon
		2. Monitor/Measure the Reading Foundations Plan and Professional Development Plan through classroom observations/walkthroughs and PLC meetings (monthly at the school level and quarterly at the district level). June 30, 2016 and Ongoing; District and School Leadership	5. Continue the plan to implement Reading Foundations, including persons responsible and a timeline. Ongoing and June 10, 2016; Jennifer McLaurin, Nancy Diggs and Lawanda McLendon and ILC
		3. Correct/Adjust the Reading Foundations Plan and/or Professional Development Plan based on the data from monitoring and measuring. Ongoing from August 25, 2015 to June 10, 2016; District and School Leadership	6. Continue to deliver professional development to increase teacher understanding and capacity to teach reading using Reading Foundations. Ongoing and June 10, 2016; Nancy Diggs, Jennifer McLaurin and Lawanda McLendon and ILC

Reading to Learn - ACS will provide support and resources to increase 7-12 teacher capacity to teach reading and writing strategies across the curriculum through researched-based professional development.

Strategy 3:	1. Review and reflect on current Reading and writing strategies to identify instructional gaps. December 1, 2015; Instructional Leadership Council-Liaison Deborah Davis, Heather Campbell, Jennifer Buccolo, Bonnie McMurray, Amy Stewart, Nicole Steagall	4. Implement reading and writing strategies across the curriculum with fidelity. Ongoing from January 31, 2016; District and School Leadership
	2. Develop a literacy plan for reading and writing strategies across the curriculum including persons responsible and a timeline. December 1, 2015; Instructional Leadership Council-Liaison Deborah Davis, Heather Campbell, Jennifer Buccolo, Bonnie McMurray, Amy Stewart, Nicole Steagall	5. Monitor/Measure the Reading and Writing across the Curriculum Plan and Professional Development Plan through classroom observations/walkthroughs and PLC meetings (monthly at the school level and quarterly at the district level). Ongoing from January 31, 2016; District and School Leadership
	3. Plan and develop professional development for reading and writing strategies across the curriculum to increase the teacher capacity to support student comprehension in the content areas. December 1, 2015; Instructional Leadership Council-Liaison Deborah Davis, Heather Campbell, Jennifer Buccolo, Bonnie McMurray, Amy Stewart, Nicole Steagall	6. Correct/Adjust the Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum Plan and/or Professional Development Plan based on the data from monitoring and measuring. Ongoing from January 31, 2016; Instructional Leadership Council-Liaison Deborah Davis, Heather Campbell, Jennifer Buccolo, Bonnie McMurray, Amy Stewart, Nicole Steagall
Strategy 4:	Reading Wonders: ACS will provide support and resources to implement with fidelity a core instructional program.	
	Action steps:	
	1. Plan and deliver professional development to increase teacher understanding and capacity to teach reading using a core instructional program (Reading Wonders). August 25, 2014 and Ongoing; Instructional Leadership Council-Liaison Jennifer McLaurin, Nancy Diggs and Lawanda McLendon	4. Correct/Adjust the Core Instructional Program (Reading Wonders)Plan and/or Professional Development Plan based on the data from monitoring and measuring. August 25, 2015 to June 10, 2016; District and School Leadership
	2. Implement the Core Instructional Program (Reading Wonders)Plan with fidelity. June 30, 2015 and Ongoing; District and School Leadership	5. Review and reflect on current core reading instruction to identify instructional gaps. Ongoing and June 30, 2016; Instructional Leadership Council-Liaison Jennifer McLaurin, Nancy Diggs and Lawanda McLendon

3. Monitor/Measure the Core Instructional Program (Reading Wonders) Plan and/or Professional Development Plan through classroom observations and PLC meetings (monthly at the building level and quarterly at the district level). June 30, 2015 and Ongoing; District and School Leadership

Professional Development - Identify the professional development required to successfully implement the strategies above.

Staff person or group	Course name/title	Course provider	Date completed
All K-5 Classroom Teachers	Three Tier RtI Model	Amy Jablonski	Fall 2013 and ongoing
All K-3 Classroom Teachers and All Elementary EC teachers	Reading Foundations	NCSIP - Elizabeth Gibbs, Judy Goins, Windy Dorsey, Lee Hill, Jennifer Ross and Dale Rivers	Fall 2013 and ongoing
All K-5 Classroom Teachers	Reading Wonders Workshops	Reading Wonders Representatives and Lawanda McLendon	Fall 2013, Spring 2014 and ongoing
ACS Designated Staff	Professional Development on creating district unit plans for grades K-5.	Jennifer McLaurin	Summer 2012 - 2013 and ongoing
ACS Designated Staff	Professional Development on creating district unit plans for grades 6-8.	Jennifer McLaurin	Summer 2012 - 2013 and ongoing
ACS Designated Staff	Professional Development on creating district unit plans for grades 9-12.	Jennifer McLaurin	Summer 2012 - 2013 and ongoing
K-8 Principals and Leadership	Professional Development on Co-Teaching and RtI Scheduling Process	Elizabeth Gibbs and Ric Powers	Spring 2014
ACS K-2 Teachers	Reading Wonders Refresher Workshops	Reading Wonders Representatives and Lawanda McLendon	5-Feb-15
ACS 3-6 Teachers	Reading Wonders Refresher Workshops	Reading Wonders Representatives and Lawanda McLendon	6-Feb-15
ACS Coaches and Principals	Reading Wonders Training	Reading Wonders Representative	16-Jul-15
ACS Beginning Teachers	Reading Wonders Training	Reading Wonders Representative	28-Jul-15
ACS Grade 3 Teachers	Reading 3D Training	Dr. Judy Goins	October 12-15, 2015
ACS Grade 3 Teachers	Coaching and Support	Jackie Frazier, Reading Wonders Representative	September, 2015 and January, 2016
ACD Grade 7-12 Teachers	5 Reading Strategies Across the Curriculum	Bonnie McMurray	January-February, 2016
ACD Grade 7-12 Teachers	5 Writing Strategies Across the Curriculum	Bonnie McMurray	January-February, 2016

How will we fund these strategies and associated professional development?

(Vertical label on left margin: Plan/Do)

Funding source State funds for exceptional children	**Funding amount:**	$4,175
Funding source Other	**Funding amount:**	$340,038
Funding source Other	**Funding amount:**	$27,203
Funding source Select a funding source	**Funding amount:**	$0
Funding source Select a funding source	**Funding amount:**	$0
	Total initiative funding:	**$371,416**

Review frequen Weekly Review

Assigned implementation te Instructional Leadership Council: H. McLean, J. McLaurin, D, Davis, S. High, N. Diggs, S. Dutton, and M. Ratliff.

Check	**What data will be used to determine whether the strategies were deployed with fidelity?**
	Reading 3D (BOY, MOY, EOY), ELA End of Grade (EOG) and English II End of Course (EOC)

Check	How will you determine whether the strategies led to progress toward the goal? (Include formative, benchmark, and summative data as appropriate.)
	Instructional Leadership Council and Building Leadership will review data gathered through classroom observations, PLC meetings, Reading 3D (BOY, MOY, EOY) and district and state assessments for each school . The monitoring will occur monthly at the building level and quarterly at the district level. Monitoring will begin on a regular basis beginning August 25, 2014.
	What does data show regarding the results of the implemented strategies?
	The data for the 2014-2015 school year shows mixed results with some reading and ELA data showing improvement (Grades 3, 5, and 6) and some showing a need for improvement (Grade 4). After analyzing the data, we believe the strategies that were developed (implementation of MTSS, Reading Foundations and Reading Wonders) in 2014 have the ability to move data in a positive direction in all grade levels (Grade 3-6) , but monitoring for fidelity of implementation and correcting and adjusting as needed is paramount for this success. We also, believe refresher professional development in Reading Foundations and Reading Wonders will strengthen teacher capacity. The data in Grades 8 and 9 showed a need for improvement.
Act	Based upon identified results, should/how should strategies be changed?
	After analyzing the data, we believe the strategies that were developed (implementation of MTSS, Reading Foundations and Reading Wonders) in 2014 have the ability to move data in a positive direction in all grade levels (Grade 3-6) , but monitoring for fidelity of implementation and correcting and adjusting as needed is paramount for this success. We also, believe refresher professional development in Reading Foundations and Reading Wonders would strengthen teacher capacity. There is a need for a reading and writing strategies initiative at the secondary level (7-12).

ELA/Reading Targets:

Reading EOG Proficiency: Grades 3-8:					
	Grade 3:	2015 - 37.6	2016-2017 AMO - 66.3	2016 Target: 52	2017 Target: 66.3
	Grade 4:	2015 - 32.0	2016-2017 AMO - 66.3	2016 Target: 49	2017 Target: 66.3
	Grade 5:	2015 - 29.0	2016-2017 AMO - 66.3	2016 Target: 48	2017 Target: 66.3
	Grade 6:	2015 - 29.1	2016-2017 AMO - 66.3	2016 Target: 48	2017 Target: 66.3
	Grade 7:	2015 - 28.7	2016-2017 AMO - 66.3	2016 Target: 48	2017 Target: 66.3

Grade 8:	2015 - 22.4	2016-2017 AMO - 66.3	2016 Target: 43	2017 Target: 66.3
English II EOC Proficiency:	2015 - 23.9	2016-2017 AMO - 71.5	2015 Target: 48	2016 Target: 71.5

Priority Goal 2 and Associated Strategies

Area for improvement and supporting data:

Area for Improvement: Mathematics Student Achievement The percentage of the students within the district whose mathematics scores were at or above grade level on the 2012 - 2013 math EOGs in grades 3-8 are as follows: 3rd grade - 34.6%, 4th grade - 23.7%, 5th grade - 22.6%, 6th grade - 24.7%, 7th grade - 22.5%, 8th - 9.3%, and Math I EOC - 10.1%.

Mathematics EOG/EOC 2013-2014: Grade 3 - 35.1 (+0.5), Grade 4 - 36.7 (+13.0), Grade 5 - 35.0 (+12.4), Grade 6 - 41.6 (+16.9), Grade 7 - 21.3 (-1.2), Grade 8 - 26.1 (+16.8), Math I - 26.0 (+15.9). AES improved grades 4, 5, and 6 and dropped grade 3; LES improved in grades 3, 4, 4, 5, and 6; MES improved in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; PPES improved in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6; WES improved in grades 5 and 6; WPS improved in grade 3; AMS improved in grade 8 and dropped in grade 7; AA is unchanged; ACEC improved by 40.4 points; AHS improved by 17.1 points; ANTHS improved by 10.4 points.

Mathematics EOG/EOC 2014-2015: Grade 3 - 42.4 (+7.3), Grade 4 - 40.3 (+3.6), Grade 5 - 36.0 (+1.0), Grade 6 - 38.6 (-3.0), Grade 7 - 27.9 (+6.6), Grade 8 - 29.3 (+3.2), Math I 33.1 (+7.1). AES improved in grades 3 and 5 and dropped in grades 4 and 6; LES improved in grade 6 and dropped in grades 3, 4, and 5; MES improved in grades 3 and 5 and dropped in grades 4 and 6; PPES improved in grades 3 and 4 and dropped in grades 5 and 6; WES improved in grade 6 and dropped in grade 5; WPS improved in grade 3 and dropped in grade 4; AMS improved by 6.5 points in 7th grade and improved by 2.4 points in 8th grade; AA is unchanged at 0.0; AHS improved by 8.4 points; ANTHS improved by 1.2 points and ACEC improved by 37 points.

Priority Goal 2:	Anson County Schools will provide support and resources to improve instruction to increase student achievement in Mathematics as measured by Math EOG and Math I EOC. (See target data at the bottom of the Goal 2 document.)
Supports this district goal:	All Anson County Schools' students will meet or exceed state and community academic learning standards.
Target:	See target data attached at the bottom of the Goal 2 document
Indicator:	Mathematics End of Grade Assessment, and Math I End of Course Assessment
Milestone date:	30-Jun-16

Goal 2 Improvement Strategies – Identify research-based strategies whenever possible.

MTSS (RtI and PBIS): ACS will provide and support resources to implement MTSS (RtI and PBIS) model for mathematics instruction in all Anson County Schools for all students.

Plan/Do	Strategy 1:	**Action steps:**	
		1. Review and reflect on current mathematics instructional practices to identify instructional gaps. December, 2015; ILC - Liaison Nancy Diggs, Jennifer McLaurin, Deborah Davis and Angie Beachum	5. Plan and deliver professional development to increase teacher understanding and capacity to teach mathematics using a MTSS (RtI and PBIS) model - August 28, 2015 and Ongoing; ILC - Liaison Jennifer McLaurin,, Deborah Davis, Nancy Diggs
		2. Create a Math Core Review Teams (Elementary and Secondary). October 31, 2016; ILC - Liaison Nancy Diggs, Jennifer McLaurin, Deborah Davis	6. Implement the Mathematics MTSS (RtI and PBIS) Plan with fidelity. June 30, 2016; District and School Leadership
		3. Develop a plan to establish roles and responsibilities for a mathematics coach for K-6 grades and implement the plan by identifying a fund source and identifying a strong content-based candidate for the position. August, 2016; ILC - Liaison Howard McLean and Jennifer McLaurin	7. Monitor/Measure the Mathematics MTSS (RtI and PBIS) Plan and Professional Development Plan through classroom observations/walkthroughs and PLC meetings (monthly at the building level and quarterly at the district level). June 30, 2016; District and School Leadership
		4. Develop a plan to implement a MTSS (RtI and PBIS) model for mathematics instruction, including persons responsible and a timeline - November 30, 2014 and Ongoing; ILC - Liaison Jennifer McLaurin, Deborah Davis, Nancy Diggs and Math Core Review Teams	8. Correct/Adjust the Mathematics MTSS (RtI and PBIS) Plan and/or Professional Development Plan based on the data from monitoring and measuring. Ongoing from August 28, 2015; District and School Leadership
	Strategy 2:	**Mathematics Foundations: ACS will provide support and resources to increase teacher capacity to teach mathematics effectively through research-based professional development.**	
		Action steps:	
		1. Develop and submit a grant to obtain funding through NCSIP to support Mathematics Foundations professional development and the purchase of materials. March 31, 2014; Nancy Diggs and ILC - **Grant Rejected**	5. Plan and deliver professional development to increase teacher understanding and capacity to teach mathematics using Mathematics Foundations. February, 2015 through June 30, 2016; Instructional Leadership Council and Chuck Coker
		2. Review and reflect on current mathematics instructional practices to identify instructional gaps. September 30, 2014 and Ongoing; ILC - Liaison Jennifer McLaurin, Deborah Davis, Nancy Diggs	6. Implement the Mathematics Foundations Plan with fidelity. June 30, 2016 and Ongoing; District and School Leadership

	3. Develop and submit a grant to obtain funding through RttT Mini Grant to support Mathematics Foundations professional development and the purchase of materials. February, 2015; Instructional Leadership Council and Chuck Coker (DTC)	7.Monitor/Measure the Mathematics Foundations Plan and/or Professional Development Plan through classroom observations and PLC meetings (monthly at the building level and quarterly at the district level). June 30, 2016 and Ongoing; District and School Leadership
	4. Develop a plan to implement Mathematics Foundations, including persons responsible and a timeline. February, 2015; Instructional Leadership Council and Chuck Coker	8. Correct/Adjust the Mathematics Foundations Plan and/or Professional Development Plan based on the data from monitoring and measuring. Ongoing from February, 2015; District and School Leadership

	Action steps:	
Strategy 3:	1. Review and reflect on current mathematics instructional practices to identify instructional gaps. October, 2015; Instructional Leadership Council, Jennifer McLaurin, Deborah Davis and Core Math Teams (K-6 and 7-12)	5. Implement the Core Instructional Program (Mathematics)Plan with fidelity. June 30, 2016; District and School Leadership
	2. Develop a plan to implement a mathematics core instructional program, including persons responsible and a timeline. December, 2015; ILC - Liaison Jennifer McLaurin, Deborah Davis and Core Math Teams	6. Monitor/Measure the Core Instructional Program (Mathematics) Plan and/or Professional Development Plan through classroom observations and PLC meetings (monthly at the building level and quarterly at the district level). June 30, 2016; District and School Leadership
	3. Develop a plan for the selection of a core instructional program for mathematics. June 30, 2016; ILC - Liaison Jennifer McLaurin, Deborah Davis and Core Math Teams	7. Correct/Adjust the Core Instructional Program (Mathematics)Plan and/or Professional Development Plan based on the data from monitoring and measuring. August 25, 2015 and Ongoing; District and School Leadership
	4. Plan and deliver professional development to increase teacher understanding and capacity to teach mathematics using a core instructional program (My Math - K-6, Math Course I-III - Grade 7-8 and Implementing the Common Core Standards - Grade 8-12). June 30, 2016; ILC - Liaison Jennifer McLaurin, Deborah Davis and Core Math Teams	

	Professional development - Identify the professional development required to successfully implement the strategies above.			
	Staff person or group	**Course name/title**	**Course provider**	**Date completed**
Plan/Do	ACS Administrators	Overview of Math Foundations	Matt Hoskins	23-Jan-15
	ACS Staff (K-3 and K-6 EC)	Math Foundations - Level I	Carol Hale	February 11-12, March 3-4, March 18-19, March 25-26, April 22 and April 23, 2015
	ACS Selected Staff	Math Foundations - Level II for Trainers	Carol Hale	June 8-13, 2015
	ACS Elementary Staff	My Math Training	McGraw-Hill Representative	June 15-18, 2015
	ACS Staff (Grades 4-6)	Math Foundations - Level I	Carol Hale	Winter 2015-2016
	ACS Secondary Math Staff	Implementing the Common Core Standards Training	Pearson	January - February, 2016
	ACS Secondary Math Staff	IXL (Interactive Individualized Student Learning Training	Kristin Park and Jennifer Buckingham	February, 2016
	ACS Secondary Math Staff	Kuta Training	Patricia Bennett	February, 2016

How will we fund these strategies and associated professional development?

Funding source 1:	Other	**Funding amount:**	$55,000
Funding source 2:	State funds - DSSF	**Funding amount:**	$22,208
Funding source 3:	Federal funds - Title I	**Funding amount:**	$21,000
Funding source 4:	Other	**Funding amount:**	$268,711
Funding source 5:	Federal funds - Title I	**Funding amount:**	$10,500
		Total initiative funding:	**$377,418**

Review frequency: Quarterly

Check	**Assigned implementation team:** Jennifer McLaurin, Nancy Diggs, Math Core Review Teams, and ILC
	What data will be used to determine whether the strategies were deployed with fidelity?
	Mathematics End of Grade Assessment, and Math I End of Course Assessment

	How will you determine whether the strategies led to progress toward the goal? (Include formative, benchmark, and summative data as appropriate.)
Check	Instructional Leadership Council and Building Leadership will review data gathered through classroom observations, PLC meetings, K-2 Mathematics Assessment and district and state assessments for each school. The monitoring will occur monthly at the building level and quarterly at the district level. Monitoring will begin on a regular basis beginning August 28, 2015.
	What does data show regarding the results of the implemented strategies?
	The data for the 2014-2015 school year showed mixed results in the Math data in K-8. Grades 3, 4,and 5 showed improvement and Grade 6 showed a decline. After analyzing the data, we believe plans and strategies need should be developed and implemented for MTSS, Math Foundations and a core math instructional program in 2015 - 2016 and that monitoring for fidelity of implementation, and correcting and adjusting as needed is paramount for this success. We also, believe professional development in Math Foundations and a core math instructional program will strengthen teacher capacity. Math I showed a good gain, but is still way below state average. A core instructional program also needs to be developed and implemented for Grades 8-12 for all courses especially Math I.
Act	**Based upon identified results, should/how should strategies be changed?**
	2014-2015: After analyzing the data, we believe plans and strategies must be developed and implemented for MTSS, Math Foundations and a core math instructional program in 2015 - 2016 and that monitoring for fidelity of implementation and correcting and adjusting as needed is paramount for this success. We also, believe professional development in Math Foundations and a core math instructional program would strengthen teacher capacity. A core instructional program needs to be developed and implemented for Grades 8-12.

Mathematics Targets:

Mathematics EOG Proficiency:					
Grades 3-8:					
	Grade 3:	2015 - 42.4	2016-2017 AMO - 65.5	2016 Target: 54	2017 Target: 65.5
	Grade 4:	2015 - 40.3	2016-2017 AMO - 65.5	2016 Target: 53	2017 Target: 65.5
	Grade 5:	2015 - 36	2016-2017 AMO - 65.5	2016 Target: 51	2017 Target: 65.5
	Grade 6:	2015 - 38.6	2016-2017 AMO - 65.5	2016 Target: 52	2017 Target: 65.5
	Grade 7:	2015 - 27.9	2016-2017 AMO - 65.5	2016 Target: 47	2017 Target: 65.5
	Grade 8:	2015 - 29.3	2016-2017 AMO - 65.5	2016 Target: 48	2017 Target: 65.5

Math I EOC Proficiency:	2015 - 27.1	2015-2016 AMO - 63.2	2016 Target: 45	2017 Target: 63.2

Priority Goal 3 and Associated Strategies

Area for improvement and supporting data:	
Area for improvement: Student Behavior Support	
Student Attendance Data 2013-2014: ANTHS - 92.72%, LES - 95.35%, AES - 95.87%, AMS - 94.02%, WPS - 94.09%, PPES - 95.47%, AHS - 91.74%, ACEC - 96.02%, MES - 95.19%, WES - 94.24%, AA - 70.38%	
Student Attendance Data 2014-2015: ANTHS - 93.10%, LES - 94.39%, AES - 95.31%, AMS - 93.94%, WPS - 88.05%, PPES - 94.52%, AHS - 92.13%, ACEC - 96.19%, MES - 94.52%, WES - 96.20%, AA - 66.33%	
Student Suspension Data 2013-2014: MES - 87 (66 OSS and 21 Bus Suspension), AA - 364 (352 OSS and 12 Bus Suspension), ACEC - 1 (1 OSS), AES - 0, AHS 407 (401 OSS and 6 Bus Suspension), AMS - 356 (336 OSS and 20 Bus Suspension), ANTHS - 9 (9 OSS), LES - 46 (4 OSS and 42 Bus Suspension), PPES - 23 (23 OSS), WES - 159 (149 OSS and 10 Bus Suspension), WPS - 254 (249 OSS and 5 Bus Suspension), ACEC - No Data	
Student Suspension Data 2014 - 2015: AA - 386 (361 OSS and 25 Bus Suspension), AHS 404 (383 OSS and 21 Bus Suspension), AMS - 273 (207 OSS and 66 Bus Suspension), ANTHS - 14 (14 OSS), AES - 17 (17 OSS), LES - 34 (34 OSS), MES - 52 (52 OSS), PPES - 33 (33 OSS), WES - 144 (135 OSS and 9 Bus Suspension), WPS - 230 (230 OSS)	
Student Referrals Data 2013-2014: MES - 87, AA - 389, ACEC - 1, AES - 72, AHS 407, AMS - 407, ANTHS - 9, LES - 47, PPES - 23, WES - 406, WPS - 254	
Student Referrals Data 2014-2015: AA - 406, AHS - 407, AMS - 341, ANTHS - 14, AES - 17, LES - 34, MES - 52, PPES - 33, WES - 407, WPS - 231, ACEC - No Data	

Priority Goal 3:	**Anson County Schools will provide support and resources to improve student behavior as measured by student attendance data, office referrals and suspensions. (See target data at the bottom of the Goal 3 document.)**
Supports this district goal:	**The Anson County Schools will be organized efficiently and effectively to ensure that all students meet or exceed state and community academic learning standards.**
Target:	See target data attached at bottom of the Goal 3 document
Indicator:	Student Attendance Data, Office Referrals, Suspension Data, School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET), Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI)
Milestone date:	30-Jun-16

Goal 3 Improvement Strategies – Identify research-based strategies whenever possible.

	PBIS: ACS will provide support and resources to implement a behavioral model in all Anson County Schools for all students.
	Action steps:

Plan/De		
Strategy 1:	1. Review and reflect on current student behavior data to identify a new behavioral support model. June 30, 2015; Instructional Leadership Council-Liaison Nancy Diggs and Angie Beachum	5. Implement the PBIS Plan with fidelity in MES, WPS and WES in phase I and AMS, AA, AHS, ANTHS in phase II. June 30, 2016 and Ongoing; District and School Leadership
	2. Develop a PBIS plan for student academic and behavior including a timeline and person/s responsible. August 2015; Instructional Leadership Council - Liaison Nancy Diggs and Angie Beachum	6. Implement the PBIS Plan with fidelity in AES, LES, PPES, and ACEC in phase III. August 2016 and Ongoing; District and School Leadership
	3. Plan and deliver professional development for PBIS to increase administrator and teacher understanding and capacity to implement the model. August 2015 and Ongoing; Instructional Leadership Council - Liaison Nancy Diggs, Angie Beachum and DPI Consultant	7. Monitor/Measure the PBIS Plan through classroom observations/walkthroughs and PLC meetings (monthly at the school level and quarterly at the district level). June 30, 2016 and Ongoing; District and School Leadership
	4. Plan and deliver professional development for PBIS to increase parent understanding of the model and partner with the district/school in implementation. December 2015 and Ongoing; Instructional Leadership Council - Liaison Nancy Diggs and Angie Beachum	8. Correct/Adjust the PBIS Plan based on the data from monitoring and measuring. August 25, 2015 and Ongoing; District and School Leadership

	Action steps:	
Strategy 2:	1.	5.
	2.	6.
	3.	7.
	4.	8.

	Action steps:	
Strategy 3:	1.	5.
	2.	6.
	3.	7.
	4.	8.

Plan/Do			
Strategy 1:	1. Review and reflect on current student behavior data to identify a new behavioral support model. June 30, 2015; Instructional Leadership Council-Liaison Nancy Diggs and Angie Beachum	5. Implement the PBIS Plan with fidelity in MES, WPS and WES in phase I and AMS, AA, AHS, ANTHS in phase II. June 30, 2016 and Ongoing; District and School Leadership	
	2. Develop a PBIS plan for student academic and behavior including a timeline and person/s responsible. August, 2015; Instructional Leadership Council - Liaison Nancy Diggs and Angie Beachum	6. Implement the PBIS Plan with fidelity in AES, LES, PPES, and ACEC in phase III. August, 2016 and Ongoing; District and School Leadership	
	3. Plan and deliver professional development for PBIS to increase administrator and teacher understanding and capacity to implement the model. August, 2015 and Ongoing; Instructional Leadership Council - Liaison Nancy Diggs, Angie Beachum and DPI Consultant	7. Monitor/Measure the PBIS Plan through classroom observations/walkthroughs and PLC meetings (monthly at the school level and quarterly at the district level). June 30, 2016 and Ongoing; District and School Leadership	
	4. Plan and deliver professional development for PBIS to increase parent understanding of the model and partner with the district/school in implementation. December, 2015 and Ongoing; Instructional Leadership Council - Liaison Nancy Diggs and Angie Beachum	8. Correct/Adjust the PBIS Plan based on the data from monitoring and measuring. August 25, 2015 and Ongoing; District and School Leadership	

Strategy 2:	**Action steps:**		
	1.	5.	
	2.	6.	
	3.	7.	
	4.	8.	

Strategy 3:	**Action steps:**		
	1.	5.	
	2.	6.	
	3.	7.	
	4.	8.	

Staff person or group	Course name/title	Course provider	Date completed
WES WPS MES Staff	PBIS Module 1 Training	Angie Beachum and DPI Consultant	January 12-13, 2015
ACS Various Staff - Secondary	PBIS Module 1 Training	Angie Beachum and DPI Consultant	August 5-6, 2015
MES, WES, WPS Staff	PBIS Module 1 Training	Angie Beachum and DPI Consultant	31-Aug-16
ACS Administrators	Overview of PBIS	DPI Consultant - Trish Scardina	19-Oct-15
PBIS Coach Team	Monthly	Angie Beachum and School Coaches	Various Dates in 2015-2016

How will we fund these strategies and associated professional development?

Funding source 1:	State funds for exceptional children	**Funding amount:**	$6,000
Funding source 2:	Select a funding source	**Funding amount:**	$0
Funding source 3:	Select a funding source	**Funding amount:**	$0
Funding source 4:	Select a funding source	**Funding amount:**	$0
Funding source 5:	Select a funding source	**Funding amount:**	$0
		Total initiative funding:	**$6,000**

Review frequency: Quarterly

Assigned implementation team:

What data will be used to determine whether the strategies were deployed with fidelity?

Student Attendance Data, Office Referrals, Suspension Data, School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET), Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI)

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF NORTH CAROLINA
State Board of Education | Department of Public Instruction

	How will you determine whether the strategies led to progress toward the goal? (Include formative, benchmark, and summative data as appropriate.)
Check	Improvement in Student Attendance Data, Office Referrals, Suspension Data, School-wide Evaluation Tool (SET), Tiered Fidelity Inventory (TFI)
	What does data show regarding the results of the implemented strategies?
Act	Based upon identified results, should/how should strategies be changed?

2016 Behavior Targets:

School		Student Attendance	Suspensions	Office Referrals
	AES	>95%	9	9
	LES	>95%	17	17
	MES	>95%	26	26

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF NORTH CAROLINA
State Board of Education | Department of Public Instruction

PPES	>95%	17	17
WES	>95%	72	204
WPS	>95%	115	116
AMS	>95 %	138	172
AA	>95%	193	203
ACEC	>95%	0	0
AHS	>95%	202	204
ANTHS	>95%	7	7