

Brevard County Public Schools School Improvement Plan 2012-2013

Name of School:

Area:

South Area

Johnson Middle School

Principal:

Area Superintendent:

Mark Mullins

Rob Fish

SAC Chairperson:

Sommer McDonald

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

Johnson Middle School strives to form a literate community of lifelong learners, staff, students and families who embody determination, perseverance, independence and a desire for excellence.

Vision Statement:

Johnson Middle School is committed to excellence in education and preparation of all students with the knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship, higher education and productive employment.

Brevard County Public Schools

School Improvement Plan

2012-2013

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

Data Analysis from multiple data sources: *(Needs assessment that supports the need for improvement)*

Johnson Middle School scored dismally low on the 2012 FCAT. In reading, the percent of 7th graders scoring a Level 3 or above dropped from 74% in 2011 to 62% in 2012. The 8th grade also had a noticeable drop from 61% in 2011 to 52% in 2012. This is a 25% drop from a high of 77% in 2010. For the entire student body, 58% scored a three or higher. This is down from 75% in 2011 and 76% in 2010. The percentage of the lowest 25% making annual learning gains in reading fell from 57% in 2011 to 52% in 2012. It had been 51% in 2010.

Johnson experienced significant drops in math as well. In 2012, 58% of the 7th graders were meeting high standards, a drop of 11% from the last two years. The 8th grade experienced a more dramatic drop of 19% in 2012, dropping from 74% in 2011 and 77% in 2010 to a low of 55% in 2012. Additionally, 59% of the student body scored a Level 3 or above. This is a decrease from a high of 81% in 2010 and 78% in 2011. The percentage of the lowest 25% making annual learning gains fell from 66% to 44%. Although there had been a drop of 5% from 71% in 2010 to 66% in 2011, this 22% drop was the most significant decrease in all of the school's test scores.

The science scores dropped from 61% making a three or above in 2011 to 50% in 2012. There had been a drop of 1% from 2010 to 2011.

In 2010, 83% of our students were meeting high standards in writing. The 2011 scores were slightly higher, 86%. Although the score for meeting high standards in writing has been raised by the DOE, this year's score of 67% is a 19% decrease from last year.

The 2012 Algebra EOC results show that 86% of the students scored a 3 or above. This is a decrease of 3% from 2011. There was an increase of 5% of the students scoring a Level 5 this year, from 9% to 14%.

During classroom walkthroughs, administration noticed the lack of some of the SIP strategies being implemented. In conversing with the teachers, administration learned that teachers were not aware of all of the strategies.

Analysis of Current Practice: *(How do we currently conduct business?)*

	Page 3	

Although some of the eighteen strategies from the 2011-12 SIP were implemented at LBJ, there were some strategies that were not fully implemented or attempted by all teachers. In reviewing our strategies or action steps, we can document that teachers were indeed implementing those strategies that dealt with lesson development and research-based teaching methodologies. Teachers were using the 4MAT model, attempting to address different learning styles, linguistic representation, Cornell Notes, interactive notebooks and word walls, to name a few. Although there is evidence to support this, it is not consistent and does not include **all** teachers implementing **all** strategies. Rather, teachers were allowed to “cherry pick” strategies to implement. We realize now that the reason for this outcome is that we had too many strategies for teachers to implement. Some of our strategies had other strategies imbedded within them, making it even more difficult to implement them.

Our PLTs made significant progress last year in understanding the function of the PLT after attending a building level inservice on PLTs and collaboration presented by Bill Hall. Although some PLTs developed common formative and summative evaluations, other PLTs did not evolve to that level.

Best Practice: *(What does research tell us we should be doing as it relates to data analysis above?)*

LBJ teachers will make a concerted effort to design formative assessments in the MESH classes. Research by Black and William in 1998 provided evidence that formative assessments have positive learning outcomes for all students. In 2004, research by Ruiz-Primo and Furtak found that there is a direct, positive correlation between students’ level of learning and the quality of teachers’ formative assessments. In addition, the PLCs will meet more frequently than last year. “Teachers working in (collegial) teams, engaging in an on-going cycle of questions (about instruction and curriculum) that promote deep team learning leads to higher levels of student achievement.” (DuFour 2004) LBJ will also provide more training this year in AVID strategies. “The mission of AVID is to ensure that all students will succeed in the most rigorous curriculum, will enter mainstream activities of the school, will increase their enrollment in four-year colleges, and will become educated and responsible participants and leaders in a democratic society” (AVID Summer Institute 2000). Lastly, with the implementation of the Common Core Standards, our students will develop college and career readiness skills. The Common Core Standards are (1) research and evidence based, (2) aligned with the college and work expectations, (3) rigorous, and (4) internationally benchmarked. (FL DOE Common Core Institute Summer 2012)

CONTENT AREA:

Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Parental Involvement	Drop-out Programs
Language Arts	Social Studies	Arts/PE	Other:		

School Based Objective: *(Action statement: What will we do to improve programmatic and/or instructional effectiveness?)*

In an effort to increase student learning and achievement, we will implement research-based instructional strategies via Professional Learning Teams (PLT) school wide.

Strategies: *(Small number of action oriented staff performance objectives)*

<i>Barrier</i>	<i>Action Steps</i>	<i>Person Responsible</i>	<i>Timetable</i>	<i>Budget</i>	<i>In-Process Measure</i>
1. Need time to meet as a team	1. Work in grade level, discipline specific PLTs to develop the essential learning for both first and second semesters.	Teachers, AP	First semester=mid September, second semester=late October	none	PLT meeting notes, essential learning for each academic and level
2. Need time to meet as a team	2. Collaborate in discipline specific PLTs to discuss and create common formative and summative assessments to drive instruction.	Teachers, AP	Each nine weeks	None	PLT meeting notes, assessments for each academic and level
3. Training for teachers	3. Begin the integration of the Common Core Standards across subject areas.	Department heads, AP	ongoing	none	Lesson plans, PLT meeting notes. Use of complex text in classes

4. Training for teachers, time	4. Incorporate research-based reading strategies across the curriculum.	Teachers, AP, reading coach	Ongoing – one strategy per month will be introduced	none	Lesson plans, classroom observations
5. Training for teachers, time	5. Utilize informational/non-fiction text at a complex level in all subject areas	Teachers, AP, reading coach, media specialist	Ongoing-at least one text per unit of study	None	Lesson plans, classroom observations. Use of informational texts in classes
6. training for teachers, time	6. Utilize Marzano, AVID or other research-based strategies, such as, Cornell Notes, WICOR, Socratic Seminar, Philosophical Chairs, and Interactive Notebooks to increase communication and critical thinking skills.	Teachers, AP, reading coach, AVID teacher and coordinator	Ongoing- at least one strategy per month will be presented at a faculty meeting for immediate use	none	Lesson plans, classroom observations
7. training for teachers, time	7. Address the learning goal by posing and posting an essential question(s) to promote learning and student awareness.	Teachers, AP	Immediately and daily	none	Classroom observations, lesson plans, posted essential question.

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

Qualitative and Quantitative Professional Practice Outcomes: *(Measures the level of implementation of the professional practices throughout the school)*

With the implementation of the SIP action steps, LBJ will be a school focused on student learning. With the common planning periods and other times to meet, Johnson’s PLTs will meet more frequently than last year, weekly in most cases. During the PLT meetings, team members will discuss the common curriculum and will develop and use common assessments. The use of common assessments will lead naturally to discussions about best practices. In the classrooms, we will have an emphasis on informational/non-fiction text at a complex level. The teachers will use research-based strategies to help students comprehend the more complex text. Using informational/non-fiction text at a complex level will be the initial school-wide implementation of the Common Core Standards.

Each classroom will have the essential question for the lesson posted in the classroom. In addition, teachers will utilize research-based strategies. AVID methodologies, such as Cornell Notes, WICOR, higher-order questioning, etc. will also be prevalent in most classes. Teachers will also use Marzano’s high yield strategies, such as interactive notebooks, summarizing, non-linguistic representation, etc. to further student achievement.

We will measure the depth of implementation of the PLT model by reviewing the first and second semester common curriculum the PLTs discussed and developed. While visiting classrooms, we will see if PLT members are indeed teaching the same concepts. By attending their meetings and/or reviewing their PLT minutes, we will be aware of common assessments. During our classroom visits, we will look for and comment on the presence or absence of an essential question. Further, we will see teachers using complex informational text. We will also observe this by reviewing their lesson plans.

Qualitative and Quantitative Student Achievement Expectations: *(Measures of student achievement)*

With the implementation of the SIP action steps, the students will develop higher order thinking skills and will increase reading comprehension through the use of non-fiction text. Johnson will measure the implementation of the SIP action steps by monitoring and comparing individual students’ FAIR scores throughout the year. Available scores from DA testing will also be reviewed by the faculty. The 2013 FCAT scores will be the most determining factor in

measuring the implementation of the SIP. The expected level of performance for the 2013 year will be a 5% increase in the percent of students showing proficiency in math, reading, writing and science. In addition, the subgroups will meet the targeted AMOs for the 2013 school year in order to reduce the achievement gap by 50% in six years.

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

1.	Reading Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance <small>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)</small>	2013 Expected Level of Performance <small>(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)</small>
	Anticipated Barrier(s): 1.		
	Strategy(s): 1.		
	FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	58% 464 students (based on 800)	63% 500 students (based on 793)
	Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	33% 4 students Based on 12	38% 3 students Based on 8
	FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	28.5% 228 students	33.5% 266 students

<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	<p>25%</p> <p>3 students Based on 12</p>	<p>30%</p> <p>2 students Based on 8</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	<p>18%</p> <p>2 students Based on 12</p>	<p>23%</p> <p>2 students Based on 8</p>
<p>FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p> <p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	<p>52%</p> <p>104 students</p>	<p>57%</p> <p>113 students</p>
<p>Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:</p> <p>Baseline data 2010-11:</p>		
<p>Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading :</p> <p>1.White:</p> <p>2.Black:</p> <p>3.Hispanic:</p> <p>4.Asian:</p> <p>5.American Indian:</p>	<p>Enter numerical data for current level of performance</p> <p>1. 64</p> <p>2. 32</p> <p>3. 46</p> <p>4. 64</p> <p>5. NA</p>	<p>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance</p> <p>1. 71</p> <p>2. 51</p> <p>3. 62</p> <p>4. 63</p> <p>5. NA</p>
<p>English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	<p>5%</p>	<p>38%</p>
<p>Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading</p> <p>Barrier(s):</p> <p>Strategy(s): 1.</p>	<p>24%</p>	<p>40%</p>

Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	51%	61%
--	-----	-----

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Complex informational text	10/19/12	Classroom walkthroughs, PLT notes, lesson plans
AVID reading strategies	10/19/12, ongoing at faculty meetings	Same as above

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/ Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 83%			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: 29%			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing: 57%			

1. Mathematics Goal(s):	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1.		
Strategy(s): 1.		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	59% 472 students	64% 507 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	50 % 6 students Based on 12	55% 4 students Based on 8
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	27% 217 students	32% 254 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	17% 2 students Based on 12	22% 2 students Based on 12
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	55% 6 students Based on 12	60% 5 students Based on 8
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	44% 88 students	49% 97 students

Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	67% 2 students	72% 2 students
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11:		
Student subgroups by ethnicity : 1.White: 2.Black: 3.Hispanic: 4.Asian: 5.American Indian:	1. 63 2. 32 3. 51 4. 91 5. NA	1. 75 2. 52 3. 59 4. 82 5. NA
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	40	35
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	21	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	47	61

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Introduction to Standards for Mathematical Practice (Common Core)	Preplanning, ongoing	PLT notes, lesson plans

Writing	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		
FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	67% 261 students	72% 297 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing	67% 6 students Based on 9	72% 3 students Based on 4

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)

<p>Barrier(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Test Item Spec document availability ● Pacing of content ● Lack of FCAT 2.0 tested terms ● Time to identify critical terms ● Time to develop lessons <hr/> <p>Strategy(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Science teachers will identify annually assessed NGSSS from the DOE’s FCAT 2.0 Test Item Specs. PLC’s will ensure these standards are among their power standards and topics covered and limitations in questioning studied. Standards listed as “assessed as” will be studied, taught and assessed specifically as written. 2. PLC’s will identify and teach specific vocabulary critical to the identified Power Standards. 3. Each PLC will develop lessons where students must graph and interpret data 		
<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science:</p>	<p>50% 195 students</p>	<p>55% 227 students</p>
<p>Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science</p>	<p>56% 5 students Based on 9</p>	<p>61% 2 students Based on 4</p>
<p>FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:</p>	<p>10% 37 students</p>	<p>15% 62 students</p>

Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science	25% 3 students Based on 9	30% 1 student Based on 4
---	---------------------------------	--------------------------------

1. Science Goal(s) (High School)	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science		

<p>Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">White:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Black:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Hispanic:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Asian:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">American Indian:</p>		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

APPENDIX B

(SECONDARY SCHOOLS **ONLY**)

Algebra 1 EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.	Based on 143	Based on 139
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Algebra:	55% 79 students	60% 83 students
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra:	31% 44 students	36% 50 students
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. <p style="text-align: right;">White:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Black:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Hispanic:</p>		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

Geometry EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): Strategy(s): 1.		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry:		
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. <p style="text-align: right;">White: Black: Hispanic:</p>		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		

Biology EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Biology:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology:		

Civics EOC	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Civics:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics:		

U.S. History EOC	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in U. S. History:		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U. S. History:		

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: Goal 1: Goal 2:			

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: Goal 1: Goal 2:			

Additional Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: Goal 1: Goal 2:			

APPENDIX C
(TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

Highly Effective Teachers

Describe the school based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, highly effective teachers to the school.

Descriptions of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1.		
2.		
3.		

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are not highly effective. *When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessionals that are	Provide the strategies that are being
--	---------------------------------------

teaching out-of-field/and who are not highly effective	implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective

For the following areas, please write a brief narrative that includes the data for the year 2011-12 and a description of changes you intend to incorporate to improve the data for the year 2012-13.

MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI (Identify the MTSS leadership team and its role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)

Johnson Middle School's Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS) team includes the Exceptional Student Education (ESE) guidance counselor, the ESE Staffing Specialist, School Psychologist, Behavior Analyst, Assistant Principal/Dean, general education guidance counselor, and general education teachers. In an effort to implement the school improvement plan, data was reviewed from the 2011-2012 school year. More specifically, the number of office referrals broken down by incident frequency was analyzed to determine the greatest area of concern. A total of 2,243 office referrals were written. Almost half, 48%, of the office referrals were in the areas of misconduct, disrespect, and general offenses. The MTSS team determined that this number could be significantly decreased if a school wide positive behavior support (PBS) plan were implemented. In May 2012, a majority of the MTSS team attended training for PBS presented by the University of South Florida (USF). Implementation of PBS will occur over three to five years. During the first year of implementation, school-wide expectations were developed for common areas such as the hall and cafeteria. Students caught exhibiting the expectations are instantly recognized with a "Longhorn Gram", and are entered into a drawing for student of the week, which allows the students additional privileges. Whole group recognition programs are in place as well. At the end of the 2012-2013 school year, the numbers will be examined again to determine whether any correlations exist between the office referral rates and the PBS plan in place.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT:

On the 2011-12 Parent Survey, LBJ had 165 parents respond. The top three most effective ways for communication were email (96%), Edline (74.2%) and personal phone calls (41.7%). For the question concerning the helpfulness and friendliness of the front office, the results were similar to last year's results: 21% found the helpfulness of the staff to be in the Fair/Poor range; 36% found the friendliness of the staff to be in the Fair/Poor range.

This year, LBJ will continue to find ways to communicate with parents. During registration, the emails of parents were collected and typed into AS400. This way, the email is readily available to teachers. The email address is also in Edline, and this is how the school now sends the school newsletter home.

ATTENDANCE: (Include current and expected attendance rates, excessive absences and tardies)

During the 2011-2012 school year, Johnson Middle school's average number of students per day was 831. The daily attendance rate was at 94%; therefore, approximately 788 students attended Johnson Middle School each day, on average. An attainable annual measurable goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the average daily attendance rate from 94% to 96%.

Specific objectives are necessary to meet this goal. First, the attendance clerk will run weekly attendance reports to ensure that attendance is being taken correctly and in a timely manner. Additionally, Synervoice is being used to call home when students are absent from any one period during the school day. Further, the parents of chronic absentee's will be called to determine whether there is an underlying antecedent as to the student's absenteeism. Our final school based intervention involves our school-wide Positive Behavior Support (PBS) plan. One of the expectations in our REPPS acronym is Prompt. Chronically absent students will be met with individually, and a reinforcement plan will be implemented in order to address the issue. If all of the aforementioned interventions fail, chronic absentees will be reported to the truant officer, as per Brevard Public School protocol.

SUSPENSION:

There were 329 incidents resulting in in-school suspension (ISS) and 297 incidents resulting in out of school suspension (OSS) (623 suspendable incidents) during the 2011-2012 school year. Johnson implemented school wide expectations and developed a set discipline ladder during pre-planning of that school year. Johnson was also beginning to utilize response to intervention or RtI as it relates to behavior and behavior intervention plans (BIPS) on a tier 2 and 3 level. For the 2012-2013 school year ISS had been eliminated so it is likely that the number of OSSs will increase. That said, Johnson has implemented some new programs which should reduce the number of suspendable offenses overall. Additionally Johnson has made some other changes that will reduce the number of suspendable offenses.

This school year Johnson implemented a positive behavior support plan (PBS). At pre-planning the faculty and staff adapted the school wide expectation into REPPS- Respect, Engaged, Prompt, Prepared, Safe, as well as expectations for the hallways and lunch time. We will teach these expectations and recognize students who adhere to them through several programs. We have a whole class compliance program which is known as the "popsicle drawing". A class is drawn at random and an administrator, guidance counselor, or PBS team member will go the classroom and check for whole class compliance for dress code, promptness, and/or preparedness with the school planner. If the whole class is in compliance they receive an ice pop. The second program is the REPPS Student of the Week. Faculty and staff recognize students who adhere to the REPPS with "longhorn grams". On Friday, one gram is drawn for each of the REPPS and those students are recognized as the student's of the week.

PBS has had a positive effect on Johnson thus far. The community has embraced the initiative and Johnson plans to increase the PBS activities on campus. While there have been behavior infractions and suspensions, overall, the behavior of the students and their compliance to dress code has improved since last year.

DROP-OUT (High Schools only):

POSTSECONDARY READINESS: (How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful? Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.)