

St. Johns County School District

Allen D Nease Senior High School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Allen D Nease Senior High School

10550 RAY RD, Ponte Vedra, FL 32081

www-nhs.stjohns.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Kunze

Start Date for this Principal: 1/15/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	4%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (76%) 2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (73%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Johns County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Allen D Nease Senior High School

10550 RAY RD, Ponte Vedra, FL 32081

www-nhs.stjohns.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	4%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Johns County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Allen D. Nease High School is to inspire all students to be globally-minded and socially responsible life-long learners by providing a rigorous and differentiated curriculum in a safe and nurturing environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide every Allen D Nease High School student, the most relevant, high level education in a safe environment. To prepare students to successfully participate in post-secondary education programs including technology preparation and promote 21st century skills in the global workplace.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kunze, Lisa	Principal	
Wuellner, Nathaniel	Assistant Principal	Oversees guidance, social studies and science.
Johnson, Stacey	Assistant Principal	LEA, oversees Math
Rapp, Holly	Assistant Principal	Oversees English, The Arts, PE and the Deans
Combs, Jaime	Other	Oversees Career Academies
Kennedy, Missy	Other	Oversees guidance and IB program
Druggan, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	school ILC
Gebauer, Kelli	Other	Teaches and leads math department
Ishee, Meg	Other	teaches science and leads science department
Goodman, Cheryl	Other	Teaches English and leads English department
Russell-Michael, Amber	Instructional Coach	Coaches English and Social Studies
Mietzner, Kasey	Other	Teaches and leads ESE department
Burney, Becky	Other	Handles discipline for seniors and part of 10th grade

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 1/15/2017, Lisa Kunze

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

10

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

96

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,223

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

22

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

19

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	607	587	582	765	2541	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	44	53	78	212	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	84	56	60	299	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	52	64	66	237	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	20	29	82	165	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	59	53	59	225	

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	11	5	4	30	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/27/2022

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	850	843	754	644	3091
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	100	109	63	349
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	89	68	55	305
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	123	116	46	392
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	57	33	34	181
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	108	84	45	332

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	43	25	24	110
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	850	843	754	644	3091	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	100	109	63	349	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	89	68	55	305	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	123	116	46	392	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	57	33	34	181	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	108	84	45	332

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	43	25	24	110
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	84%	74%	51%				79%	74%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	72%						64%	60%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						51%	50%	42%
Math Achievement	80%	50%	38%				78%	73%	51%
Math Learning Gains	67%						61%	58%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						54%	55%	45%
Science Achievement	90%	70%	40%				90%	86%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	90%	59%	48%				91%	88%	73%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	89%	87%	2%	67%	22%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	91%	88%	3%	70%	21%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	67%	79%	-12%	61%	6%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	83%	81%	2%	57%	26%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	34	47	37	47	47	36	44	62		87	24
ELL	46	64								92	75
ASN	97	83		100	78		100	98		100	91
BLK	63	50	25	61	67		72	80		90	29
HSP	83	70	70	78	69	74	84	90		95	57
MUL	73	64	53	74	54		88	91		100	74
WHT	83	71	60	81	67	55	91	89		97	61
FRL	55	43	38	65	65	55	64	70		97	39
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	30	53	46	37	40	33	48	65		87	49
ELL	23	59	53	45	44	50	72	73		90	
ASN	95	84	62	82	57		98	95		100	88
BLK	52	59	68	56	48	50	69	72		100	38
HSP	73	68	58	67	47	50	89	81		94	66
MUL	78	80		61	52		75	90		96	70
WHT	77	69	57	75	49	41	88	91		97	63
FRL	43	51	49	51	48	52	74	76		91	57
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	30	43	40	44	37	36	61	74		95	30
ELL	53	63	63	56	56	58					
ASN	95	84		93	62		100	98		100	87
BLK	59	60	48	57	40	40	68	88		94	29
HSP	71	58	42	66	56	43	89	89		94	44
MUL	75	65		78	60		82	100		100	53
WHT	80	63	53	81	63	58	90	90		96	56
FRL	63	56	53	65	51	35	74	90		91	37

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	812
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	66
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	93
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	60
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	77
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	75
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	76
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Across subgroups we see lower learning gains in ELA and in math. We also continue to see lower scores in learning gains in the lowest 25% in ELA and in math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Learning gains for lowest 25% in ELA and Math are the lowest and have the greatest need for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Contributing factors to limited growth in the lowest 25% is student efficacy, attendance, and suspensions.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

We had good growth in ELA achievement, especially 9th grade, and Geometry Achievement.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The ELA Achievement is due to English teachers focusing on needed skills as they implemented the BEST standards along with blocking lowest 25% students in World History/Reading block. Geometry Achievement is due to teachers differentiating instruction based on data from standards-based grading.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Teachers focusing on standards and using progress monitoring data to differentiate instruction. Teachers also need to build student relationships to help increase student efficacy. Non-ELA teachers need to incorporate reading and writing into courses more.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We will continue our focus on unpacking standards and writing common summatives with question written 20-60-20 using Webbs Depth of Knowledge. We will focus more this year on creating better common formatives that provide useful data to differentiate instruction. We will also focus more on incorporating reading and writing strategies.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We have more than one ILC to work with PLC teams. Improving teacher instruction is the only way to ensure sustainability of improvement.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Student achievement in ELA and in math will be measured on the BEST standards. Since we need to improve learning gains in both areas, the teachers will focus on these new standards and their understanding of what students need to know and be able to do.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We want to see a 2% improvement in learning gains in all students, especially in our lowest 25% in ELA and in math.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will use state and district progress monitoring along with teacher formative and summative data to drive instruction. We will monitor through PLC data analysis and planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Druggan (jennifer.druggan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Working with teachers in PLCs to analyze data and share strategies for differentiation is a research-based strategy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Our rationale for working with teachers through their PLCs is to increase the teaching capacity of our teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Academic coaches will attend all PLC meetings for English 1, English 2, and Algebra. The coach attending the PLC will keep teachers focused on unpacking standards, writing common formatives and summatives aligned to those standards, analyzing all data from state and district progress monitoring and teacher created assessments, then using data to differentiate instruction to improve learning.

Person Responsible

Lisa Kunze (lisa.kunze@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

We have a few subgroups that are not achieving well in the college and career acceleration category.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We would like to increase college and career acceleration in each subgroup by 2%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Our school counselors and administrators working with guidance will encourage students to take courses that would earn college or career acceleration points.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nathaniel Wuellner (nathaniel.wuellner@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The strategy being utilized is working with each student individually to discuss college and career plans and encouraging them to take a course that would benefit them in their plan.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

We can't force students to be successful in particular courses. Having buy-in and students understanding how a course can benefit them is help them be more successful.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Tour FCTC dual enrollment program with ESE students to make them aware of available options.

Person Responsible

Stacey Johnson (stacey.johnson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Find and offer courses that have a certification exam that students will find useful.

Person Responsible

Jaime Combs (jaime.combs@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

School counselors meet individually with students to discuss future plans and what courses students need to take to receive college and career acceleration point.

Person Responsible

Nathaniel Wuellner (nathaniel.wuellner@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

We are always trying to improve our systems such as building the capacity of the school leadership team and improving systems for teacher efficacy.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

I would like to have 6 additional teachers trained in CET.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

I will target teachers to attend the training and will offer an incentive.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Kunze (lisa.kunze@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Using PLCs to identify teachers to target for teacher mentorship.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

We need more teacher mentors for teacher recruitment and retention - mentoring new hires and college interns.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Identify teachers that would make great teacher mentors.

Person Responsible

Lisa Kunze (lisa.kunze@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Invite them to attend the CET training offering them an incentive.

Person Responsible

Lisa Kunze (lisa.kunze@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Cell phones

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The number of student incidents involving cell phones on campus has continued to increase over the last few years.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The number of behavior incidents will decrease by 2% and student performance should increase by 2%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Number of incidents throughout the school year and progress monitoring data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Kunze (lisa.kunze@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

We are removing cell phones from the classroom environment so students can focus on learning and they are not distracted by their phone.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

We met with school leadership team and discussed issues with cell phones in the classroom. The leadership team decided that each classroom would have a phone pocket holder and students would be required to place their phone in the holder during classtime.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Posters were made with the new cell phone policy and hung in every classroom.

Person Responsible

Lisa Kunze (lisa.kunze@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

We held grade-level assemblies sharing behavior expectations and the new phone policy and consequences.

Person Responsible

Lisa Kunze (lisa.kunze@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Pocket holders were purchased and placed in every classroom.

Person Responsible

Lisa Kunze (lisa.kunze@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our SWD students are not achieving learning gains in reading and math like their peers.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

An increase in learning gains in both reading and math for SWD students by 2%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will use new BEST standards progress monitoring and district CAS for math to differentiate instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Kunze (lisa.kunze@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Using formative data and progress monitoring data to provide targeted instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Students will be taking the new FAST assessment for the BEST standards, so we need to use the data throughout the year to ensure we are headed in the correct direction with instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Work with the Algebra and Geometry teachers to use CAS data to target instruction.

Person Responsible

Stacey Johnson (stacey.johnson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Implement the new BEST math standards with fidelity.

Person Responsible

Stacey Johnson (stacey.johnson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Implement the new BEST ELA standards with fidelity.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Druggan (jennifer.druggan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Use the progress monitoring data from the State to target instruction.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Druggan (jennifer.druggan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Work with the Algebra and Geometry teachers to use CAS data to target instruction.

Person Responsible

Stacey Johnson (stacey.johnson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Implement the new BEST math standards with fidelity.

Person Responsible

Stacey Johnson (stacey.johnson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Implement the new BEST ELA standards with fidelity.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Druggan (jennifer.druggan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Use the progress monitoring data from the State to target instruction.

Person Responsible

Jennifer Druggan (jennifer.druggan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Work with the Algebra and Geometry teachers to use CAS data to target instruction.

Person Responsible Stacey Johnson (stacey.johnson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Implement the new BEST math standards with fidelity.

Person Responsible Stacey Johnson (stacey.johnson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Implement the new BEST ELA standards with fidelity.

Person Responsible Jennifer Druggan (jennifer.druggan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Use the progress monitoring data from the State to target instruction.

Person Responsible Jennifer Druggan (jennifer.druggan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Work with the Algebra and Geometry teachers to use CAS data to target instruction.

Person Responsible Stacey Johnson (stacey.johnson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Implement the new BEST math standards with fidelity.

Person Responsible Stacey Johnson (stacey.johnson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Implement the new BEST ELA standards with fidelity.

Person Responsible Jennifer Druggan (jennifer.druggan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Use the progress monitoring data from the State to target instruction.

Person Responsible Jennifer Druggan (jennifer.druggan@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Nease has trained teachers in Capturing Kids Hearts to help them build positive relationships with students. We have high expectations for our students academically and behaviorally. We encourage students to get involved through clubs, organizations and athletics to make their high school experience more fun and enjoyable. We have a link crew program which consists of 11th and 12th grade students who mentor the freshman. We have over 60 clubs for students be involved in and grow leadership skills.

This school year, we have implemented a school-wide cell phone policy as cell phones were the teacher's biggest complaint last year. As a leadership team last year, we decided to purchase pocket holders for all classrooms and require students to place their phone in the cell phone holder during class. We explained the new policy to parents and students and established consequences for failure to comply. We expect to see students more focused in class on learning, which will ultimately improve all aspects of school academic performance.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Administrative team is very supportive of our teachers and are always looking for ways to remove teacher concerns, so they can focus on instruction. The administrative team is also very supportive of students building our master schedule based on student courses they have selected and want to take. We also provide opportunities for students to be involved and have pride in their school.

The teachers work tirelessly to provide the best possible instruction to their students. They understand the importance of using data to drive instruction to meet the needs of all students.

Nease has an amazing support group from parents - PTSO, IB Boosters, Band Boosters, Athletic Boosters, etc. The parents are amazing at providing needs funds or items for instruction or activities along with the man power to run events. Our parents also value education and want their children to be successful, so they are supportive of school expectations.

Nease students are the best. They rise to the level of performance and behavior that is expected of them. They know that at Nease learning is top priority. Students start and manage clubs on campus that provide leadership and service opportunities for many students.