

St. Johns County School District

Allen D Nease Senior High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	8
III. Planning for Improvement	12
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Allen D Nease Senior High School

10550 RAY RD, Ponte Vedra, FL 32081

www-nhs.stjohns.k12.fl.us

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kunze, Lisa	Principal	Oversees all aspects of SIP.
Abbs, Trevor	Assistant Principal	LEA and oversees Social Studies
Johnson, Stacey	Assistant Principal	Oversees guidance and math
Kennedy, Missy	Other	IB Coordinator & Registrar
Combs, Jaime	Other	Career Specialist
Druggan, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Assists all teachers and helps plan PL.
Gebauer, Kelli	Teacher, K-12	Teacher & Math Department Chair
Goodman, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12	Teacher & English Department Chair
Ishee, Meg	Teacher, K-12	Teacher & Science Department Chair
Koenig, Sabrina	Teacher, K-12	Teacher & World Language Department Chair

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Teachers provide feedback regarding student curriculum sequence and course offerings. We discuss as a group course additions and removals. Discussions occur on best strategies for offering courses to SWD and lowest 25%.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Throughout the year, we will review progress monitoring data to make revisions to the plan.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	30%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	4%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A

	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	79	71	50	84	74	51	78		
ELA Learning Gains				72			70		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			58		
Math Achievement*	69	61	38	80	50	38	72		
Math Learning Gains				67			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			44		
Science Achievement*	93	86	64	90	70	40	88		
Social Studies Achievement*	89	82	66	90	59	48	89		
Middle School Acceleration					47	44			
Graduation Rate	95	94	89	97	84	61	97		
College and Career Acceleration	60	64	65	61	86	67	64		
ELP Progress	30	51	45	53			57		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	515
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	95

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	812
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	97

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	52			
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	95			
BLK	64			
HSP	78			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	81			
FRL	72			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	47			
ELL	66			
AMI				
ASN	93			
BLK	60			
HSP	77			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	59			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	79			69			93	89		95	60	30
SWD	38			28			64	64		21	6	
ELL										21	3	30
AMI												
ASN	96			89			98	98		93	6	
BLK	54			38			90	74		36	6	
HSP	81			69			90	85		49	6	
MUL	89			45			95	76		35	6	
PAC												
WHT	77			71			92	90		61	6	
FRL	65			56			100	79		38	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	84	72	59	80	67	59	90	90		97	61	53
SWD	34	47	37	47	47	36	44	62		87	24	
ELL	46	64								92	75	53
AMI												
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	
PAC												
WHT	83	71	60	81	67	55	91	89		97	61	
FRL	55	43	38	65	65	55	64	70		97	39	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	78	70	58	72	49	44	88	89		97	64	57
SWD	30	53	46	37	40	33	48	65		87	49	
ELL	23	59	53	45	44	50	72	73		90		57
AMI												
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	45
MUL	78	80		61	52		75	90		96	70	
PAC												
WHT	77	69	57	75	49	41	88	91		97	63	
FRL	43	51	49	51	48	52	74	76		91	57	

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	80%	73%	7%	50%	30%
09	2023 - Spring	80%	70%	10%	48%	32%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	78%	-9%	50%	19%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	67%	8%	48%	27%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	86%	6%	63%	29%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	82%	6%	63%	25%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Math achievement showed the lowest performance. We had an inexperienced algebra teacher last year that we coached the entire year.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Algebra scores showed the greatest decline. The only factor that was different was our teaching staff. We had an inexperienced teacher that we coached the entire year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

We are above the state average in all data.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Reading achievement showed the most improvement. Our 9th grade teachers focused on skills and students practiced cold reads.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

ELA and Math achievement for our SWD were both low at 59%.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Reading improvement in lowest 25% and SWD.
Math improvement in lowest 25% and SWD.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The number of student incidents involving social media drama and cyberbullying has continued to increase.

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 Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We have a classroom phone policy, we have an active 9th grade Link Crew and we are revitalizing Sources of Strength.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students are constantly distracted by their phones. While in class they need to focus on learning instead of playing on social media and making inappropriate posts. We are hoping that Link Crew leaders can help the 9th graders throughout the year stay focused and help with reminding them to make positive choices. Sources of Strength will have a monthly focus that will also remind students about appropriate behavior and good choices.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Continue implementation of our phone policy - posters were made and policy reviewed in expectation assemblies.

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

By When: August 2023

Link Crew Orientation and planning of monthly activities for freshman.

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

By When: Orientation occurred in August 2023 - monthly meetings and activities throughout the year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We will continue to focus on PLCs using data to make informed instructional decisions. We will also continue our focus of PLCs incorporating reading strategies and vocabulary into their units of instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is a 2% increase in ELA scores.

Monitoring:

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

Assistant Principals and coaches will be attending PLCs meetings to keep them focused.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We will offer professional learning on reading and vocabulary strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We need students to practice reading strategies outside of English class. The more students are reading and writing the better prepared they will be. We need to increase vocab instruction in all courses.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Reteach reading and vocab strategies to teachers

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

By When: End of September.

Attend PLC meetings to ensure reading & vocab strategies are being incorporated.

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

By When: All year

#3. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We will continue to focus on reading and math learning gains in our students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We want to increase learning gains for this subgroup by 2% in each category.

Monitoring:

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

We will use state progress monitoring data to monitor our progress throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will use the data to differentiate instruction. We have continued to double block our lowest students in Algebra 1 and all of our ELA Level 1 students are taking IR.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The blocked algebra and IR courses allow extra time working on skills.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus