

St. Johns County School District

# Palencia Elementary School



## 2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |          |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>3</b> |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>4</b> |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>6</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>9</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b> |

## Palencia Elementary School

355 PALENCIA VILLAGE DR, St. Augustine, FL 32095

<http://www-pes.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2017-18 Title I School | 2017-18 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|---|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | No                     | 11%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white<br>on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 19%   |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A       | A       | A       | A*      |

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 9/25/2018.

### 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.

"We are a CREW setting SAIL into Tomorrow's world."

Included in this are the Key words CREW and SAIL, which stand for:

C- Creative S- Successful  
R- Responsible A- Adventurous  
E- Engaged I - Innovative  
W - Worthy L- Leaders

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Our School Vision is very simple: 100%

100% to us means that we strive to be a school where ALL (100%) of our students are achieving the required level of proficiency.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name                | Title               |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Goodrich, Catherine | Principal           |
| Ledford, Jennifer   | Teacher, K-12       |
| Whaley, Rebecca     | Teacher, K-12       |
| Kerekes, Cheryl     | Teacher, K-12       |
| Crecco, Nicole      | Teacher, K-12       |
| Hackney, Sharon     | Teacher, K-12       |
| Worthington, Hali   | Teacher, K-12       |
| Mehanna, Maya       | Assistant Principal |
| Echevarria, Tatiana | Teacher, K-12       |
| Glennon, Erin       | Teacher, K-12       |
| Johnston, Gwen      | Instructional Coach |
| Brown, Rebecca      | Teacher, K-12       |
| Kirby, Kim          | Teacher, ESE        |
| Dowdie, Kate        | Teacher, K-12       |
| Craig, Alison       | Teacher, K-12       |

#### Duties

**Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.**

**Principal:** At Palencia Elementary, the principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing Rtl, conducts assessment of Rtl skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support Rtl implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based Rtl plans and activities, as well as participating on the Rtl team. The principal ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards.

**Assistant Principal:** The assistant principal at Palencia Elementary also provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing Rtl, conducts assessment of Rtl skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support Rtl implementation, communicates with parents regarding school-based Rtl plans and activities, and also participates on the Rtl team.

**Instructional Coach:** Palencia Elementary's Instructional Literacy Coach develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. The coach identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children.

**Teacher:** The teachers serve a valuable role in the Leadership of the school. They provide valuable information as to the current condition of the school and the needs of the students. They often provide suggestions as to resolving instructional issues. The teachers are the most important aspect of the school.

**Early Warning Systems**

**Year 2017-18**

**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 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 4           | 8 | 11 | 9 | 9 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 55    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0  | 1 | 0 | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0 | 1 | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0 | 4 | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |

**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     | 3           | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0           | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |

**Date this data was collected**

Monday 7/23/2018

**Year 2016-17 - As Reported**

**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 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 1           | 10 | 6 | 3 | 8  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 35    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 1  | 3 | 0 | 2  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 3 | 5  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 10 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |

**Year 2016-17 - Updated**

**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 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 1           | 10 | 6 | 3 | 8  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 35    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 1  | 3 | 0 | 2  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 3 | 5  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 10 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |

**The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                                  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

### Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

#### Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

The data component performed the lowest is in 5th grade Science. In 2017 there was 73% proficiency and it declined to 56% proficiency in 2018. This is not a trend because in 2016 the school had 59% proficiency and then increased to 73% proficiency in 2017.

#### Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The data component had the greatest decline is in 5th grade Science. In 2017 there was 73% proficiency and declined to 56% proficiency in 2018.

#### Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The data for 5th grade Science exceeded the state average of 55% proficiency by 1%, which was the smallest difference from the state proficiency rate.

#### Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The data component that showed the most improvement is the fourth grade Math cohort from 2017-2018 increasing in 11% proficiency. An increase in proficiency percentages with cohorts of students is a trend for fourth grade Math over the past three years.

#### Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Utilizing the district curriculum maps and regularly attending the SJCS D Math Cohort Meetings has led to this trend. Teacher professional development and collaboration has encouraged more conceptual understanding of the content which led to an increase in student proficiency.

### School Data

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      | 2018   |          |       | 2017   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 77%    | 72%      | 56%   | 67%    | 68%      | 52%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 66%    | 59%      | 55%   | 60%    | 59%      | 52%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 56%    | 50%      | 48%   | 61%    | 53%      | 46%   |
| Math Achievement            | 78%    | 77%      | 62%   | 67%    | 70%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 71%    | 67%      | 59%   | 65%    | 63%      | 58%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 62%    | 58%      | 47%   | 53%    | 60%      | 46%   |
| Science Achievement         | 55%    | 68%      | 55%   | 59%    | 66%      | 51%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator                   | Grade Level (prior year reported) |        |        |       |       |        | Total   |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|-------|-------|--------|---------|
|                             | K                                 | 1      | 2      | 3     | 4     | 5      |         |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 (1)                             | 8 (10) | 11 (6) | 9 (3) | 9 (8) | 14 (7) | 55 (35) |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |       |       |       |        |        | Total   |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|---------|
|                                 | K                                 | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4      | 5      |         |
| One or more suspensions         | 0 (0)                             | 0 (1) | 0 (3) | 1 (0) | 0 (2)  | 1 (1)  | 2 (7)   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (3) | 1 (5)  | 2 (3)  | 3 (11)  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (1) | 4 (10) | 8 (23) | 12 (34) |

#### Grade Level Data

**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 |
| 03                    | 2018 | 85%    | 78%      | 7%                         | 57%   | 28%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 79%    | 80%      | -1%                        | 58%   | 21%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2018 | 75%    | 74%      | 1%                         | 56%   | 19%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 65%    | 74%      | -9%                        | 56%   | 9%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 10%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -4%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2018 | 70%    | 73%      | -3%                        | 55%   | 15%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 77%    | 75%      | 2%                         | 53%   | 24%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2018 | 78%    | 80%      | -2%                        | 62%   | 16%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 73%    | 80%      | -7%                        | 62%   | 11%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2018 | 84%    | 83%      | 1%                         | 62%   | 22%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 78%    | 82%      | -4%                        | 64%   | 14%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 11%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2018 | 75%    | 79%      | -4%                        | 61%   | 14%                     |
|                       | 2017 | 86%    | 80%      | 6%                         | 57%   | 29%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -11%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -3%    |          |                            |       |                         |



| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2018 | 56%    | 73%      | -17%                       | 55%   | 1%                      |
|                   | 2017 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Subgroup Data

| 2018 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 52       | 51     | 48          | 54        | 64      | 49           | 28       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 91       | 81     |             | 87        | 82      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 64       | 62     | 60          | 76        | 74      | 75           | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 78       | 65     | 52          | 79        | 70      | 61           | 58       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 61       | 48     | 54          | 63        | 73      | 61           | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2017 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 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD                                       | 51       | 53     | 35          | 55        | 63      | 50           | 22       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 86       | 83     |             | 86        | 92      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 68       | 80     |             | 73        | 85      |              | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 73       |        |             | 73        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 74       | 60     | 50          | 81        | 74      | 61           | 76       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 62       | 60     | 48          | 63        | 64      | 52           | 52       |         |           |                   |                     |

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

### Areas of Focus:

| Activity #1                   |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Title</b>                  | ELA   |
| <b>Rationale</b>              | Based upon 2018 data, our lowest quartile is not making adequate growth in ELA as compared to other districts around the state.   |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b>       | Each grade level will collaboratively establish expectations and curricula for high quality ELA instruction.<br>This is for all students to meet growth expectations with additional focus on those students in the lowest quartile. The learning gains of the lowest 25% in ELA will increase 2% from 2017-2018 scores to 58%.       |
| <b>Point Person</b>           | Gwen Johnston (gwen.johnston@stjohns.k12.fl.us)   |
| Action Step                   |   |
| <b>Description</b>            | Time for teams to collaborate and to vertically plan (identify individual student gaps in learning and address through specific instruction) using the PLC process.   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Catherine Goodrich (catherine.goodrich@stjohns.k12.fl.us)   |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness |   |
| <b>Description</b>            | The leadership team will review PLC minutes in relation to the i-Ready data with a focus on the lowest 25%. The data in reference to the lowest 25% will be reviewed at team leader meetings to discuss progress.   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Catherine Goodrich (catherine.goodrich@stjohns.k12.fl.us)   |
| Activity #2                   |   |
| <b>Title</b>                  | MATH  |
| <b>Rationale</b>              | Based upon 2018 data, our lowest quartile is not making adequate growth in Math as compared to other districts around the state.  |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b>       | Each grade level will collaboratively establish expectations and curricula for high quality Math instruction.<br>This is for all students to meet growth expectations with additional focus on those students in the lowest quartile. The learning gains of the lowest 25% in math will increase 2% from the 2017-2018 scores to 64%. |
| <b>Point Person</b>           | Gwen Johnston (gwen.johnston@stjohns.k12.fl.us)   |
| Action Step                   |   |
| <b>Description</b>            | Time for teams to collaborate and to vertically plan (identify individual student gaps in learning and address through specific instruction) using the PLC process.   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Catherine Goodrich (catherine.goodrich@stjohns.k12.fl.us)   |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness |   |
| <b>Description</b>            | The leadership team will review PLC minutes in relation to the i-Ready data with a focus on the lowest 25%. The data in reference to the lowest 25% will be reviewed at team leader meetings to discuss progress.   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Catherine Goodrich (catherine.goodrich@stjohns.k12.fl.us)   |

| Activity #3                   |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Title</b>                  | SCIENCE   |
| <b>Rationale</b>              | Based upon 2018 data, 5th grade Science proficiency decreased significantly from 73% to 56% proficiency.  |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b>       | Each grade level will collaboratively establish expectations and curricula for high quality Science instruction.<br>This will lead to a stronger understanding of the Science standards throughout all grade levels in order to raise our proficiency on the 5th grade Science FCAT. Science proficiency will increase to 60%.      |
| <b>Point Person</b>           | Catherine Goodrich (catherine.goodrich@stjohns.k12.fl.us)   |
| Action Step                   |   |
| <b>Description</b>            | Time for teams to collaborate and to vertically plan (identify individual student gaps in learning and address through specific instruction) using the PLC process.   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Catherine Goodrich (catherine.goodrich@stjohns.k12.fl.us)   |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness |   |
| <b>Description</b>            | The leadership team will review vertical planning minutes within PLC process.   |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Catherine Goodrich (catherine.goodrich@stjohns.k12.fl.us)   |
| Activity #4                   |   |
| <b>Title</b>                  | CHARACTER COUNTS  |
| <b>Rationale</b>              | Based on the St. Johns County core values, we will continue to integrate Character Counts! throughout daily academic and social activities.   |
| <b>Intended Outcome</b>       | Palencia Elementary School will inspire good character and a passion for lifelong learning in all students, creating educated and caring contributors to the school and the community. Office referrals will decrease by 5% from the 2017-2018 school year and participation in Character Counts celebrations will increase by 10%. |
| <b>Point Person</b>           | Catherine Goodrich (catherine.goodrich@stjohns.k12.fl.us)   |
| Action Step                   |   |
| <b>Description</b>            | Time for teams to collaborate, vertically plan, and create activities to teach the Character Counts! values in daily academic and social activities.  |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Catherine Goodrich (catherine.goodrich@stjohns.k12.fl.us)   |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness |   |
| <b>Description</b>            | The leadership team will monitor participation in the Character Counts program monthly.<br>The leadership team will review minutes from the vertical planning meeting through the PLC process.  |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>     | Catherine Goodrich (catherine.goodrich@stjohns.k12.fl.us)   |