

Volusia County Schools

Read Pattillo Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Read Pattillo Elementary School

400 6TH ST, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/readpattillo/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Lewis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2009

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (53%) 2014-15: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Volusia 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Read Pattillo Elementary School

400 6TH ST, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/readpattillo/pages/default.aspx>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	77%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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 Read-Pattillo family and community are committed to creating an environment where every student will dream, reach, achieve, soar.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through the individual commitment of all, our students will graduate with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to be successful contributors to our democratic society.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lewis, Kelly	Principal	The principal is responsible for the school's academic success which includes monitoring and tracking the academic and social-emotional performance of students and responding expediently when students demonstrate areas of concern. This leader also evaluates and monitors the effectiveness of instructional activities taking place within classrooms and provides follow-up actions as needed. The principal establishes an orderly, safe and secure school environment.
McCormack, Corey	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal with monitoring the school's academic success which includes tracking the academic success and social-emotional performance of students and responding expediently when students demonstrate areas of concern. This leader also evaluates and monitors the effectiveness of instructional activities taking place within classrooms and provides follow-up actions as needed. The assistant principal establishes an orderly, safe and secure school environment.
Smith, Cindy	Instructional Coach	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring school wide data and participants in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.
Anderson, Samantha	Instructional Media	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring school wide data and participants in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.
Schrader, Jen	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring school wide data and participants in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.
Dinardi, Amy	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring school wide data and participants in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.
Bolt, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	SEL/TOA: She provides support for the social-emotional competencies of all students through small group lessons and SEL program efforts.
Stoddard, Donna	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring school wide data and participants in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by 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	63	67	62	73	73	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	416
Attendance below 90 percent	12	7	8	12	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	16	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	2	0	0	3	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	12	6	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

24

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/5/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

Prior Year - 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	17	12	11	8	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	4	12	13	10	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	18	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	3	3	3	7	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	54%	56%	57%	66%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	56%	58%	60%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	46%	53%	56%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	57%	59%	63%	65%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	69%	56%	62%	47%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	43%	51%	37%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	57%	53%	78%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	63 (0)	67 (0)	62 (0)	73 (0)	73 (0)	78 (0)	416 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	12 ()	7 ()	8 ()	12 ()	9 ()	12 ()	60 (0)
One or more suspensions	2 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	9 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	16 (0)	19 (0)	38 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: 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
03	2019	64%	58%	6%	58%	6%
	2018	64%	56%	8%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	54%	-5%	58%	-9%
	2018	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
05	2019	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	60%	-11%	62%	-13%
	2018	56%	58%	-2%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	59%	8%	64%	3%
	2018	59%	60%	-1%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%
	2018	64%	57%	7%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	52%	56%	-4%	53%	-1%
	2018	63%	56%	7%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	18	36	47	25	61	53					

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
BLK	29	38		38	59	43	38				
HSP	23			46							
MUL	64			57							
WHT	63	56	64	63	74	69	60				
FRL	46	53	58	50	68	52	34				
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	10	26	27	15	17	6	21				
BLK	25	25		30	21	27					
HSP	70			80							
MUL	59	25		60	50						
WHT	62	49	35	67	55	42	68				
FRL	46	38	35	50	41	33	48				
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	30	41	35	23	31	18	57				
BLK	58	54		54	33						
HSP	75	64		67	36						
MUL	67	82		67	64						
WHT	65	57	48	66	47	43	77				
FRL	58	57	52	56	46	35	72				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	390
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	35
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

After reviewing the data, our Science achievement scores showed the lowest performance. Contributing factors to the low performance in science achievement are a lack of direct instruction and lack of unified response to data analysis and trends.

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

After reviewing the data, our Science achievement scores showed the greatest decline. Contributing factors to the decline in science achievement are a lack of direct instruction and lack of unified response to data analysis and trends.

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.

After reviewing the data, both our ELA Learning Gains and Math Achievement components had a gap of 6% between our school average and that of the state average. Our ELA Learning Gains was 52% while the state was 58% and our Math Achievement was at 57% and the state was at 63%. Contributing factors to these gaps are a lack of direct instruction and lack of unified response to data analysis and trends.

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

Our ELA Lowest 25th Percentile increased from 33% in the 2017-2018 school year to 53% in the 2018-2019 school year. A new action taken to increase student achievement was targeted intervention for our lowest quartile.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Two area of concern is attendance (students below 90%) and students performing at a level 1 on state assessments in 4th and 5th grade.

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

1. Science
2. ELA Learning Gains
3. ELA Lowest Quartile
4. ELA Achievement
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Achievement
Rationale	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 54%, ELA Learning Gains was 52%, and Lowest Quartile Learning Gains was at 53%. Our SLT decided to focus on ELA Achievement, as this would improve learning gains and overall proficiency for all of our students, including our lowest quartile. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our ESSA subgroups, Hispanic and Students with Disabilities, are in our lowest quartile, so focusing on ELA Achievement will target this group.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELA Achievement from 54% to 61%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kelly Lewis (krlewis@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards based focus board - learning targets / goals / success criteria
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to John Hattie, having learning goals has an effect size of .68. How we make meaningful connections between standards and the objectives is through a focus board, that's how we link the science of teaching to the art of teaching.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review student data 2. Facilitate PL on standards based focus board - learning goals (September 16, 2019) 3. Implement standards based focus boards in classrooms 4. During weekly PLCs, discuss and plan standards based focus boards, include in PLC meeting agendas and minutes 5. Monthly progress monitoring to review use of standards based focus boards 6. Provide teachers with three half-day planning days throughout the school year to review student data, develop direct instruction (tier one instruction) plans, and create a common language for standards based boards
Person Responsible	Kelly Lewis (krlewis@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Science Achievement
Rationale	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Science Achievement was at 50%, which is a decline of 13% from the previous school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase Science Achievement from 50% to 61%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kelly Lewis (krlewis@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Direct Instruction with deliberate planning and focus on student data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According the John Hattie, direct instruction has an effect size of .59. By reviewing current student data regularly and planning during PLC time to drive our science curriculum direct instruction, our student achievement will increase.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review student data - district science exams 2. Meet with district curriculum specialist to develop a plan based on current student data 3. Meet weekly during PLC's to discuss and plan the weeks science lessons and focus boards 4. Monitor effectiveness of direct instruction through data analysis (formatives and summatives at PLC meetings) 5. Conduct learning walks with district curriculum specialists, coaches, and teachers during science instruction 5. After each district science exam, meet to disseminate data and develop or alter instructional plan to meet students needs 6. Schedule family science events in conjunction with PTA.
Person Responsible	Kelly Lewis (krlewis@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

One school-wide improvement priority is school safety by addressing the social-emotional needs of students. One way this will be addressed is with the use of common expectations throughout the campus with our CRIMP motto to model positive interactions on campus. Another way we plan on addressing the social emotional needs of our students in identified ESSA subgroups is to set up a mentoring program and implement our H.U.G. strategy (Hello. Update. Goal) to help create a positive learning environment for our students.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

PFEP will be uploaded

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Read-Pattillo Elementary school ensure the social-emotional needs of all of our students are being met in several ways. First, we have Social-Emotional Learning times build into several of our grade levels master schedule to teach students positive ways to interact with their peers and how to cope with their emotions. We also have an SEL/TOA who hosts SEL small group lessons and provides SEL support to students and parents as needed. We also work with community mentors and an outside counseling agency to provide more support for identified students.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

The school employs a number of supportive events to help with the transition of students from one school level to another. This includes:

- Kindergarten Orientation
- Meet the Teacher
- Kindergarten Expectation Night
- 5th Grade Learning Expectations Night
- Open House
- Incoming 6th Grade Orientation with local middle school

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The school improvement plan is data driven and focuses on areas of school-based need for both specific content areas as well as specific student populations. Similarly, MTSS is a data-driven framework that seeks to find solutions/resources matched in intensity to student need in academic and behavioral areas. The MTSS framework follows the district's four-step problem solving process, with Rtl as an integral component of the process. As a result, the school improvement plan is based on a strategic analysis of data, and identified resources (as identified by the school based leadership team) are matched to meet the needs of the students/school. Building the SIP within the context of MTSS results in the school determining the areas of most significant need and, as importantly, enables the school to develop a plan that can be addressed based on existing resources.

Programs supported by Title I include:

- 2 full time Intervention Teachers

TIPA Tutors

Supplemental funds for ongoing staff development as determined by the results of FSA data

Supplement Tutoring after school

Supplemental materials and supplies needed to close the achievement gap

Parent to Kids workshops to teach literacy skills to parents so they can support their children to become better readers

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Read-Pattillo Elementary School fosters relationships with local community and business partners that positively impact our students. We host Publix Math Night with our local Publix Supermarket and host a Science night at the Museum of Arts and Sciences and at our school. We also incorporate career awareness opportunities through guest speakers from local business and industries.