Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

Name of School: **Area:**

South

Bayside High School

Principal: **Area Superintendent:**

Dr. Mark Mullins

Robin Novelli

SAC Chairperson:

Aaron Parr and Michael Thomas

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

To instill character for life while preparing for college and careers.

Vision Statement:

Bayside High School uses collaboration, reflection, and instructional technology as essential tools, preparing all students to excel in the workforce or post-secondary education. Moreover, faculty and staff stress the importance of integrity through modeling and reinforcing high character standards.

Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

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

For the fourth concurrent year, Bayside High school has made notable progress in student achievement. During this time period, we have experienced a decrease of approximately 1200 students. However, both the number and percentage of students scoring a three or better on Advanced Placement Exams has increased. Bayside also demonstrated tremendous growth in the number of Industry Certifications provided through our Career and Technical Education classes, going from a 57% passing rate in 2011 to 84% in 2012. Furthermore, BHS outperformed the district in Industry Certifications both years with the district passing 52% in 2011 and 72% in 2012. BHS has also exhibited growth in the area of learning gains made by the bottom quartile readers; the 2012 FCAT 2.0 results indicated an unprecedented increase in learning gains made by bottom quartile readers, rising from 53% to 71%. Level One readers decreased from 22% to 8%, and students scoring a Level Three or higher rose from 54% to 62%. Even with these indicators of success, our tenth-grade readers were outperformed by the District by 7%, signifying a need to further strengthen the reading skills of our students.

With regard to math, our data from the Algebra I EOC Spring Administration indicated that students scoring in the Level One through Level Three range decreased while Levels Four and Five increased, demonstrating strong student achievement. BHS students averaged a Mean Scale Score (MSS) of 51 on the Spring Administration of the Geometry EOC, two points higher than the State average; however, BHS lagged behind the District average by one point. That difference is much smaller than the reading comparison.

On the Biology EOC, Bayside students outscored the State with regard to the MSS by one point, while they fell behind the District MSS by two points. With such inconsequential score differences, the results were inconclusive at best.

Finally, one area that demonstrated a significant need for improvement was that of writing. The percentage of Bayside High School's tenth graders who earned a Level Four or higher on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing test decreased from 77% to 34%. This is very similar to the drop in scores for the District, which dropped from 77% to 41% and the State, which dropped from 75% to 38%. Therefore, after close consideration of this data, it is evident that in light of the transition to the Common Core State Standards, BHS needs to focus improvement on the reading/writing connection.

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

Research clearly states the importance of connecting reading with writing, and that the connection completely supports college and career readiness. In Mike Schmoker's *Focus: Elevating the Essentials to Radically Improve Student Learning (2011),* he clearly addresses the topic by stating that, "We need to redirect those hours toward the most simple, obvious tasks that prepare students for college, careers, citizenship: meaningful reading, writing . . . around an adequately coherent body of content in the subject areas" (28).

Additionally, CCSS states, "[Students] have to become adept at gathering information, evaluating sources, and citing material accurately . . . in a clear and cogent manner . . .[while] . . .able to read complex informational text . . . with independence and confidence because the vast majority of reading in college and workforce training programs will be sophisticated nonfiction" (CCSS 60). Finally, David T. Conley addresses the issue of the reading/writing connection in his *College Knowledge* (2005) by asserting, ". . . the following four intellectual standards were paramount, within and among the disciplines: 1) read to infer/interpret, draw conclusions; 2) support arguments with evidence; 3) resolve conflicting views encountered in source documents; and 4) solve complex problems with no obvious answer." Thus, reinforcing the conclusion derived by data analysis.

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

Bayside is continuing its focus on becoming a whole school Professional Learning Community, focusing on Collaborative Teams and Cadres. We have readily adopted a culture where adults work together to institute effective instructional strategies through the creation of common formative assessments, sharing of data and reflective practices. At the end of the 2011-2012 school year, teachers were surveyed, and 68% indicated that their small group PLCs had aligned essential learning with State/District standards and high stakes assessments that were required of their students. Fifty-one percent of those who responded indicated that they used the results of common formative assessments to build on strengths and address weaknesses in instructional strategies as a part of continuous improvement design. We understand the essential nature of conducting peer observations and providing constructive feedback in an effort to improve instruction. However, as an indication that we still need to improve, forty-one percent of those surveyed indicated that their teams were still in the phase which requires them to address clarity on essential learning at the course/grade level.

In terms of parent involvement, our 2012 Client Survey indicates that parents seek informative sessions that will assist them in the areas of study skills, homework assistance, extra-curricular activities, student online classes, and career preparation along with those already provided concerning college preparation/information and ACT/SAT information. Although we acknowledge there are still some communication gaps, BHS actively seeks ways to improve our communication with parents and with the community at large.

Finally, the reading/writing connection across the content areas has been subject to limited practice at BHS. Reading and writing have been addressed by isolated means in individual classrooms, but never as a concerted, organized effort by the entire faculty.

CONTENT AREA:

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

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

Across all content areas, Bayside teachers will prepare students for college and career readiness by teaching students to read for key ideas and details, use textual evidence when writing to clearly convey complex ideas and information, and write arguments to support claims.

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

Barrier	*Action Steps*	*Person Responsible*	*Timetable*	*Budget*	*In-Process Measure*
1.Insufficient teacher collaboration	1. Promote participation in cadres allowing teacher choice of members. All teachers are required to participate in at least one cadre. A cadre is a group of 2-4 teachers who depend upon each other in order to achieve a common goal to improve the quality of teaching and learning in their classroom.	Classroom Teachers	8/2012-5/2013	$0.00	Data Analysis and/or cadre minutes

2. Teachers' lack of clarity of the CCSS	2. Preplanning meetings and October building in-service training	Media Specialist and AP trained teachers	8/2012-5/2013	$0.00	In-service documents/ agendas
3. Shortage of reading/writing assignments within each discipline that specifically address the elements in the school-based objective	3. Create assignments that focus on incorporating key ideas in reading, the use of textual evidence in writing to convey complex ideas and information and to write arguments that support claims specific to each subject area.	Classroom Teachers	8/2012-5/2013	$0.00	Copies of assignments
4. Lack of teacher confidence in assuring grading reading/writing using rubrics with fidelity	4. Design rubrics within cadres and during in-service training specific to subject area/ assignments	Classroom Teachers, AP Board Trained	8/2012-5/2013	$0.00	Cadre minutes/ rubrics
5. Inadequate time to collaborate and plan	5. Allocate time for cadre meetings (ie: Tues/Thurs mornings, monthly shortened Wednesdays)	Principal and teachers	8/2012-5/2013	$0.00	Cadre schedules/ minutes

6.Lack of teacher buy-in of the value of utilizing reading/writing to improve student achievement in areas of the curriculum outside of English/ Language Arts	6. Through in-service, teachers will learn that the School-Based Objective encompasses CCSS 1-3 (out of 10) in reading and writing. Student assessment (and ½ of teacher evaluation) will be dependent on all 10 CCSS in 2014-2015.	Principal	8/2012-5/2013	$0.00	In-service notes/ agenda
7. Lack of parental knowledge and support of what's required for success in college and careers	7. Inception of Bayside University, a series of parent workshops to address the areas of need specified by our parents	Mrs. Thorstensen	8/2012-5/2013	$0.00	Meeting schedule and program notes

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

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

Following Professional Development Day, teachers in all disciplines will create lesson plans integrating our school improvement plan with the first three CCSS in both reading and writing. Teachers will also begin the process of revising curriculum to meet the new CCSS to prepare students for proficiency in reading informational text and writing with an emphasis on text-based evidence. Teachers will work on continuous improvement by inviting colleagues (both administrators and peers) to observe these lessons and provide constructive feedback.

Another measure of professional development implementation will be conducted in the spring with a follow-up survey to determine effectiveness of PLC collaboration. A further survey will be conducted at the end of the school year to measure the percentage of teachers implementing new instructional practices learned through

professional development training.

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

Student achievement will be determined over the course of the entire school year through feedback (both formal and informal) provided by the students. Administrators and teachers will elicit comments and observations from the students regarding perceived strengths and weaknesses in the areas addressed by the school-based objectives. Content area teachers will gather additional measures of student achievement through the assessment of results on frequent DBQ lessons. The assessment validity of these DBQs will be ensured through the use of rubrics and training provided by experienced AP instructors. Finally, student achievement will be measured by the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading and Writing scores.

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

Reading Goal **1.**	**2012 Current Level of Performance** **(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance** **(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)**
Anticipated Barrier(s): **1.**		
Strategy(s): **1.**		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	33%=263/804	34%=292/860

Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	25%=2/8	37.5%=3/8
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	28%=226/804	29%=249/860
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	62.5%=5/8	75%=6/8
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	25%=1/4	40%=2/5
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.** **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	71%=143/201	72%=155/215
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline data 2010-11: 61%**	62%	68%

Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading : White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	Enter numerical data for current level of performance 33% 51% 38% N/A N/A	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance 31% 46% 39% N/A N/A
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	80%	62%
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	63%	59%
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	44%	43%

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
CCSS Reading/Writing	10/12/2012	Teacher Lesson Plans and/or assignments

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/ Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Listening/ Speaking:** 33%	Lack of an audio system for group listening	Seek funds to cover expenses of audio system for group listening in the classroom	Principal
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Reading:** 33%	Insuff icient computers to allow for individual student use	Seek funds to cover expenses of additional computers to allow for individual student use in the classroom	Principal
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Writing**: 33%	Absence of a writing software program in the classroom	Seek funds to cover expenses of writing program for the computers in the classroom	Principal

Mathematics Goal(s): **1.**	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Anticipated Barrier(s): **1.**	N/A	N/A
Strategy(s): **1.**	N/A	N/A

FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	**50%=4/8**	**62.5%=5/8**
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	**50%=4/8**	**62.5%=5/8**
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	**25%=1/4**	**40%=2/5**
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	**N/A**	**N/A**
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline Data 2010-11: 62%**	73%	68%

Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in math : White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	20% 36% 34% N/A N/A	27% 50% 37% N/A N/A
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	42%	47%
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	50%	37%
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	71%	54%

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
CCSS Math	10/12/2012	Teacher Lesson Plans and/or assignments

Writing	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage

		reflects)
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A
FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	86%=348/405	87%=348/400
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing	100%=5/5	60%=3/5

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) **1.**	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science**:**	N/A	N/A
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	N/A	N/A
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	N/A	N/A
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading	N/A	N/A

Science Goal(s) (High School) 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	33%=1/3	50%=2/4
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science	33%=1/3	50%=2/4
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:** **Asian:** **American Indian**:	 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	 N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	N/A	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	N/A	N/A

APPENDIX B

(SECONDARY SCHOOLS **ONLY**)

Algebra 1 EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Algebra**:**	52%=144/277	53%=103/194
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra:	8%=22/277	9%=17/194
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11 N/A	N/A	N/A

Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:**	33% 47% 50%	32% 46% 49%
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	52%	51%
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	54%	53%
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra	N/A	N/A

Geometry EOC Goal	**2012 Current Level of Performance(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry**:**	41%=149/363	42%=152/380
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry:	N/A	N/A

Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11 N/A	N/A	N/A
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:**	N/A	N/A
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry	N/A	N/A
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry	N/A	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry	N/A	N/A

Biology EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter	2013 Expected Level of Performance

	percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Biology**:**	37%=134/361	38%=152/399
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology:	N/A	N/A

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

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

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/ Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: **Goal 1: Increase participation in technology competitions that combines the skills learned in the STEM courses**	Decreased funding from outside agencies that support participation in programs/ competitions	Look for alternative sources of funding through the writing of grants	Individual teachers

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: **Goal 1:Increase the pass rate to be 90% or higher for all industry certification tests taken as mandated by the School District**	Limited collaboration among CTE teachers working to improve instructional strategies	CTE teachers will work together with peers at BHS and with like teachers from other schools	Kimbrell

APPENDIX C

(TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

Highly Effective Teachers

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

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

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field/and who are not highly effective	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective

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

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

Overall, the MTSS/RTI program is an effective system in ensuring all students get the proper intervention at the appropriate time. At the high school level, however, there are a variety of challenges we face in providing one-on-one or small group interventions with our existing system. For example, at the elementary level, it is relatively easy to pull a child or a small group from class several times a week to meet with a team of teachers to ensure an intervention is implemented with fidelity and consistency. In high school, the students are not on teams and generally do not share a set of teachers. Our students are mandated to meet graduation requirements, so removing them from classes on a regular basis could be detrimental to their academic success. In addition a further difficulty arises since the students are not on teams and their teachers do not share planning time to implement interventions. Our administration is committed to making the best master schedule this and future school years in an attempt to offset the difficulties described above.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT:

Bayside continuously seeks new ways to expand opportunities for parent involvement. For the 2012-2013 school year, we added "Freshman Parent Day" so parents of our new students can navigate through a typical day in their child's high school career. This awareness of their child's daily life opens up a dialogue between student and parent that can benefit all of us. Bayside University is another system we've created to help guide our parents through high school These sessions connect parents with vital information to assist in steering through the challenges of high school in order to better prepare for post-secondary career or college. Finally, we've developed an intervention for any freshman currently failing a course. On our parent conference night, deans will be conducting parent conferences to open the communication between parents and school and help parents see how we can all work together to improve student performance. In addition, these same students will be attending Operation Recovery at which time they will meet with both their parents and counselor to chart a course to get back on track for academic success.

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

As evidenced by the 94.6% attendance rate at Bayside during the 2011-2012 school year, we do not believe attendance is a crisis issue. Our rate is within one percent of the district average of 95.4%. We would like to set a progress goal in this area as there is room for improvement. Our Guidance department will escalate post-absence follow-ups. Our faculty and administration will continue to encourage both students and parents to submit appropriate documentation for excused absences.

SUSPENSION:

Over the past two years, Bayside has worked to reduce our number of suspensions. In order to increase attendance in after-school detentions, we changed the day from Saturday to Tuesday. We are also implementing in-school suspension every Monday. These two interventions provide additional steps on the ladder to deter misconduct.

DROP-OUT (High Schools only):

In the 2011-2012 school year the Guidance Collaborative team worked together to research the reasons of drop-out and methods to prevent. The major concern with drop-out is the at-risk students. The individual guidance counselors have been tracking each students respectively and monitored their progress.

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

There are several strategies used at Bayside High School to improve and promote post-secondary competency. Every student has a one-on-one meeting with his or her counselor to determine appropriate course selections based on annual post-secondary readiness evaluation scores. These score reports are provided by two district assessments: all 10th grade students take the PLAN test, and all 11th grade students take the ACT. The scores from these two assessments provide the baseline used by counselors in the spring to help students design an academic and career plan reflective of their academic aptitude and post-secondary interests. For students not meeting readiness benchmarks, Bayside provides courses in English and/or Mathematics designed to prepare students for college-level course work in these disciplines. The goal of these courses is to allow our graduates to begin courses at the community college without having to take remedial courses. In addition, the scores from the PLAN and ACT are used to identify potential students for Advanced Placement classes offered on campus. Counselors assist students in determining which AP courses will benefit them on their post-secondary paths. Counselors also encourage students to avail themselves of the AP opportunities, informing them of the many advantages these courses will give them in their post-secondary education. Finally, Bayside High School encourages the participation of our students in dual enrollment classes by conducting several informational meetings both during the school day and after school hours. The Bayside Guidance webpage keeps parents and students updated on these meeting times and agendas.