Withdrawal Notice
March 3, 2011

Cathleen P. Black
Chancellor

The Proposal to Phase-out P.S. 114 Ryder Elementary (18K114)

I. Description of the subject and purpose of the proposed item under consideration.

P.S. 114 Ryder Elementary (18K114, "P.S. 114") is an existing zoned elementary school located at 1077 Remsen Avenue, Brooklyn, NY 11236, in Community School District 18, in Building K114 ("K114"). It currently serves students in Kindergarten through fifth grade and offers a full-day Pre-Kindergarten program. On December 17, 2010, the New York City Department of Education ("DOE") published an Educational Impact Statement ("EIS") proposing to phase out and eventually close P.S. 114 based on its poor performance, and the DOE's assessment that the school lacks capacity to turn around quickly to better support student needs. On December 29, 2010, the DOE amended this EIS to correct typographical errors and formatting, delete a redundant table and correct two erroneous references to the District 19 Middle School Choice process instead of the District 18 process. On January 12, 2011, the DOE published a revised EIS, which modified the proposed phase-out enrollment plan for P.S. 114 which was initially described in the original EIS published on December 17, 2010. In addition, the revised EIS identified the charter school that will open in K114 in 2011-2012, clarified text and footnotes related to building capacity and utilization, included information related to charters occupying DOE space, included 2010-2011 un-audited register information, and included estimated 2010-2011 building utilization rates. The notice published on January 12 also changed the date of the joint public hearing from January 24 to January 28, 2011. On January 14, 2011, the revised EIS was amended to correct one erroneous mention of the State Education Department ("SED") as the charter authorizer, and clarify that the lottery priority for the new charter school would give preference to students who currently attend a school that is phasing out or where phase-out has been proposed in an EIS issued by the DOE.

After receiving community feedback, however, the DOE has determined to withdraw the proposal to phase out P.S. 114.

As a result, the proposal to phase out P.S. 114 will not be considered by the Panel for Educational Policy ("PEP") and P.S. 114 will not be phased out.

On January 14, 2011, the ("DOE") proposed to site a new zoned elementary school, P.S. 521 (18K521, "P.S. 521"), and Explore Charter School (84K704, "Explore") in K114. An amended Educational Impact Statement ("EIS") was released on February 14, 2011 to correct typographical errors, include information about the community-based organization in Building K114, and clarify further information in regards to P.S. 114. Since the DOE has withdrawn the proposal to phase out P.S. 114, the DOE anticipates that the proposal to site P.S. 521 and Explore in K114 will be revised to reflect this change by March 4, 2011. The proposal will be revised in two significant ways: (1) the DOE will no longer propose to site P.S. 521, the new DOE

elementary school, in K114; and (2) P.S. 114 will be co-located with Explore as Explore phases into the building. More details on this revised proposal will be posted by March 4 at http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/leadership/PEP/publicnotice/2010-2011/Mar232011Proposals.htm.

II. Summary of all public comment received to date.

This proposal was initially scheduled to be voted upon by the PEP on February 3, 2011. Comments received prior to that anticipated PEP vote, were included and responded to in an Analysis of Public Comment, posted here: http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/leadership/PEP/publicnotice/2010-2011/Mar12011Proposals.htm

The DOE also received comments regarding the proposal to phase-out P.S. 114 at the hearing regarding the co-location of P.S. 521 and Explore in K114 on February 16, 2011. A summary of those comments is provided here:

1. A commenter expressed opposition to the proposal and stated that P.S. 114 is not failing. The commenter noted that the DOE cannot provide data that supports the decision to phase out P.S. 114. He also noted that P.S. 114 is being phased out because Marty Markowitz, the Brooklyn Borough President, and the Mayor are friends. He further stated that the decision to phase out P.S. 114 is due to politics, money and the Principals Academy. He noted that the school has been around for 100 years without a problem.
2. A commenter stated that P.S. 114 was never given the chance to succeed. The Chancellor acknowledged that the DOE made a lot of mistakes, but has not taken action. The commenter hopes that the DOE is listening to the feedback it has received and, that Cathie Black and Shael Suransky are aware of the problems with this proposal and that the March 1 vote is not a joke.
3. A commenter stated that the phase-out proposal should not be approved because the school was mismanaged by the previous principal.
4. A commenter wondered why there is a proposal to phase out the school when there is a three-year lease on the building.
5. Multiple speakers stated that P.S. 114's struggles in recent years were not the school's fault, but rather were due to the fact that the DOE has failed to support the school.
6. A commenter stated that she has friends who work at P.S. 114, and that if the school closes they will lose their jobs.
7. Councilman Lew Fidler stated that he hopes that the DOE would reconsider the proposal to phase-out P.S. 114 because of the feedback it has received at the joint public hearings. He further asked that the DOE recognize the hard work of the staff and the existing partnerships in the building. He noted that he has brought in over $1 million in capital funding for P.S. 114 in the past, and that he would double the support for the school if it is allowed to remain open. He requested that the DOE allow the school to remain open and that the funds that would have been provided to the charter school be provided to P.S. 114 instead. He also requested that P.S. 114 be allowed the opportunity to turn around.
8. The representative from Councilman Charles Barron's office stated that their office had worked with parents on the phase-out of P.S. 114 and that parent leaders had submitted a proposal on how to better support P.S. 114. He stated that P.S. 114 is a good school and that the school's alumni had gone on to achieve great things. He stated that P.S. 114's

failure was due to the lack of resources the DOE provided the school, and this meeting was not meaningful because the DOE had likely already made their decision to phase out the school. He noted that the DOE should work with the school instead of phasing it out.

9. A commenter stated that she has been satisfied with the education that the school has provided students and with the hard work of the teachers at the school. She further stated that P.S. 114 has been treated unfairly, the data is inaccurate and that the children and teachers are not failures.
10. A commenter voiced opposition for the phase-out of P.S. 114. She stated that she has multiple children at P.S. 114 and she has been satisfied with their education and the hard work of the teachers; she expressed concern that her children would be split up if the school phases out.
11. A commenter voiced opposition for the phase out P.S. 114. She noted that many parents work multiple jobs and do not speak English, and therefore these parents did not understand the notices provided by the DOE. She further stated that the DOE should support existing schools.
12. A commenter expressed concern for existing fourth and fifth graders who would remain at P.S. 114 during the phase-out. The commenter noted that these students that would be displaced, and stated that P.S. 114 needs the DOE's support and resources that Explore would receive.

In addition, comments were also received in writing after the initial Public Comment Analysis on this proposal was published. A summary of those comments is provided below:

13. A commenter asked for proof that services were provided to students, training was provided to staff and that the DOE tried to remove an inept principal that parents and teachers complained about for years.
14. A commenter expressed confusion regarding the grades that would be served by P.S. 114 next year if the proposal were approved, and suggested that having children in multiple schools in the same building is unnecessary and confusing.
15. A commenter asked why P.S. 114 received no Quality Review last year and how the phase-out decision can be made without this information.
16. A commenter stated that there have been three different principals at the school in the last three years, wondered why this was the case, and stated that stability of leadership is necessary before judging the success of the school.
17. A commenter asked why the State and the City seem to disagree on P.S. 114's achievements, and what the formula is for determining what constitutes a failing school. Previous Quality Reviews have not been bad; rather, it seems the only consistent problem is leadership, so leadership should be the issue addressed.
18. A commenter stated that the money being invested in new schools should be given to P.S. 114 instead so that they can turn around the school.
19. A commenter asked why the DOE allowed the principal to run the school into the ground and who specifically failed to appropriately supervise and support the school.

20. Multiple commenters noted that Councilman Fidler's office had offered to provide a great deal of money and time to support the school if it was given another chance, and argued that this type of opportunity should not be refused.
21. A commenter asked for clarification on the decision-making process, citing concerns that the DOE did not appropriately seek or listen to feedback from staff.
22. Multiple commenters stated that leadership and DOE supervision of leadership are to blame for current struggles and that a leadership change is all that is necessary to turn the school around.
23. A commenter asked how peer schools are determined, citing the differences in demographics, programs administrators, budget issues, socio-economic situations, ethnic mixes, and curriculums, so it does not seem that the peer schools listed for P.S. 114 in the Fact Sheet are appropriate.
24. A commenter stated that several of the schools that were supposed to close last year went on to do well; therefore, the assessment that these schools could not turn around quickly was wrong. What evidence is there that this assessment is not also wrong? How is this proposal different?
25. A commenter stated that the community has clearly stated its opposition to the proposal; however, no changes to the proposal have been made. The commenter asked if the community has any role in this process, and suggested that a change to this proposal would show that the DOE is listening and willing to work with schools.
26. A commenter stated that the Deputy Chancellor acknowledged that the DOE had made mistakes in the past by not supporting P.S. 114, and therefore the DOE is at fault and should fix the school instead of closing it.
27. A commenter stated that the DOE is sending students the wrong message by "quitting" on the school rather than working hard and telling the school to persevere.

IV. The name, office, address, email and telephone number of the city district representative, knowledgeable on the item under consideration, from whom information may be obtained concerning the item.

Name: Benjamin Taylor
Office: Division of Portfolio Planning
Address: 52 Chambers St
Email: D18Proposals@schools.nyc.gov
Phone: 212-374-0208