



Revised Notice
June 6, 2011

Dennis M. Walcott
Chancellor

The Revised Proposed Co-location of a New Public Charter School, Success Academy Charter School, with Existing Schools Louis D. Brandeis High School (03M470), The Urban Assembly School for Green Careers (03M402), The Global Learning Collaborative (03M403), Innovation Diploma Plus (03M404), and Frank McCourt High School (03M417) in the Brandeis Educational Campus

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

In an Educational Impact Statement (“EIS”) posted on December 17, 2011, the New York City Department of Education (“DOE”) proposed to open a new public charter school, Success Academy Charter School (“SACS”), and site it in the Brandeis Educational Campus, Building M470 (“M470” or the “Brandeis Campus”), located at 145 West 84th Street, New York, NY 10024 in Community School District 3. SACS would be co-located in M470 with Louis D. Brandeis High School (03M470, “Brandeis High School”), The Urban Assembly School for Green Careers (03M402, “Green Careers”), The Global Learning Collaborative (03M403, “Global Learning”), Innovation Diploma Plus (03M404, “Diploma Plus”), and Frank McCourt High School (03M417, “Frank McCourt”). A “co-location” means that two or more school organizations are located in the same building and may share common spaces like auditoriums, gymnasiums, and cafeterias. The proposal was approved by the Panel for Educational Policy (“PEP”) on February 1, 2011.

The DOE has now published a revised EIS and revised BUP in response to public comments on this and other proposals. The changes to the EIS and BUP are described in detail in Section II below.

This revised notice also provides information about a joint public hearing that will take place regarding this revised proposal. The revised proposal will also be subject to a new vote by PEP, the date and location of which are set forth below.

SACS would open in September 2011 to serve 180-190 students in Kindergarten and first grade, and would add one grade each year until it reaches full scale in 2015-2016. At that time, SACS will serve approximately 480-490 students in Kindergarten through fifth grade. The charter for SACS authorizes a higher enrollment for this school; however, the proposed enrollment is the maximum that can be accommodated in the available space.

The Brandeis Campus currently houses five high schools. Brandeis High School is in the process of phasing out, and is scheduled to close in June 2012. It currently serves 685 students in grades 11-12. Four other high schools, as noted above, are phasing in to the Brandeis Campus and all will serve grades 9-12 at full scale.

The Brandeis Campus has the capacity to serve 2,148 students. In the 2010-11 school year, the building only served 1,403 students, yielding a utilization rate of 65%. Once Brandeis High School has phased out, the other four high schools have phased in, and SACS is serving students in grades K-5, there will be approximately 1,980-2,090 students served in the building, yielding a building utilization rate of 92%-97%.

II. Identification of all revisions, including substantial revisions to the item.

The DOE is now revising this proposal. The revised EIS:

- updates current enrollment at all schools to reflect the 2010-2011 Audited Register (which was not yet available at the time the original EIS was published);
- changes the projected enrollment for Green Careers and Global Learning to conform to budget register projections for 2011-2012, and therefore also changes the total number of students projected to be served by all schools and the projected building utilization rate;
- includes additional information about the programs and partnerships of the high schools in the Brandeis Educational Campus;
- includes additional information on the impact of the proposal on future elementary school students in District 3;
- provides detailed projections of the proposed grade levels and estimated enrollments of all six organizations in M470 over a 5 year period;
- includes updated facilities information and;
- includes information about a YABC program that operates in the M470 building.

The revised BUP, which is annexed to this revised EIS, makes the following changes:

- the proposed shared space schedule has been revised and the DOE has clarified the rationale for the amount of time that each co-located school is allocated in the shared spaces under this proposal;
- the current enrollment information for all DOE schools has been updated to reflect the 2010-11 Audited Register (which was not available at the time the BUP was originally published);
- the number of students that Green Careers is projected to serve in 2011-2012 has been revised to reflect budget register projections for 2011-2012;
- the allocation of space between all school organizations has been revised to address mathematical inconsistencies in the original BUP, and additional information about planned construction;
- the science labs have been included as shared spaces and have not been allocated to the individual schools;
- room allocation charts have been added for each school during each year;
- updated and more detailed information has been provided regarding planned construction projects in the building and;
- the formatting of the room allocation charts in the original BUP has been altered to make them easier to understand.

III. Summary of all public comment received to date.

A joint public hearing regarding this proposal was held at Brandeis Educational Campus on January 25, 2011. At that hearing, interested parties had an opportunity to provide input on the proposal. Approximately 371 members of the public attended the hearing, and 112 people spoke. Present at the meeting were Manhattan High Schools Superintendent Elaine Gorman; District 3 Community Education Council President Noah Gotbaum; Rachel Dahill Fushell, Academic Dean of Global Learning Collaborative representing the School Leadership Team; Lisa Steglich, a representative of the Frank McCourt School Leadership Team; John Englert, co-chair of the Citywide Council on Special Education; Ellen McHugh, member of Citywide Council on Special Education; Paola Dekoeck, representing Citywide Council for High Schools; Harvey Lichtman, a teacher from Brandeis High School representing the School Leadership Team; Rick Sherwin, a representative of the Global Learning Community School Leadership Team; Elizabeth Rose and Gaby Fighetti from the Division of Portfolio Planning. Eva Moskowitz from Success Charter Network also attended.

The following comments and remarks were made at the joint public hearing:

1. Noah Gotbaum, president of Community Education Council 3 asserted that:
 - a. District 3 is overcrowded. The DOE has never previously offered the Brandeis campus as an option to relieve that overcrowding. There is not enough space in District 3. When the DOE co-locates charters with district schools, it pushes out district students.
 - b. At PS 149 and Wadleigh Secondary School, Success Network pushed out district students. At PS 149, students receive therapy in hallways and cannot use the gym because Harlem Success Academy is in the building.
 - c. The Brandeis campus recently underwent a \$22 million renovation. Mr. Gotbaum asserted that recently-created science rooms, hallways, and closets will be renovated into classrooms. Mr. Gotbaum expressed the opinion that this is wasteful and reflects poor planning.
 - d. The District 3 community does not want or need a new elementary school. Existing elementary schools are high quality. Parents want more resources and less overcrowding in public schools.
 - e. District 3 received a federal magnet grant to upgrade and integrate schools. The DOE is undermining this grant by providing space and funds to a charter school to recruit students away from the schools that the federal government is funding an effort to recruit students to attend.

2. Rachel Dahill Fushell, a representative of the Global Learning Collaborative School Leadership Team, shared an anecdote about students at her school. She noted that students from the schools on the campus are reprimanded if they move into space designated for other the schools. She also asserted that:
 - a. The four high schools on the campus have built a strong collaboration. The schools share resources such as science laboratories, ceramic and dance studios, music rooms, the cafeteria, gymnasias, and other athletic facilities. The schools also share resources such as paper for bulletin boards and a laminating machine.

Students participate in extracurricular activities such as attending a Model United Nations conference together.

- b. The schools have been told that if the new school comes into the building, it will not be part of that collaboration because it is an elementary school which needs to remain separate. This undermines the strong collaboration the schools have established. The schools on the campus had hoped that another organization would join them and be part of that collaboration.
 - c. Global Learning Collaborative is participating in Phase One of the special education reform. To be successful in this effort, the school requires more space than has been allotted. Students require space for emotional, social, and intellectual growth. This requires an easy, comfortable environment, not overcrowded, chaotic rooms and hallways.
 - d. Though the numbers may indicate that this campus has room for an additional school, based on the idiosyncratic needs of students, this numerical calculation does not work.
 - e. A DOE representative told the schools at a meeting that they were being asked to do the impossible. Instead of asking this, the DOE should help the schools and students be successful.
3. Rick Sherwin, a representative of the Global Learning Community School Leadership Team asserted that:
- a. Community Board 7, Community Education Council 3, and many elected officials oppose this colocation. The community does not want this colocation; it will be dangerous. If this colocation is approved, this hearing means nothing.
 - b. \$22 million were spent to renovate this campus for high schools. Renovating the campus to fit an elementary school is a waste of money. How much will it cost to renovate the campus for an elementary school?
 - c. The building is already confined. There is not extra space. Where will the one thousand new students go?
 - d. The DOE walk through labeled science labs, music rooms, art rooms, and a theater as classrooms that can be used for the new school. These are not classrooms; the existing schools need them for their designated purposes.
 - e. One of the schools on the campus is a transfer school with students up to 20 years old. It is not a good idea to put these students in the same building with young elementary school students. Two of the schools are participating in Phase One of the special education reform. The campus has a higher enrollment of special education students than other schools do. The schools welcome these students and it is the schools' mission to serve them. But, they need space.
 - f. The existing schools need to grow into full capacity in their building before another school organization is added.
 - g. Teachers in schools colocated with charter schools say that colocation leads to unequal treatment, including being moved into inferior space.
4. Lisa Steglich, a representative of the Frank McCourt School Leadership Team, asserted that:

- a. The Educational Impact Statement (EIS) contains numerous errors, including: a kitchen and a dance studio are counted as regular classrooms; the number of students at Brandeis High School is listed as 600, but 800 actually attend; and specialty rooms are listed as regular classrooms.
 - b. The EIS does not address the issue of flow management and control of different student populations.
 - c. The EIS states that space will not be taken away from existing schools. But each year, existing schools have received additional classrooms. If this stops happening, space will be taken away.
 - d. The DOE developed this proposal based on a walk through of the building. This walk through was subjective and has insufficient detail. Why doesn't the DOE use the facilities survey which is objective and much more detailed?
 - e. The EIS states that Success Academy students will not have to go through scanners. This sends a message that Success Academy students are privileged and trustworthy and other students are not.
 - f. Demand for schools in the building is higher than demand for Success Academy. Success Academy receives about 3 applications for each seat, while Frank McCourt receives about 9 and Global Learning Collaborative receives about 8.
 - g. In a time of tight budgets, why spend public school dollars converting a high school to an elementary school?
 - h. The DOE will build a separate cafeteria for Success Academy. This is an admission that high school and elementary school students should not mix.
 - i. Spaces such as the ceramic studio and kiln, black box theater, lighting and sound control room, science labs, and music rehearsal rooms will be threatened.
 - j. The DOE has told principals their schools will receive \$500,000 in matching funds if a charter school is colocated with them. But the EIS states that the DOE will decide if the schools qualify for the match after the project is complete. This is a conflict.
5. John Englert, co-chair of the Citywide Council on Special Education, asserted that:
- a. The EIS does not address educational issues, including scheduling, equipment, programs, activities, testing accommodations, and social interactions between students with disabilities and their peers.
 - b. The DOE states that if the proposal is approved specific room allocations will be made by the Office of Space planning in conjunction with the building council. A draft building utilization plan has been provided. However, reconfiguration of classroom space without redesign of mechanical systems can lead to air quality control and ventilation issues, jeopardizing the health and safety of children.
 - c. The proposal does not address time it takes students to travel through overcrowded halls in the building.
 - d. Rooms are not designated for the delivery of special services.
 - e. The DOE targets 28 students per classroom, not 20 which is acceptable for K-3.
 - f. Why didn't the DOE consider space of nearby Catholic schools which are closing: St. Joseph, Holy Family, and All Saints?
 - g. This plan has been developed without consideration for children's education and safety. The community needs to hold the DOE accountable.

6. Ellen McHugh, asserted that:
 - a. Students with low incidence disabilities, such as deaf students, are underrepresented in the population of charter school students with disabilities. The law states that charter schools must provide the full range of supports and services for students with disabilities to succeed.
 - b. Students with disabilities are often discriminated against and segregated.

7. Paula Dekock, a representative of the Citywide Council on High Schools, asked:
 - a. Why is the \$22m that was spent on this school for high school students now being used for non-HS students?
 - b. Current high schools need space for things like extracurriculars, sports, labs, and CTE space. Why take space away from this?
 - c. Why take HS seats away at all? We need more good HS seats across the city.
 - d. Why do potential charter parents want to come to a school meant for HS students?

8. Harvey Lichtman, a teacher delegate from Brandeis HS, asserted that:
 - a. The Brandeis SLT opposes this collocation
 - b. If SA8 is collocated here, the DOE will cut the budgets and staffing of the other schools in the building
 - c. Charter schools represent a privatization of public education, and he opposes charter schools in general.

9. Noah Gotbaum, president of Community Education Council 3 asserted that:
 - a. What level of outrage and comment does the DOE need to hear to know that the community is opposed to this proposal?
 - b. Knowing the district is overcrowded and that the school is prioritizing ELL and children from at risk schools, how does this address the needs of the community? And how does the DOE define a “failing school” for this purpose?
 - c. Typically, as a charter school grows into a building, the district schools shrink. This would displace high need students already in schools in the building.

10. Eva Moskowitz, founder of Success Network, asserted that:
 - a. The goal of this school is to increase choice, regardless of whether it is a district or a charter school.
 - b. The new school will focus on critical thinking, science, reading and writing, and field studies.

11. Robert Gottheim, a representative from US Congressman John Nadler, read a statement from the Congressman:
 - a. This proposal will not address overcrowding in the district, nor will it bring new resources to struggling schools.
 - b. This will divert resources and will require additional costs to retrofit the building for K students
 - c. We should not collocate K and HS students

12. Jared Chausow, a representative for State Senator Tom Duane, read a statement from the Senator:
 - a. We should use the space in this building to expand one of the high schools in the building, or to create another high school serving the community.
 - b. This proposal would take away space from existing schools and would cause strife and disruption as the schools fight for scarce resources
 - c. Success Network has bad relations with other schools that they share buildings with, including at PS 149 and 241.
 - d. Mixing high school and kindergarten students is dangerous to the students and would cost extra money to retrofit the building. These modifications would limit the current schools ability to work together to share and exchange space
 - e. Success's desire to grow could threaten further capital investment in the building
 - f. Success's lottery preferences would mean that the school does not serve students from District 3. In addition, because demand is so high for Success schools, local families would have a low chance of getting access to the school.
 - g. The DOE should instead promote the district choice schools, or schools that are part of the federal magnet grant.

13. City Councilmember Gale Brewer asserted that:
 - a. This building is meant for high school students, and it is unfair for high school and kindergarten students to come through different entrances and only one through metal detectors.
 - b. The current high schools need to grow, for extracurriculars and sports
 - c. Success's preference for ELL and "at risk" students will not solve the overcrowding problem in the district
 - d. The district needs more high school seats. The space should be used for that.

14. Sophia Raheem, representing Councilmember Inez E. Dickens, stated:
 - a. Opposed to this collocation and other collocations because schools need room to grow for things like the Arts.
 - b. This would create inequity in resources, as Success could solicit additional funds for things like smartboards, while the DOE schools would be subject to city constraints
 - c. Success should find private facilities with its private endowment, such as leasing one of the closing Parochial Schools.

15. Lauren Schuster, representing Assemblymember Linda Rosenthal, stated:
 - a. The district is overcrowded, and it is irresponsible to allocate space to an elementary charter school. This would not address the overcrowding problem
 - b. It is dangerous to put kindergarten students in a building with students 18-20 years old
 - c. Success charter gives preference to ELL and "at risk" students from out of district over in-district students, which will worsen the seat shortage
 - d. Addressing the district seat shortage is not part of the school's plan, as laid out in its charter

- e. Current diagnosis of the space is incorrect, and in a recent walkthrough community leaders noted that several rooms were mis-categorized
 - f. The West Side community is opposed to this proposal, and the community board voted unanimously to oppose it
 - g. Parents on the West Side are satisfied with the schools they have and want them expanded, rather than have charter schools brought in
16. Multiple commenters stated that there is not enough space in the building for another school, and it will cause overcrowding in the school building.
 17. Multiple commenters stated that the school is dangerous, and that it is not a good idea to mix elementary and high school students
 18. Multiple commenters stated that this colocation will cause current schools to lose space, programs, and teachers, and will cause current schools to have less access to shared space such as the gym and cafeteria
 19. Multiple commenters stated that they would prefer the current schools to expand rather than bring in another school
 20. Multiple commenters stated that this colocation would require the school to be retrofitted for younger students, and the current high schools would lose access to space
 21. Multiple commenters stated that the district has a space shortage, and this does not provide a solution for the need for more district seats. The seats are needed for district seats
 22. Multiple commenters stated that Success will not serve District 3 students because of the preferences in its lottery, and so will exacerbate space problems in the district
 23. Multiple commenters stated that Success Network schools have not been good neighbors in other co-locations throughout the city, and would not likely be in this situation either.
 24. Multiple commenters stated that Success Network is an educational benefit to the community, and would increase the number of high-quality seats in the community
 25. Noah Gotbaum stated, in response to a question, that he would not support a Success network high school in this building because in other colocations in the city they have squeezed out kids in the current schools.
 26. Carmen Valcasero, an SLT member from Frank McCourt, stated that their children have a right to be in the building and use the resources of the building, and the charter school does not
 27. Multiple commenters stated that the presence of Success would create additional choice for district 3 residents, which they desire
 28. Multiple commenters stated that the Department of Education is simply imposing its will over the opinions of the community
 29. Multiple commenters stated that Success schools have a track record of high achievement
 30. Multiple commenters stated that Success schools do not have self contained classes, that they do not accept students that need those services, or that they counsel out students with special needs
 31. One commenter stated that Success schools do not accept students with behavioral issues
 32. Multiple commenters stated that there is no problem putting elementary and high school students in the same building, and that private schools do it all the time

33. One commenter stated that rezoning and the federal magnet grant has created uncertainty in the district, and that adding a charter would create an inflexible school that cannot adapt to the needs of the community
34. One commenter stated that a Success elementary school is collocated with a high school in another building, and there are no problems
35. One commenter stated that Success was supposed to change its charter in the Fall to say it would prioritize district students, but it has not done that.
36. Multiple commenters stated that Success students would have preference for District 3 seats when the move from 5th to 6th grade, and there is not room to accommodate them. There is hardly room to accommodate all of the district 3 students that will be seeking 6th grade then
37. Multiple commenters stated that the district needs middle and high school seats, not elementary school seats.
38. One commenter stated that hundreds of parents want this school in their community, as evidenced by the hundreds of students who have already applied for the lottery
39. One commenter stated that there are plenty of other high quality elementary school options in district 3, and so this choice is not needed
40. One commenter stated that this co-location will increase congestion in the neighborhood, including more buses idling on the street during the day
41. One commenter asked how many special education students are actually served by Success
42. One commenter stated that the DOE formerly said that Brandeis was not suitable for an elementary school, and so it put PS 452 in a middle school building. Why is this case different?
43. One commenter stated that it is unfair that charter schools can determine their own admissions criteria
44. One commenter stated that the Success told him if a student receives a seat in the lottery but does not accept a spot, then the school does not pull from the wait list but from somewhere else
45. Multiple commenters stated that it is unfair that the high school students would have to go through the scanners, but the Success students would not
46. One commenter stated that every school in the district is opposed to this collocation, because they know that it means eviction for district schools
47. One commenter stated that charter schools drive a wedge between community members, and between the resources of schools
48. One commenter stated that Success schools have better resources than the district schools they are co-located with, which is unequal and unfair
49. One commenter stated that the community was not consulted on this decision
50. One commenter state that the preference for ELL students is going to negatively affect dual language programs across the city that need these students to implement their model
51. One commenter stated that choice in this instance is bad because choice for one person precludes choice for another person
52. One commenter stated that this proposal is way to get Success access to one of the nicest buildings in the district
53. One commenter stated that Success appears to have discriminatory hiring practices

54. One commenter stated that Success students come in already at or near grade level, because the school gets to select its students

The DOE received comments at the Joint Public Hearing which did not directly relate to the proposal.

55. One commenter stated that district schools are just as orderly and high-quality as Success schools claim to be
56. One commenter stated that the DOE phased out PS 241 only to make room for Success several years ago in another building
57. One commenter stated that Success plans to add a 6-8 school afterwards, and there is no room for that in district 3
58. One commenter stated the solution to the space shortage would be to build new schools

Summary of Issues Raised in Written and/or Oral Comments Submitted to the DOE

59. New York State Assembly Member Daniel O'Donnell expressed his opposition to the proposal based on following reasons: it is in violation of the intent and spirit of the law passed in 2010 by the New York State Legislature that requires advanced public notice of potential co-locations; the retrofitting needed to accommodate a K-5 student population would represent an inappropriate expenditure and misuse of financial resources; and a co-location would potentially interfere with the growth and success of the schools currently thriving at Brandeis.
60. The Global Learning Collaborative held a town meeting on January 25, 2011 and submitted a statement opposing the proposed co-location. Reasons given included:
 - a. Brandeis campus was built to hold a pre-determined number of students.
 - b. Concern for how age-diverse groups of students will fit together and move with safety and ease.
 - c. Special needs populations need space beyond the current determination of the number of rooms and types of space listed in the BUP.
61. Approximately 353 comments were received in opposition to the proposed co-location. Reasons given were:
 - a. The campus is unsuitable for elementary school students and remodeling would be expensive.
 - b. Existing High schools should have the option to expand in the future.
 - c. Parents chose the schools in Brandeis campus specifically because the building wasn't overcrowded.
 - d. The number of rooms outlined in the Building Utilization Plan is incorrect.
 - e. New Charter School would funnel resources from the existing schools.
 - f. New Charter School gives priority admission to students "at risk" from within and then outside of District 3 before admitting students not at risk from within the district.
 - g. Middle and high schools seats will be lost.
 - h. Music rehearsal rooms, ceramic studio, dance studio and black box theatre in the building should not count as classrooms.
 - i. Overcrowding is a serious and long-term issue in District 3.

- j. District 3 has zero priority high school seats compared to other districts.
 - k. Safety concerns regarding big age gap among the students.
 - l. Co-locating Success charter schools with other public schools have resulted in negative impact on all schools.
 - m. Special Education students need space for development.
 - n. Publicly funded facilities should be dedicated to public schools.
 - o. Charter school buses would cause street congestion in the neighborhood.
 - p. Charter schools discourage children with special needs from applying.
 - q. Community leaders are all against the proposal
 - r. The charter school claims it is recruiting English Language Learner students but doesn't even have promotional material printed in Spanish. This is not a school for the whole community.
 - s. Success Charter has enough funds to waste on relentless solicitations via robo-calls and mailings.
62. Approximately 10 comments were received in support of the proposed co-location. Reasons given were:
- a. More options for the parents.
 - b. There is currently lack of space at P.S. 9; the charter school would alleviate overcrowding in one school.
63. One commenter raised concerns that the PEP would only see the public comments analysis 24 hours before the vote and with all the other proposals that the comments will not be taken into consideration.
64. One commenter questioned why the PEP members had a pre-meeting to discuss the proposals without receiving community input.
65. The DOE has received approximately 968 copies of an online petition opposing the co-location citing the overcrowding issues in the Southern part of District 3, the lottery preference of the charter school, and issues with co-locating an elementary school with high schools.
66. One Commenter expressed support for the proposal, but asked that there be a separate dedicated entrance for SACS to ensure the K-5 children are kept separate from high school students during drop offs and pickups.
67. Public Advocate for the City of New York Bill de Blasio wrote a letter to the DOE, expressing the following concerns:
- a. Although the Department of Education attempted to engage the school community and have made significant strides in the engagement process, the meetings were rushed and the school community's valid concerns were not reflected in the process and the EIS.
 - b. Charter School would not help address current overcrowding or the need for increased classroom space.
 - c. Students will be admitted to the charter school through the citywide lottery, which will bring additional students into an already overcrowded district.
 - d. DOE will have to modify the recent renovations at Brandeis to adjust for elementary school students.
 - e. 5 year old children and 19 year old students in a single building raises serious safety concerns and requires a plan for addressing security needs.

- f. Brandeis High School will lose valuable space such as classrooms, a kitchen and a dance studio.
 - g. If these questions are not answered, the PEP should vote against the proposal.
68. Recording Secretary, Paola de Kock, of Citywide Council on High Schools expressed her opposition to the proposal, citing that the Brandeis campus should be reserved to serve the community it was designed for, high school students in District 3.
69. Council Member Melissa Mark-Viverito expressed her opposition to the proposals to co-locate charter schools in District 3 based on the lack of long term plan in place, engagement in extensive community dialogue, and development of comprehensive community impact statement.
70. CEC 3 Resolution titled “CEC 3 Resolution Against Proposed and Future Charter Co-Locations in District 3 Including the Establishment of Upper West Success Academy in the Brandeis High School Complex, and Harlem Success Academy I Middle School at P.S. 149 and Wadleigh Secondary” was submitted. Following points were made:
- a. District 3 has a range of good to excellent zoned and district schools, all of which require additional resources.
 - b. District 3 has numerous choice schools.
 - c. District 3 has been awarded a federal magnet grant, which attract students from across the district.
 - d. DOE’s calculations project fewer than 300 district-wide elementary and middle school seats available by September 2012.
 - e. DOE has failed to provide long term plan on how to accommodate District 3 students over the next five years.
 - f. Success Charter co-locations have been uniformly terrible.
 - g. Success Charter Schools enroll and educate far lower percentages of the most needy and at risk children including ELLs.
 - h. CEC3 resolved that;
 - i. The PEP denies the votes on co-locations.
 - ii. There be a freeze on Charter co-locations and expansions in District 3 until DOE provides District 3 Community with adequate facilities and resources for existing schools.
 - iii. The Comptroller conduct an audit to reconcile DOE capacity and utilization statistics with experiences and observations of parents, educators, and CECs.
71. Community Board 7 submitted a Resolution expressing opposition to the proposal, citing severe overcrowding and substantial expense that would be required to retrofit a high school building to serve kindergarteners as main reasons
72. Citywide Council on Special Education submitted a statement that was read during the hearing and is described in the above comment 5.

73. US Congressman John Nadler submitted a statement that was read during the hearing and is described in the above comment 11.

IV. Information regarding where the full text of the proposed item may be obtained.

The revised EIS and revised BUP can be found on the Department of Education's Web site: <http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/leadership/PEP/publicnotice/2010-2011/June2011Proposals>

Copies of the revised EIS and revised BUP are also available in the main offices of Brandeis High School, Green Careers, Global Learning, Diploma Plus, and Frank McCourt.

V. Submission of public comment.

Written comments can be sent to D03Proposals@schools.nyc.gov

Oral comments can be left at 212-374-3466.

VI. 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: Yoo Jin Cheong
Office: Division of Portfolio Planning
Address: 52 Chambers Street, New York, NY 10007
Email: D03Proposals@schools.nyc.gov
Phone: 212-374-3466

VII. Date, time and place of joint public hearing for this proposal.

The joint public hearing on this proposal was held on January 25, 2011. The transcript from this hearing is available at the following links:

<http://schools.nyc.gov/community/planning/changes/manhattan/SACS>

An additional joint public hearing will be held:

June 21, 2011 at 6:00 p.m.
Brandeis Educational Campus,
145 West 84th Street,
New York, NY, 10024

Questions about the proposal should be directed as indicated in section VI above.

Speaker sign-up will begin 30 minutes before the hearing and will close 15 minutes after the start. Interpretation services will be provided in Spanish. To request interpretation services in another language, please contact Ms. Cheong at the e-mail address or telephone number above.

VIII. Date, time and place of the Panel for Educational Policy meeting at which the Panel will vote on the proposed item.

June 27, 2011 at 6:00 p.m.
High School of Fashion Industries,
225 West 24th Street,
New York, NY 10011