

### **Public Comment Analysis**

Date: October 29, 2013

Topic: The Proposed Co-location of a New District High School (06M211) with Existing Schools J.H.S. 052 Inwood (06M052) and High School for Excellence and Innovation (06M423) in Building M052 Beginning in 2014-2015

Date of Panel Vote: October 30, 2013

---

### **Summary of Proposal**

On September 13, 2013, the New York City Department of Education (“DOE”) issued a proposal to open and co-locate a new district Career and Technical Education (“CTE”) /early college high school, 06M211, in building M052 (“M052”) located at 650 Academy Street, New York, NY 10034 within the geographical confines of Community School District 6 (“District 6”) beginning in 2014-2015. CTE programs integrate academic study with workforce skills in specific career clusters. Students receive instruction in an industry-related area and have the opportunity to graduate high school with industry-specific competencies and skills that lead to postsecondary education, further industry training and/or entry into the workforce. The early college program is designed to give students the opportunity to earn an associate’s degree free of charge, and to put them on a postsecondary pathway potentially leading to career-track employment within the information technology industry. The proposed new high school, 06M211, will offer CTE programming in the information technology career cluster with a focus on healthcare technology, as described in more detail below, as well as early college programming.

If this proposal is approved, 06M211 will be co-located in building M052 with two existing schools, J.H.S. 052 Inwood (06M052, “J.H.S. 052”), a district middle school that currently serves students in grades six through eight; and High School for Excellence and Innovation (06M423, “HSEI”), a high school that currently serves students in grades nine through twelve and admits students aged 15 or 16 who are entering high school for the first time and have a record of being held back twice in elementary and/or middle school. 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.

If this proposal to open and co-locate 06M211 in M052 is approved, students will have access to a new high school option in Manhattan. Through a six-year program, students will have the opportunity to earn a CTE-endorsed Regents diploma, associate’s degree, and industry-recognized credentials. Students will also engage in a progressive sequence of work-based learning experiences informed by industry partners. More information about CTE endorsed diplomas can be found in Section III of this Educational Impact Statement (“EIS”). Students at CTE/early college programs seamlessly earn credits so that they can graduate within a six-year period having earned both a CTE-endorsed Regents diploma and a related associate’s degree.

CTE/early college programs provide students with a career-focused educational experience that prepares them for career-track employment within their field of study. Each CTE/early college high school program is developed and administered in close collaboration with the college that awards the associate’s degree and a high-profile employer that can offer first-in-line hiring consideration for qualified students who complete the early college program.

06M211 will be a CTE/early college school and will offer CTE programming in information technology with a focus on healthcare technology solutions. 06M211 will partner with Microsoft, New York- Presbyterian Hospital, and one of the twenty-three colleges within The City University of New York (“CUNY”) school system. CUNY’s mission is to preserve academic excellence and extend higher educational opportunities to a diversified urban population. The CUNY school system is dedicated to providing general, liberal arts career education and continuing education programs relevant to the needs, interests and aspirations of students of all ages. 06M211 will partner with

Microsoft, one of the world's largest technology companies, and New York-Presbyterian Hospital, among the world's largest comprehensive university hospital systems. Classes and internships will emphasize computer information and systems management, as students will train for healthcare technology careers on Microsoft systems for New York-Presbyterian Hospital's operations.

06M211 students will have the opportunity to complete an associate's degree at no cost to themselves or their families. 06M211 students will also have the opportunity to begin earning college credit in ninth through twelfth grade. In addition to Microsoft and New York-Presbyterian Hospital, 06M211 will build a network of strategic partnerships to offer industry-related opportunities to its students. The partnerships supporting 06M211 will facilitate access to career opportunities with some of New York City's most successful companies. The DOE anticipates that students working to earn their associate's degree during the early college program will also be able to earn other industry-recognized certifications.

Over the course of the program, students will complete internships and take off-site classes at one of the twenty-three colleges within the CUNY school system. During their fifth and sixth years in the program, most students will likely not be in the M052 building the majority of the time.

The proposed co-location of 06M211 in building M052 with J.H.S. 052 and HSEI is part of the DOE's central goal to create new school options that will better serve future students and the community at large and to provide another option in the M052 building. This proposal is not expected to impact the enrollment or programs at J.H.S. 052 or HSEI.

J.H.S 052 is an existing district middle school serving students in grades six through eight. J.H.S. 052 enrolls students in three programs: the Environmental and Applied Science Program, which admits students through a zoned admissions method; the Alpha Academy Honors Program, which admits students through a screened admissions method; and the Inwood Visual and Performing Arts Program, which admits students through an audition admissions method. More information on the middle school admissions process is provided in Section III.A below.

HSEI is an existing high school serving students in grades nine through twelve. HSEI admits students aged 15 or 16 who are entering high school for the first time and have a record of being held back at least two times in elementary and/or middle school. HSEI admits students through a limited unscreened admissions method. More information on the high school admissions process is provided in Section III.A below.

If this proposal is approved, 06M211 will open in September 2014 in building M052, where it will be co-located with J.H.S. 052 and HSEI. 06M211 will be open to students through the Citywide High School Admissions Process and will have a limited unscreened admissions method, with priority for students residing in Manhattan. In 2014-2015, 06M211 will enroll approximately 75-85 students in the ninth grade. 06M211 will gradually phase in by adding one grade per year. The school is expected to reach full scale in 2019-2020, when it will serve approximately 450-510 students in grades nine through fourteen. As noted earlier, students in their fifth and sixth years will spend the majority of their time outside of building M052.

In addition, there are two community-based organizations ("CBO") occupying space in the M052 building: Universidad National and Eastside Settlement House. This proposal is not expected to impact the continued siting of these programs.

According to the 2011-2012 Enrollment, Capacity, Utilization Report (the "Blue Book"), M052 has a target capacity to serve 1,207 students. During the 2013-2014 school year, the building serves a total of approximately 759 students, yielding a building utilization rate of approximately 63%. This means that the building is "under-utilized" and has space to accommodate additional students. If this proposal is approved, there will be sufficient space to accommodate 06M211, J.H.S. 052 and HSEI.

In 2019-2020, once 06M211 has fully phased in, there will be approximately 1,175-1,305 students served by all

schools in the building, yielding an estimated building utilization rate of approximately 97%-108% using the DOE's standard calculations. However, this standard utilization rate is likely overstated because it includes 150-170 students in grades thirteen and fourteen at 06M211. As noted above, these students will primarily complete their studies at off-site locations and will only occasionally be in the M052 building. Because building use by students in grades thirteen and fourteen cannot be fully estimated at this time, the utilization rates in this EIS conservatively assume that those students will be served in M052, like all other students enrolled at 06M211. This utilization estimate also overestimates enrollment and utilization in that it presumes that all incoming ninth-grade students will exercise their option to enroll in grades thirteen and fourteen. Therefore, the DOE expects that utilization in the fifth and sixth years of this proposal will be on the lower end of all projected ranges.

The DOE supports parent choice and strives to ensure that all families have access to high-quality schools that meet their children's needs. The co-location of 06M211 will offer new CTE opportunities to families and connect students with an early college educational option that will give students the opportunity to earn an associate's degree free of charge. CTE programs empower students to complete high school and advance to higher education and career-track employment. The DOE strongly believes in the importance of CTE education and supports the opening of a new high school in the M052 building which will offer CTE programming in information technology as well as an early college program. This opportunity is intended to create an option for Manhattan students in their high school years who wish to put themselves on a postsecondary pathway potentially leading to career-track employment within the information technology industry and other post-secondary education and training.

### **Summary of Comments Received at the Joint Public Hearing**

A joint public hearing regarding this proposal was held at building M052 on October 22, 2013. At that hearing, interested parties had an opportunity to provide input on the proposal. Approximately 160 members of the public attended the hearing and 26 people spoke. Present at the meeting were: J.H.S. 052 Inwood Principal Salvador Fernandez; J.H.S. 052 Inwood Assistant Principals Lupe Leon and Luis Tejada; J.H.S. 052 School Leadership Team (“SLT”) representative and Parent Teacher Association President Yuderka Valdez; J.H.S. 052 Inwood SLT representative and UFT chapter leader Zachariah Plotkin, and J.H.S. 052 Inwood SLT representative Blanca Aviles and Rosalba Acosta; High School for Excellence and Innovation Principal Tyona Washington; High School for Excellence and Innovation UFT chapter leader Charles Ivy; High School for Excellence and Innovation SLT representative Lanette Smith; High School for Excellence and Innovation Network Leader Lawrence Pendergast; Community Education Council 6 (“CEC”) representatives Miriam Aristy-Farer, Tory Frye, Yuderka Valdez, and Angela Garces; Panel for Educational Policy member and Manhattan representative Patrick Sullivan; a representative of Manhattan Borough President Scott Stringer, Ingrid Sotelo; New York City Council Member Ydanis Rodriguez; United Federation of Teachers (“UFT”) District 6 representative Mayra Cruz; Manhattan High School Superintendent Anthony Lodico; and Meera Jain from the DOE’s Division of Portfolio Planning.

#### **The following comments and remarks were made at the joint public hearing on October 22, 2013:**

1. Patrick Sullivan, Panel for Educational Policy Manhattan Representative, opposed the proposal and commented as follows:
  - a. I have been appointed by Manhattan Borough President Scott Stringer to serve on the Panel for Educational Policy.
  - b. I am one of the 13 Panel for Educational Policy members that will vote on this proposal.
  - c. The immigrants in this community will tell you what they need and what needs to be done.
  - d. I will vote how you tell me to vote.
  - e. This school belongs to the community.
  - f. The community should have a say in what should be done.
2. Ingrid Sotelo, a representative of Manhattan Borough President Scott Stringer, read a statement on his behalf opposing the proposal:
  - a. I am a proud graduate of J.H.S. 052.
  - b. I have long supported DOE’s expansion of early college high school models to improve academic options and outcomes for City students.
  - c. The DOE has repeatedly failed to engage local communities, leading to strained relationships with families.
  - d. The community has spoken loud and clear: this is the right school, but in the wrong place.
  - e. The community would like J.H.S. 052 to expand to high school which the DOE rejected and refused to engage with the community.
  - f. The DOE should work with the community to better understand their needs and interests.
  - g. The DOE should identify an alternative site for 06M211 so that all schools can grow, thrive and succeed.
3. Ydanis Rodriguez, New York City Council Member commented as follows:
  - a. President Obama supports Pathways in Technology Early College High School and wants the whole nation to follow it.
  - b. I support the CTE/early college high school model, free associate’s degree, and partnerships with Microsoft and New York-Presbyterian Hospital.
  - c. Only 60% of our students graduate from high school and are unprepared for college.
  - d. We have to make a commitment to support and prepare our students for high school, college and beyond.
  - e. Education is a civil rights movement.
  - f. 06M211 is an important model and will be supported by the next administration.
  - g. I support Northern Manhattan getting a school like 06M211 where students get an associate’s degree free of charge and are prepared to have a career.
  - h. I believe the best location for 06M211 is in building M233, not M052.

- i. We can make M233 work for 06M211, even if it doesn't have a gymnasium.
4. Mayra Cruz, UFT District 6 representative, opposed the proposal and commented as follows:
  - a. Everyone has spoken against the proposal and gave reasons why 06M211 should not be co-located in M052.
  - b. For the past four years, the UFT has taken the DOE to arbitration over large class sizes at J.H.S. 052.
  - c. Class sizes were high because parents want to send their children to J.H.S. 052.
  - d. M233 could be a temporary location for 06M211 while the DOE builds a new building.
  - e. This fight is not over and she will make sure that 06M211 is not co-located in M052.
5. Zachariah Plotkin, J.H.S. 052 SLT representative and UFT chapter leader, opposed the proposal and commented as follows:
  - a. 06M211 will admit students through the Citywide High School admissions process, but will not directly benefit Inwood and the Washington Heights communities.
  - b. There is a strong possibility that our space will be taken.
  - c. I don't like how this proposal has been sold to the staff, parents, administration of J.H.S. 052 and community.
  - d. There are severe safety concerns with putting a new school in the building.
  - e. There are logistical and technology issues with this co-location and school model.
  - f. The Tiger marching band is an integral part of the school and community.
  - g. We fear that we will lose the marching band because 06M211 will take its space.
  - h. We have faced numerous budget cuts.
  - i. We have lost programs and will continue to lose programs with this proposal.
  - j. This proposal will impact the educational outcomes of our students.
6. Rosalba Acosta, J.H.S. 052 SLT representative, opposed the proposal and commented as follows:
  - a. Why is the DOE invading our space?
  - b. I'm concerned about safety in the bathrooms with three schools.
  - c. How will we schedule three schools in one cafeteria and auditorium?
  - d. Let J.H.S. 052 grow to serve high school students.
  - e. Why is money being invested in a new school and not J.H.S. 052?
  - f. Our space will be taken away as a result of this proposal.
7. Blanca Aviles, J.H.S. 052 SLT representative, opposed the proposal and commented as follows:
  - a. Why was J.H.S. 052 denied an expansion to high school?
  - b. I'm concerned that this proposal will lead to loss of space and eventual closure of our school.
  - c. How is there money to spend on a new school, but not on our school?
  - d. Why can't the DOE spend those funds on building a new school building?
  - e. I'm concerned about the safety our children mixing with adult aged children.
  - f. 06M211 will not bring their own school safety agents.
8. Charles Ivy, HSEI UFT chapter leader, opposed the proposal and commented as follows:
  - a. This is not the right building for 06M211.
  - b. There are safety issues in this building.
  - c. We already have to share our school safety agents with J.H.S. 052 and will not have enough safety agents for three schools.
  - d. Adding another school to the building will create safety problems.
  - e. How will we share one cafeteria with two other schools?
  - f. If you add a third school to the building, our students will have to wait until 1:30 p.m. to eat lunch.
  - g. How will three schools share the bathrooms in this building?
  - h. The DOE promised us a science lab and more space, but we never got more space.
  - i. We have a great community and adding another school will limit our students' opportunities to succeed.
  - j. I am opposed to this proposal and want 06M211 to go to another building.
  - k. This proposal will deprive our students of educational options.
9. Miriam Aristy-Farer, CEC 6 President, read a statement opposing the proposal:
  - a. Two weeks ago I was in another District 6 auditorium saying the same thing about process, timing, and courtesy that this community has not been given.

- b. J.H.S. 052 is a wonderful nationally accredited school that Brazilian dignitaries visited to learn what they're doing right.
  - c. J.H.S. 052 is one of the best District 6 middle schools and offers many sports and arts programs.
  - d. We are not pleased that the DOE reduced J.H.S. 052's enrollment in the 2012-2013 school year when we need good middle school seats.
  - e. District 6 children were turned away by the DOE although J.H.S. 052 had space to serve them.
  - f. We suspect the DOE reduced J.H.S. 052's enrollment so they could propose a co-location.
  - g. The DOE did not properly engage with the community and schools in M052; their engagement was shady.
  - h. The SLT of J.H.S. 052 does not have any record of conversations with the DOE about this co-location proposal in June 2013.
  - i. Spanish translated documents were provided after English documents were made available; as a result the community did not have the required 45 days to review the proposal before the PEP votes on October 30, 2013.
  - j. Not providing Spanish translated documents to J.H.S. 052 when the student population is 62% ELLs is unacceptable.
  - k. The DOE violated the Open Meetings Law by asking to meet with the CEC 6 president alone on July 23, 2013 to discuss the proposal.
  - l. CEC 6 could not engage with the community until September because schools were closed for summer vacation.
  - m. At the City Council hearing on October 2, Chancellor Walcott agreed that it is unacceptable to provide Spanish translated documents after English documents are provided.
  - n. It is not safe to mix 11-year-old students with 17- or 18-year-old students.
  - o. The schools in M052 know that promises are never met in regards to security support when a co-location happens.
  - p. CEC 6 has a petition against co-locations and received 927 signatures opposing co-location.
  - q. CEC 6 surveyed the community and an overwhelming majority of the responses are against co-locations.
  - r. Why is the DOE ignoring the community as evidenced at the October 15, 2013 PEP?
  - s. The J.H.S. 052 community asked to expand to high school, but never asked for a separate high school.
  - t. 06M211's Citywide High school admissions will force District 6 students to enter a lottery to compete for seats.
  - u. CEC 6 would like a cost analysis of opening a new high school compared to expanding an existing middle school to serve high school students.
  - v. Why can't the DOE site 06M211 in M233 an empty building that is capable of housing 06M211.
  - w. Please listen to what our community is saying and take that into account on October 30.
  - x. The schools in M052 do not want a new high school co-located in their building.
10. Yuderka Valdez, J.H.S. 052 SLT representative, Parent Teacher Association President, and CEC 6 member, opposed the proposal and commented as follows:
- a. The CTE/early college high school model sounds marvelous and offers our students something great.
  - b. However, our students should be offered a four-year college degree, not an associate's degree.
  - c. Why do you have to co-locate 06M211 in this building?
  - d. Co-locations are not good and they do not work.
  - e. How does M052 have underutilized space?
  - f. M052 has underutilized space because our budget has been cut and had to do away with special programs.
  - g. We cannot afford to pay for a dance and culinary arts teacher.
  - h. The DOE tells us not to worry because college students will be at off-site locations.
  - i. The DOE promised us an extra security guard but we never received it.
  - j. High School for Excellence and Innovation needs extra space and will lose it when 06M211 moves in.
  - k. What will happen if the partnership between 06M211 and Microsoft and New York-Presbyterian Hospital ends?
  - l. The Tiger marching band uses rooms on the first floor and those will be given to 06M211.

- m. What will happen to the Tiger marching band program?
  - n. The DOE should help us get a better education, not co-locate another school in M052.
  - o. 06M211 is a technical school that needs good wiring and our building is old and doesn't have good wiring.
  - p. Will the DOE rewire the whole building or just the space that 06M211 occupies?
  - q. The DOE should find another building for 06M211.
11. Tory Frye, CEC 6 member, opposed the proposal and commented as follows:
- a. Patrick Sullivan is the only Panel for Educational Policy member who represents the wishes of parents.
  - b. The CEC has wanted a CTE/early college high school in our district for several years.
  - c. 06M211 will give priority to Manhattan residents and will most likely draw Northern Manhattan residents.
  - d. 06M211 will give students a two-year associate's degree which is admirable and ambitious, but I want more information about that.
  - e. The EIS doesn't provide enough details on the partnerships with Microsoft and New York-Presbyterian and doesn't name the CUNY school partner.
  - f. The EIS states that the CTE program is not accredited.
  - g. The EIS states that students in grades 13-14 will spend time outside of the building, but we know they have to be in the building to meet with advisors.
  - h. There is no evidence of how this program has worked at other schools.
  - i. The career strand offered by 06M211 is a low paying job in comparison to other CTE professions.
  - j. Will the whole building benefit from infrastructure and wiring upgrades?
  - k. The DOE tell us to not worry and to trust them, but we must not trust them.
  - l. We cannot trust the DOE after they have broken many promises and fail to meet the needs of our students.
  - m. How can the Footprint allocate one to two rooms for many different purposes like guidance, records room, college office, parent coordinator, or SETSS?
  - n. The Footprint only gives schools three rooms for administrative services, but that's not enough room for everyone.
  - o. How can so many different activities be stuffed into two or three rooms?
  - p. We know that the schools in M052 will lose their programs as a result of this proposal.
  - q. How can the building utilization rate possibly be at 108%?
  - r. The DOE had to re-site another CTE high school, Mather, after the initial building could not handle the specialized CTE needs of Mather.
12. Angela Garces, CEC 6 member, opposed the proposal and commented as follows:
- a. How is there money to bring a new school to M052 when J.H.S. 052 has had budget cuts?
  - b. I strongly urge the DOE to go back and think of other buildings to co-locate 06M211.
  - c. We support the CTE/early college high school model, but it doesn't belong in M052.
  - d. I don't want my 11-year-old child to share a bathroom with a young adult.
  - e. Why is this being rushed?
13. Lanette Smith, HSEI SLT representative and parent of HSEI student, opposed the proposal and commented as follows:
- a. There is no space in this building for a new school.
  - b. If the DOE says there is excess space in M052, why not split it between the schools that are already here?
  - c. My son is not getting the special services that he needs because we are already crowded.
  - d. We've asked for more space.
  - e. There will be safety issues when younger and older children have to share the bathrooms.
  - f. Will we get additional school safety agents with a third school?
  - g. The schools in the building are very good schools.
  - h. Why will 06M211 get the extra rooms in the building?
  - i. Why doesn't the DOE put 06M211 in District 5 where there are many empty buildings?
  - j. 06M211 sounds like a good school and we will accept it in District 5.

- k. My son travels to District 6 from District 5 because High School for Excellence and Innovation is a good school.
  - l. It's ridiculous that the DOE cannot give us more space.
  - m. The teachers at High School for Excellence and Innovation are doing a good job, but no one mentions that.
14. One commenter asserted that co-locations cause fights and problems that lead to principals not getting along with each other.
  15. Multiple commenters asserted that they are opposed to this proposal.
  16. One commenter expressed that co-location is a form of violence.
  17. Multiple commenters asserted that the DOE ruins school communities through co-location.
  18. One commenter stated that the DOE doesn't care about our children; they only care about doing whatever they want.
  19. One commenter stated that the DOE is attacking the fragility of teaching through this co-location proposal.
  20. One commenter expressed that the DOE doesn't understand what is going in the building.
  21. Multiple commenters stated that they will continue to fight this co-location proposal.
  22. Multiple commenters asserted that that the marching band will cease to exist if 06M211 is co-located in M052.
  23. Multiple commenters expressed the importance of music and arts education for children's development.
  24. Multiple commenters stated that the loss of space for the band program will be a tragedy.
  25. One commenter stated that the DOE support arts and music education, but this proposal will take away the facilities for arts and music.
  26. Multiple commenters applauded the band and arts program at J.H.S. 052.
  27. Multiple commenters stated that the band program is a beautiful arts program and should not be jeopardized.
  28. One commenter inquired if Microsoft could wire another school building for 06M211.
  29. Multiple commenters stated that they don't want children of different ages sharing the bathrooms.
  30. Multiple commenters stated that they don't want their space invaded by a new high school.
  31. Multiple commenters stated that they were promised additional school safety agents, but have not seen this carried through.
  32. Multiple commenters asserted that they are worried about the safety of their children when college-aged students will be in the building.
  33. Multiple commenters expressed concern over scheduling time in shared spaces with three schools.
  34. Multiple commenters stated that J.H.S. 052 is serving the community well and this proposal will undermine their success.
  35. Multiple commenters expressed their appreciation for Principal Fernandez, his leadership team and J.H.S. 052.
  36. One commenter stated that J.H.S. 052 offers a true education that is comparable to ones offered in the suburbs.
  37. Multiple commenters inquired why a new high school was put in M052 when J.H.S. 052 applied to expand to high school.
  38. Multiple commenters stated that the DOE should have approved J.H.S. 052's plan to expand to high school.
  39. Multiple commenters stated that 06M211 is a good program, but doesn't belong in M052.
  40. Multiple commenters stated that the M052 is already overcrowded and cannot accommodate a third school.
  41. Multiple commenters inquired as to who gave permission to co-locate a new school in M052.
  42. Multiple commenters stated that there are other buildings that can house 06M211.
  43. One commenter asserted that the DOE has other schools in District 6 in trailers and that trailers do not work.
  44. One commenter expressed that there is underutilized space in M052 because the DOE put an enrollment cap on J.H.S. 052.
  45. Multiple commenters inquired as to how this proposal will not impact J.H.S. 052's admissions, enrollment, and shared spaces and programming when a third school will be in the building.
  46. One commenter asserted that a new CTE/early college high school is a great model but its co-location will lead to the phase-out of J.H.S. 052.
  47. One commenter asserted that J.H.S. 052 and High School for Excellence and Innovation will be negatively impacted by this proposal.
  48. Multiple commenters stated that the CTE/early college high school should thrive, but not at the expense of other students.
  49. One commenter expressed that the way to keep space is to grow to another grade level.

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

50. A resolution issued by CEC 6 expresses opposition to the siting of any new schools in District 6 and states that CEC 6 will refuse to participate in joint public hearings that are mandated by Chancellor's Regulation A-190.
51. A letter was received at the joint public hearing in opposition to the proposal and commented as follows:
- a. Additional safety agents will be necessary and none were added when HSEI were both co-located in the building.
  - b. Students of different age groups will intermingle in common spaces, restrooms and staircases leading to safety issues.
  - c. Chancellor's Regulations prohibit adults from using student restrooms.
  - d. There will be safety issues and challenges scheduling arrival and dismissal times with the same number of entrances and exits, but with more students in the building.
  - e. Adult students aged 18-20 from 06M211 should not be housed with young children.
  - f. The DOE pits students against each other to negotiate the use of space within the building.
  - g. There is no plan for how the building should be divided.
  - h. M052 is outdated and would not be able to handle the technology needs of another high tech school with an extremely costly upgrade.
  - i. Availability of M052 to the community would be hindered by the addition of another high school.
  - j. Potential over-crowding would lead J.H.S. 052 Inwood students to eat lunch at 9:45 a.m. or 1:30 p.m. which would diminish students' attention, concentration and learning.
  - k. This proposal would cause the loss of dedicated classrooms for the art which include the band, chorus, and art.
  - l. J.H.S. 052 would lose a science lab that is used for the science instruction and the STEM academy.
  - m. J.H.S. 052 was promised upgrades to the lab when High School for Excellence and Innovation moved in, but was never fulfilled.
  - n. J.H.S. 052 would lose partnerships with GE to develop Common Core curriculum and NASA to develop the STEM program.
52. One comment was received via voicemail stating that they don't accept the proposal and don't want the new school in M052.
53. A letter signed by New York City Council Members Ydanis Rodriguez and Robert Jackson, New York State Senator Adriano Espaillat, New York State Assembly Member Gabriela Rosa, and CEC 6 President Miriam Aristy-Farer was received via email and commented as follows:
- a. They support the CTE/early college high school model and want to see it open in District 6.
  - b. However, 06M211 should be sited in building M233, instead of M052.

**Analysis of Issues Raised, Significant Alternatives Proposed and Changes Made to the Proposal**

Comments 1(c), 18, and 43 are unrelated to the proposal and thus do not require a response.

Comments 2(b), 3(a)-3(g), 10(a), 11(b), 11(c), , 53(a) are in support of the CTE/early college high school model, free associate's degree and partnerships with Microsoft, New York-Presbyterian Hospital and CUNY and thus do not require a response.

Comments 4(a), 4(e), 5(c), 6(a), 8(i), 9(x), 10(d), 10(n), 11(k), 11(l), 12(c), 15, 21, 30, 48, and 52 are in general opposition to the co-location proposal.

Given the finite number of buildings available in New York City, the DOE attempts to use all of its school buildings as efficiently as possible. Co-location is therefore very common in New York City schools – with 33% of all DOE buildings housing more than one school organization - as there are not sufficient school buildings to allow each school organization to operate its own building. A co-location means that two or more school organizations are located in the same building. While they share common spaces like auditoriums, gymnasiums, and cafeterias, each school is allocated particular classrooms and spaces for its own students' use. The DOE is confident that the principals in M052 will be able to create a collaborative and mutually respectful environment for all students, staff, and faculty members in the building. There are several structures to facilitate a smooth co-location between the two

schools. Co-located schools on campuses must actively participate in a Building Council, which is a campus structure for administrative decision-making for issues impacting all schools in the building. To the extent that principals are unable to reach agreement upon the use of shared spaces, they may avail themselves of a mediation process outlined in the Campus Policy Memo, which is available at <http://schools.nyc.gov/community/campusgov>.

Although the DOE recognizes that some in the community may have strong feelings against this proposal, the DOE believes that, if this proposal is approved, the school communities in M052 will be able to create productive and collaborative partnerships. The DOE strongly believes in the importance of CTE education and supports the opening of a new high school in the M052 building which will offer Information Technology CTE programming to residents throughout the borough of Manhattan. The DOE has been eager to bring new CTE opportunities to M052 to serve families throughout Manhattan; the co-location of 06M211 will help meet this goal.

Comments 2(a), 9(b), 9(c), 13(g), 13(k), 13(m), 34, 35, and 36 discuss the positive aspects of J.H.S 052, HSEI, their school leadership teams, and their standing in the community. The DOE acknowledges these comments and recognizes the collaborative role that parents and principals partake in developing these schools. In addition, schools throughout the city are not just educational institutions, but rich and tight-knit communities. The DOE expects that all schools will be fully engaged with the community and will continue to play a vital role as anchors for the community. With respect to these comments, the DOE's proposal to co-locate 06M211 in M052 is not intended as a slight against J.H.S 052, HSEI, their leadership, or its communities. Instead, it is intended to provide a new high school option.

Comments 5(a) and 9(t) state that 06M211 will not directly benefit the Inwood and Washington Heights community because it is open to Manhattan residents and students will have to compete for seats through a lottery.

Although 06M211 will not give priority to students from District 6 or the Inwood/Washington Heights community, the location of 06M211 in M052 in Northern Manhattan may draw students from this community and District 6. The DOE strongly believes in the importance of CTE education and supports the opening of a new high school in the M052 building which will offer Information Technology CTE programming to residents throughout the borough of Manhattan. The DOE has been eager to bring new CTE opportunities to M052 to serve families throughout Manhattan; the co-location of 06M211 will help meet this goal. The DOE strives to ensure that all students in New York City have access to a high-quality school at every stage of their education. The co-location of 06M211 in building M052 is intended to provide an additional option to students and families throughout Manhattan. 06M211 will admit students through the Citywide High School Admissions Process and will give priority to students in Manhattan. The Citywide High School Admissions Process is not a lottery and the process is outlined as follows: In New York City, high school admissions is a Citywide choice process, with students ranking up to 12 high school programs in order of preference. In addition to the 12 available programs to which students may apply, they may also apply to up to 8 of the Specialized High Schools requiring the Specialized High School Admissions Test ("SHSAT"), as well as up to 6 studios at LaGuardia High School.

For high school admissions for the 2014-2015 school year, there are two rounds in the High School Admissions Process:

**Round One:** All eighth-grade and interested first-time ninth-grade students participate in this round. All students, including applicants to the Specialized High Schools, will receive match results in March.

**Round Two:** All eighth-grade and first-time ninth-grade students are eligible to apply to school programs in Round Two. Any student who does not receive a match in Round One must apply to the available school programs in Round Two to be matched to a choice made on the application. In addition, any student who received a match in Round One may reapply to available programs in Round Two. A student who participates in Round Two and has already received a Round One match will have his or her Round One match nullified if the student receives a match in Round Two. The available programs for Round Two include school programs with remaining seats and new schools that will open the following September. Students will receive Round Two results in May.

Comments 5(d), 7(e), 8(b), 8(d), 9(n), 10(h), 11(g), 32, 51(b), and 51(e) relate to general safety concerns with a third school in the building and that students of different age groups should not be co-located in one building together.

Due to space limitations, it is not unusual for varying grade levels to be co-located in a building together. There are successful examples of mixed grade co-located school buildings or campuses in New York City.

Across New York City, these examples include:

- The Julia Richman Educational Complex, which houses four small high schools, a K-8 school, and a District 75 program;
- Building M092 currently houses three schools: St. Hope Leadership Academy Charter School, a charter middle school serving students in grades fifth through eighth, P.S. 92, a district elementary school which serves students in grades kindergarten through five, and Democracy Prep Charter School, a charter high school serving students in grades nine through twelve.
- Building K324 currently houses three schools: M.S. 267, an existing middle school serving students in grades sixth through eighth, La Cima Charter school, a charter elementary school serving students in grades kindergarten through five, and Bedford Stuyvesant Collegiate, an existing charter secondary school, which is currently in the process of growing to serve students in grades five through twelve. Members of the building council worked together to secure financing from KaBOOM to resurface the schoolyard and playground for all of the children at K324.

If this proposal is approved, all schools will develop a safety and security plan for M052 prior to the first day of school in September 2014.

Pursuant to Chancellor's Regulation A-414, every school/campus is mandated to form a School Safety Committee, which is responsible for developing a comprehensive School Safety Plan that defines the normal operations of the site and what procedures are in place in the event of an emergency. The School Safety Plan is updated annually by the Committee to meet the changing security needs, changes in organization and building conditions and any other factors; these updates could also be made at any other time when it is necessary to address security concerns. The School Safety Plan is evaluated by NYPD for certification. The Committee will also address safety matters on an ongoing basis and make appropriate recommendations to the Principal(s) when it identifies the need for additional security measures. Additionally, the Borough Safety Director will assist the campus principals with any safety concerns, internally and externally, and will provide additional support when available.

The Office of Safety and Youth Development ("OSYD") will regularly monitor the campus schools' DOE incident data and the NYPD building crime data for spiking trends. When there is evidence of spikes in incidents and crime, OSYD will schedule a review of the data with representatives from all the co-located schools and follow up with a safety walk or a full comprehensive safety assessment to identify areas of concern and re-establish safety and security systems for the campus, as appropriate. The DOE makes available the following supports to schools relating to safety and security:

- Providing "Best Practices Standards for Creating and Sustaining a Safe and Supportive School," as a resource guide;
- Reviewing and monitoring school occurrence data and crime data (in conjunction with the Criminal Justice Coordinator and the New York City Police Department);
- Providing technical assistance via the Borough Safety Directors when incidents occur;
- Providing professional development and support to Children's First Network ("CFN") Safety Liaisons;
- Providing professional development and kits for Building Response Teams; and
- Monitoring and certifying School Safety Plans annually.

Comment 51(d) asserts that there are specific safety concerns around entry and exit.

Several buildings in the city that are co-located with both district and/or charter schools have to make similar plans for arrival and dismissal times based on building configuration. M052 has multiple entrances and exits and this

building configuration would allow each school to have separate entrances and exits, or the schools could use one entrance and exit and stagger their students' arrival and dismissal times. The final decision on how to appropriately schedule arrival and dismissal times given the multiple entrances and exits in M052 resides with the Building Council.

Pursuant to Chancellor's Regulation A-414, every school/campus is mandated to form a School Safety Committee, which is responsible for developing a comprehensive School Safety Plan that defines the normal operations of the site and what procedures are in place in the event of an emergency. The leaders/designee of 06M211, J.H.S. 052 and HSEI will be part of the M052 School Safety Committee. They will participate in the development of the building's School Safety Plan and ensure that issues or needs, such as planning arrival and dismissal times given the building configuration, that may arise with respect to the co-location of 06M211 in M052 will be addressed on an ongoing basis. The School Safety Plan is updated annually by the Committee to meet changing security needs, changes in organization and building conditions and any other factors; these updates could also be made at any other time when it is necessary to address security concerns.

Comments 7(f), 8(c), 9(o), 10(i), 13(f), 31, and 51(a) assert that there are specific safety concerns around a perceived lack of school safety agents in M052 and/or assert that when HSEI was re-sited to M052 from M856, the building was not allocated more school safety agents.

The NYPD's School Safety Division looks at a set of variables to determine the number of SSAs to deploy to a particular school building, including the crime rate, size and design of the building, enrollment, and grade span. If this proposal is approved, additional SSAs may be allocated to M052, but as stated above, that decision will be made by the NYPD's School Safety Division, not solely by the DOE. The Office of School and Youth Development ("OSYD") supports schools in maintaining a safe, orderly, and supportive school environment. OSYD works directly with Children's First Network Safety Liaisons and schools to establish and implement integrated safety, discipline and intervention policies and procedures, to promote respect for diversity, and to nurture students' pro-social behavior by providing them with meaningful opportunities for social-emotional learning. We encourage all schools, including those in M052, to seek support from OSYD to address any issues involving safety and security, including gang-related issues. School Safety Agents ("SSAs") are allocated to schools based on each building's projected enrollment. OSYD received one request in September 2013 from the principals in M052 for additional SSAs, but there was no need identified for additional SSAs at that time, and the request was denied.

In regard to comment 11(q) about the building utilization rate, as described in the Blue Book, which is available at [http://www.nycsca.org/Community/CapitalPlanManagementReportsData/Enrollment/2011-2012\\_Classic.pdf](http://www.nycsca.org/Community/CapitalPlanManagementReportsData/Enrollment/2011-2012_Classic.pdf), a building's target utilization rate is calculated by dividing the aggregated enrollment of all school organizations in the building by the aggregated "target capacities" of those organizations. Each school organization's "target capacity" is calculated based upon the scheduled use of individual rooms as reported by principals during an annual facilities survey, the DOE's goals for maximum classroom capacities (which are lower than the United Federation of Teachers ("UFT") contractual class sizes and differ depending on grade level), and the efficiency with which classrooms are programmed (i.e., the frequency with which classes are scheduled in a given classroom).

The most recent year for which target capacity has been calculated for buildings is 2011-2012. As described earlier in this EIS, the DOE's projected utilization rates for the 2013-2014 school year and beyond are based on the 2011-2012 target capacity, which assumes that the components underlying that target capacity (scheduled use of classrooms, maximum classroom capacity, etc.) remain constant. Thus, projected utilization rates for 2013-2014 and beyond provide only an approximation of a building's usage because each of the factors underlying target capacity may be adjusted by principals from year to year to better accommodate students' needs. For example, changing the use of a room from an administrative room to a homeroom at the high school level will increase a building's overall target capacity because for high schools administrative rooms are not assigned a capacity. Holding enrollment constant, this change will result in a lower utilization rate. Similarly, if a room previously used as a kindergarten classroom is subsequently used as a fifth grade classroom, the building's target capacity will increase because we expect that a fifth grade class will have more students than a kindergarten class. This is reflected in the fact that the

DOE’s goal for maximum classroom capacity is higher for fifth grade classrooms than for kindergarten classrooms. In this example, as well, assuming enrollment is constant, the utilization rate will decrease.

There is sufficient space in M052 for all three schools. According to the 2011-2012 Enrollment, Capacity, Utilization Report (“Blue Book”), M052 has a target capacity to serve 1,207 students. During the 2013-2014 school year, the building serves a total of approximately 759 students, yielding a building utilization rate of 63%. This means that the building is “underutilized” and has space to accommodate additional students. In 2019-2020, the final year of 06M211’s phase-in, there will be approximately 1,175-1,305 students served by all schools in the building, yielding an estimated building utilization rate of approximately 97%-108% using the DOE’s standard calculations. However, this standard utilization rate is likely overstated because it includes 150-170 students in grades thirteen and fourteen at 06M211. These students will primarily complete their studies at off-site locations and will only occasionally be in the M052 building. Because building use by students in grades thirteen and fourteen cannot be fully estimated at this time, the utilization rates in this EIS conservatively assume that those students will be served in M052, like all other students enrolled at 06M211. This utilization estimate also overestimates enrollment and utilization in that it presumes that all incoming ninth-grade students will exercise their option to enroll in grades thirteen and fourteen. Therefore, the DOE expects that utilization in the fifth and sixth years of this proposal will be on the lower end of all projected ranges.

Comments 5(b), 6(f), 10(e), 10(f), 10(j), 11(m), 11(n), 11(o), 13(a), 13(b), 13(c), 13(d), 13(h), 13(l), 40, and 51(g) assert that the building cannot accommodate three schools and that their space will be impacted as a result of this proposal.

There are currently hundreds of schools in buildings across the City that are co-located; some of these co-locations are multiple DOE schools while others are DOE and public charter schools sharing space. In all cases, allocation of classroom, resource, and administrative space is guided by the Citywide Instructional Footprint (the “Footprint”) which is applied to all schools in the building. The DOE seeks to fully utilize all its building capacity to serve students. The DOE does not distinguish between students attending public charter schools and students attending district schools. In all cases, the DOE seeks to provide high quality education and allow parents/students to choose where to attend school.

The Footprint is the guide used to allocate space to all schools based on the number of class sections the school programs and the grade levels of the school. The number of class sections at each school is determined by the Principal based on enrollment, budget, and student needs; there is a standard guideline of target class size (i.e., number of students in a class section) for each grade level.

For grades six through twelve, the Footprint assumes that students move from class to class and that classrooms should be programmed at maximum efficiency. The Footprint does not require that every teacher have his or her own designated classroom. Principals are asked to program their schools efficiently so that classrooms can be used for multiple purposes throughout the course of the school day. The full text of the Instructional Footprint is available at [http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/78D715EA-EC50-4AD1-82D1-1CAC544F5D30/0/DOEFOOTPRINTSConsolidatedVersion2011\\_FINAL.pdf](http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/78D715EA-EC50-4AD1-82D1-1CAC544F5D30/0/DOEFOOTPRINTSConsolidatedVersion2011_FINAL.pdf)

As shown in the table below, during and after 06M211 completes its phase-in, there is anticipated to be excess space in M052:

| DBN    | School Name                               | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 | 2019-2020 |
|--------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 06M052 | J.H.S. 052 Inwood                         | 19        | 19        | 19        | 19        | 19        | 19        | 19        |
| 06M423 | High School for Excellence and Innovation | 9         | 9         | 9         | 9         | 9         | 9         | 9         |
| 06M211 | New CTE/ Early College School             | N/A       | 3         | 6         | 9         | 12        | 13        | 14        |

|  |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| <b>TOTAL</b>   | <b>28</b> | <b>31</b> | <b>34</b> | <b>37</b> | <b>40</b> | <b>41</b> | <b>42</b> |
| <b>ROOMS IN EXCESS OF (OR UNDER) BASELINE OR ADJUSTED<br/>BASELINE ALLOCATION OF FULL-SIZE INSTRUCTIONAL<br/>ROOMS</b> | <b>20</b> | <b>17</b> | <b>14</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>8</b>  | <b>7</b>  | <b>6</b>  |

The assignment of specific rooms and location for each in the building, including those for use in serving students with IEPs or special education needs, will be made in consultation with the Principals of each school and the Office of Space Planning if the proposal is approved. The Office of Space Planning will work with the Building Council to ensure an equitable allocation of the excess space. In determining an equitable allocation, the Office of Space Planning may consider factors such as the relative enrollments of the co-located schools, the instructional and programmatic needs of the co-located schools, and the physical location of the excess space within the building.

Comments 5(f), 5(g), 10(l), 10(m), 11(p), 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 51(k) discuss the proposal’s alleged potential impact on the music and arts program at J.H.S. 052. The DOE commends the accomplishments of the students and staff at J.H.S. 052 and does not anticipate that the co-location will impact the ability of J.H.S. 052 to offer a wide range of programs and support the needs of all students. J.H.S. 052 currently occupies and uses three specialized performing arts rooms - a dance room, band room, and chorus room, all of which are on the first floor. The DOE does not anticipate that any of J.H.S. 052’s specialized arts programming, such as the dance program, marching band, or chorus will be affected by this co-location because the DOE will not allocate any of these performing arts rooms on the first floor to 06M211 or any other schools in the building. These performing arts rooms will remain with J.H.S. 052 through the phase-in of 06M211. Because J.H.S. 052 will retain these specialized performing arts rooms on the first floor of M052, this proposal is not expected to impact their performing arts instruction.

In regard to comments 5(i) and 51(n), J.H.S. 052 and HSEI will continue to offer extra-curricular programs and partnerships based on student interests, available resources, and staff support for those programs and partnerships. The proposed co-location will not impact those opportunities, but it may change the way those programs are configured. For example, some activities may need to share classroom space or the scheduling of these activities may change as a result of greater demands on the available space during or after school hours. Students will continue to have the opportunity to participate in a variety of extra-curricular programs, though the specific programs offered at a given school are always subject to change. As mentioned in the EIS, there are currently two CBOs occupying space in the M052 building: Universidad National and Eastside Settlement House. This proposal is not expected to impact the continued siting of these programs.

In regard to comments 5(j), 8(k), 45, and 47, as stated in the EIS, the proposed co-location of 06M211 is not expected to impact the future admissions of students, enrollment, educational options, or special programming, of students currently attending J.H.S. 052 or HSEI. Both schools will continue to be allocated sufficient space to maintain current enrollment levels in the future and to provide current and future students with the programming they are receiving now according to the Instructional Footprint, as described above.

In regard to comments 8(h), 51(l), and 51(m) about the science facilities in M052 and upgrades to science labs, M052 currently has three science demonstration rooms that are used by J.H.S. 052 and HSEI. Two science demo rooms are currently used by J.H.S. 052 and one science demonstration room is currently used by HSEI. If this proposal is approved, the Office of Space Planning will work with all three schools to ensure that each school has access to the science demonstration rooms in order to meet the state mandated science requirements. According to the School Construction Authority and Division of School Facilities, the science demonstration rooms are in good condition and do not require upgrades at this time.

In regard to comments 14, 16, 17, 19, and 51(f) which suggest that co-locations pit schools against one another and destroy school communities, co-locations allow us to use our limited facilities efficiently while simultaneously creating additional educational options for New York City families. This is necessary because we have scarce resources and a demand for more options. There are examples of schools buildings in which district school

principals have collaborated together to meet the needs of all students served in the building. For example, in District 6, P.S. 128 Audubon and Castle Bridge School, two district elementary schools co-located in M128, have collaborated on a new gardening project in Highbridge Park and both schools enjoyed a performance by a visiting band. Although the DOE recognizes that some in the community may have strong feelings against this proposal, the DOE believes that, if this proposal is approved, the school communities in M052 will be able to create productive and collaborative partnerships.

In regard to comment 50, the DOE evaluates space across all buildings and believes that the co-location of 06M211 in M052 is the best use of its underutilized space. Despite CEC 6's resolution, the DOE continues to welcome their active participation in future joint public hearings.

Comments 3(h) 3(i), 4(d), 9(v), and 53(b) assert that 06M211 should open in building M233, not M052.

Building M233 located at 601 West 183<sup>rd</sup> Street, New York, New York 10033 in District 6 does not have sufficient space for 06M211. M233 has only 10 full-size rooms. At scale, 06M211 will need 14 full-size rooms. Thus, there is not sufficient space in M233 for 06M211 at scale.

Comments 2(d), 2(g), 7(d), 8(a), 8(j), 10(c), 10(q), 12(b), 13(i), 13(j), 39, and 42 suggest that 06M211 be sited in another building or that the DOE build a new building for it.

The DOE partners with the School Construction Authority ("SCA") to provide new construction and renovation projects across all of New York City's public schools. Part of SCA's work includes evaluating and projecting future needs for new capacity and identifying suitable construction sites where necessary, particularly given the space constraints of New York City. The DOE evaluates space across all buildings and believes that the co-location of 06M211 in M052 is the best use of its underutilized space. Therefore, the DOE has proposed to co-locate a new district early college/CTE school in M052 and create more educational options without requiring new construction.

Unfortunately, the DOE does not have the space and funds to construct a new building for every new school. Co-location is therefore very common in New York City schools – of all district schools, approximately two-thirds are co-located with another school, most with another district school – as there are not sufficient school buildings to allow each school organization to operate its own building. Although the DOE recognizes that people in the community may have strong feelings against this proposal, the DOE is confident that the principals in M052 will be able to create a collaborative and mutually respectful environment for all students, staff, and faculty members in the building if this proposal is approved.

In regard to comment 28 about Microsoft wiring another building for 06M211, Microsoft is one of the lead industry partners and is not responsible for facilities upgrades to DOE buildings.

Comments 2(e), 6(d), 7(a), 9(s), 37, 38, and 49 question why J.H.S. 052 was not approved to expand to serve high school grades.

The Office of New Schools manages the process for determining any changes to schools' current grade levels. Reconfigurations include either the expansion or truncation of grade levels served at a school and may be initiated by Portfolio or the school that wishes to reconfigure. All grade reconfigurations are assessed via the following decision factors: school quality, physical space, demographic need, impact on enrollment, and community input.

In 2012-2013, J.H.S. 052 submitted a grade reconfiguration application to expand from serving grades six through eight to serve six through twelve beginning in 2014-2015. After reviewing J.H.S. 052's application, ONS determined that the school did not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate the ability to implement a high-quality six through twelve school and was denied an expansion. The DOE recognizes that J.H.S. 052 is serving students in grades six through eight well, and believes the school will be most successful by continuing to focus on serving that population well.

The DOE was able to propose a standalone high school as there was sufficient excess space in the building. The

DOE strongly believes in the importance of CTE education and supports the opening of a new high school in the M052 building which will offer CTE programming in information technology as well as an early college program. This opportunity is intended to create an option for Manhattan students in their high school years who wish to put themselves on a postsecondary pathway potentially leading to career-track employment within the information technology industry and other post-secondary education and training. The DOE believes that the opening and co-location of 06M211 is the best use of space at M052.

Comments 4(b), 4(c), 9(d), 9(e), 9(f), and 44 relate to enrollment caps and class sizes at J.H.S. 052 and HSEI and the impact of enrollment changes on school budgets.

In New York City, schools are funded through a per pupil allocation. That is, funding “follows” the students and is weighted based on students’ grade level and need (incoming proficiency level and special education/ELL/Title I status). Principals have discretion over their budget and make choices about how to prioritize their resources, including programming the number of classes needed for each grade. Class size is a reflection of student enrollment trends, and is affected by how principals program the number of classes needed for each grade. As outlined in the EIS, the DOE anticipates that J.H.S. 052 and HSEI will maintain similar levels of enrollment if this proposal is approved and has not planned to strategically reduce enrollment at either school.

Over the last several years, J.H.S. 052’s enrollment has declined; between 2008-2009 and 2012-2013, J.H.S. 052’s enrollment has declined by 345 students or 38%. This has not been due to any plan or proposal implemented by the DOE, but rather, reflects reduced demand for the school.

Further, claims that the DOE capped J.H.S. 052’s enrollment in previous years are incorrect. In 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, J.H.S. 052 applied to the DOE to cap its middle school enrollment, but the DOE denied the cap given that J.H.S. 052 had space to serve more students. With regard to the arbitrations identified by one commenter, those were resolved in accordance with the collective bargaining agreement in place between the DOE and UFT.

In regard to comment 51(i), as stated in the EIS, this proposal is not expected to impact the ability of community members and organizations to obtain school building use permits at M052.

Comments 10(k), 11(e), and 11(f) inquired why more details about 06M211 were not included in the EIS.

As discussed in the EIS, each program at 06M211 is developed and administered in close collaboration with CUNY, Microsoft and New York-Presbyterian Hospital. Under standard practice for schools with this model, it is understood the Microsoft and New York-Presbyterian Hospital will facilitate connection to employment opportunities with its member agencies. All courses offered for college credit at 06M211 must be developed and approved by CUNY faculty, approved through CUNY governance, and listed in the course catalogue of the CUNY campus that partners with the 06M211. All instructors of college level courses must meet relevant academic requirements and are subject to the approval of the relevant department chairperson in consultation with 06M211’s principal. In some instances, high school teachers may meet the requirements for college level instruction. If this proposal is approved, the school leadership team of 06M211 will collaborate with the Office of New Schools, during the New Schools Intensive, a six-month training and preparation program and the Office of Postsecondary Readiness to refine specific programming details as the school grows to scale. In the unlikely event that the partnership with Microsoft and New York-Presbyterian Hospital dissolves, the DOE would recruit replacement partners for 06M211.

06M211’s program is “in development” and has not yet earned SED approval. Students in 06M211 will receive instruction in an industry-related area and will have the opportunity to graduate from high school with industry-specific competencies and skills that lead to post-secondary education, further industry training, and/or entry into the workforce. Students in these programs receive instruction in CTE content, but cannot receive CTE-endorsed diplomas unless the programs are approved by the time they graduate. Regardless of program approval status, schools with the capacity to prepare students for an industry-certified exam can continue to do so. The DOE supports all CTE programs through the program approval process, which includes an initial self-assessment and

formal self-evaluation followed by external review and submission to SED, which ultimately confers the approval. Although the SED will not approve programs until they are serving all four high school grades, the DOE is committed to securing approval of this program by the time the initial cohort of students reaches graduation.

In regard to comment 11(h), one CTE/early college high school, Pathways in Technology Early College High School, opened in 2011-2012 and two others, Health, Education and Research Occupations High School and Energy Tech High School, opened in 2013-2014. Although all three schools have not yet received a 2011-2012 progress report grade, Pathways in Technology Early College High School earned a 2011-2012 Progress Report found on the DOE's website: [http://schools.nyc.gov/OA/SchoolReports/2011-12/Progress\\_Report\\_2012\\_HS\\_K122.pdf](http://schools.nyc.gov/OA/SchoolReports/2011-12/Progress_Report_2012_HS_K122.pdf). The 2011-2012 Progress Report shows that 96% of students at Pathways in Technology Early College High School earned 10 or more credits in their first year, putting the school in the 93<sup>rd</sup> percentile in Brooklyn and the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile Citywide. Furthermore, the average responses from parents, teachers and students at Pathways in Technology Early College High School on four measures (academic expectations, communication, engagement, and safety and respect) in the 2012-2013 NYC Learning Environment Survey were all higher than the Citywide average for high schools, suggesting that parents, teachers, and students are satisfied with Pathways in Technology Early College High School. President Obama visited Pathways in Technology Early College High School on October 25, 2013 and hailed the CTE/early college high school model as a national model for replication.

In regard to comment 11(r), beginning in the 2014-2015 school year, Mather high school will be re-sited because the school offered a career strand that required specialized labs, and the school's partner later concluded that the school's initial site could not support those labs. The DOE is confident that the infrastructure in M052 can support the career strand that will be offered at 06M211.

Comments 1(e), 1(f), 2(c), 2(f), 9(a), 9(g), 9(h), 9(r), 9(w), and 41 concern engagement with the District 6 community about this proposal.

The DOE is committed to engaging with the community for all proposals to implement a significant change in school utilization, as detailed in Chancellor's Regulation A-190. Chancellor's Regulation A-190 sets out the public review and comment process that the DOE undertakes with respect to all such proposals by the Chancellor, including co-locations. The DOE appreciates all feedback from the community regarding a proposal.

Engagement with the District 6 community began well before the EIS was posted. On April 11, 2013, representatives from the Office of Portfolio Management met with J.H.S. 052's School Leadership Team and Network Leader to discuss their grade reconfiguration application and the possibility of siting a new, standalone high school in M052, in the event that their grade reconfiguration application was denied. The DOE also notified HSEI's principal of these possibilities on June 19, 2013. After the Office of New Schools notified J.H.S. 052 that they were not approved to expand to serve high school grades on July 22, 2013, representatives from the Office of Portfolio Management communicated with J.H.S. 052, HSEI, their Network Leaders, and the District 6 and High School Superintendents about the anticipated proposal to use excess space in M052 for 06M211. On July 30 and August 9, 2013, representatives from the Office of Portfolio Management communicated with CEC 6 about the proposal. Throughout July and August, representatives from the Office of Portfolio Management continued to communicate with the principals in M052, their Network Leaders, the District 6 and High School Superintendents, and CEC 6 about the proposal. On August 15, 2013, representatives from the Office of Portfolio Management attended a CEC 6 meeting to discuss the proposal with the CEC 6 and members of the community who were in attendance. On September 17, 2013, representatives of the Office of Portfolio Management met with the SLTs of J.H.S. 052 and HSEI, along with a CEC 6 representative, to discuss the proposal and encouraged the SLTs to share the information presented at the meeting with their larger communities.

When the EIS was issued on September 13, 2013, they were made available to the staff, faculty and parents at J.H.S. 052, HSEI and CEC 6, on the DOE's Web site and in J.H.S. 052 and HSEI's main office. In addition, the DOE dedicated a proposal-specific website, voicemail and email address to collect feedback on this proposal. Furthermore, all schools' staff, faculty, and parent communities were invited to the Joint Public Hearing to provide further feedback.

Although the DOE recognized that some members in the community oppose this proposal, the DOE believes that, if this proposal is approved, the schools communities in M052 will be able to create productive and collaborative partnerships.

In regard to comments 9(l), 9(p), and 9(q), the timeline for this proposal did not prevent CEC 6 from further engaging the community, and we encouraged CEC 6 to do as they saw fit. The proposal was posted on September 13, 2013, after the start of the school year, and well in advance of the PEP vote on October 30, 2013. In addition several weeks before the EIS was posted the DOE made the CEC aware of this anticipated proposal, providing additional time for CEC 6 to perform significant community outreach.

In regard to comment 9(k), it is not unusual for the Office of Portfolio Management or the DOE to contact the CEC President as a primary touch point and representative for the larger Council. The DOE expects that anything discussed with the President would and should be shared with the remainder of the Council. This means of communication complies with mandates in the Open Meetings Law. Also, the DOE's presentation on these proposals on August 15, 2013 did take place in the context of the Council's public meeting which also complies with mandates in the Open Meetings Law.

Comments 9(i), 9(j), and 9(m) relate to the availability of translated Spanish documents related to the proposal. The DOE encourages all families and community members to participate in these processes and support their schools. To facilitate the involvement of Spanish-speaking families, the DOE provided Spanish versions of the notice of joint public hearing for building M052 to J.H.S. 052, HSEI and CEC 6 on September 13, 2013, which is the same day that English versions were distributed. On September 20, 2013, the DOE provided a Spanish version of the parent letter to J.H.S 052, HSEI and CEC 6. On October 8, 2013, the DOE provided a Spanish version of the EIS to J.H.S. 052, HSEI and CEC 6. The EIS and public notice in English and Spanish, and this analysis of public comment, were posted on the DOE's Web site at: <http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/leadership/PEP/publicnotice/2013-2014/Oct30SchoolProposals>

In addition, the DOE has offered translation services at the joint public hearing and translation services will also be available for community members at the PEP vote where there will be a vote regarding this proposal.

Comments 5(h), 6(e), 7(c), 9(u), 10(g), and 12(a) pertain to funding at J.H.S. 052 and new district schools. The DOE funds schools through a per pupil allocation. That is, funding "follows" the students and is weighted based on students' grade level and need (incoming proficiency level and special education/ELL/Title I status). If a school's population declines from 2,500 to 2,000 students, the school's budget decreases proportionally—just as a school with an increase in students receives more money. Even if the Department of Education had a budget surplus, a school with declining student enrollment would still receive less per pupil funding each year enrollment falls. Between 2008-2009 and 2012-2013, J.H.S. 052's enrollment has declined by 345 students or 38%, which resulted in a decrease in Fair Student Funding. Further, this means that the opening and funding of a new school has no bearing on the funding available to other schools.

New district schools are provided with a fixed per-school allocation and a variable per-pupil allocation of funds to cover start-up other than personal services ("OTPS") costs. Based on current one-time allocations for new schools, 06M211 will receive a fixed allocation of \$80,000 and approximately \$35,625-\$40,375 in new school OTPS start-up per-pupil allocations during its first year. In addition, 06M211's basic operating budget will be determined by the Fair Student Funding ("FSF") formula used at all other New York City district public schools. Most funding in schools' budgets is allocated on a per pupil basis, based on current by the FSF per capita allocation levels. Schools receive additional funds for students with disabilities, ELLs, and those with other supplemental academic needs.

Please refer to the FSF Guide and FY14 School Allocation Memoranda below for additional information on cost of instruction and how the changes to FSF funding and other school allocations will be impacted as a result of register changes at 06M211.

The FSF Guide is available at:

[http://schools.nyc.gov/offices/d\\_chanc\\_oper/budget/dbor/allocationmemo/fy13\\_14/FY14\\_PDF/sam01\\_1c.pdf](http://schools.nyc.gov/offices/d_chanc_oper/budget/dbor/allocationmemo/fy13_14/FY14_PDF/sam01_1c.pdf)

The FY14 School Allocation Memoranda are available at:

[http://schools.nyc.gov/offices/d\\_chanc\\_oper/budget/dbor/allocationmemo/fy13\\_14/FY14\\_PDF/sam21.pdf](http://schools.nyc.gov/offices/d_chanc_oper/budget/dbor/allocationmemo/fy13_14/FY14_PDF/sam21.pdf)

In addition, schools with CTE programs receive funds related to the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act (“VTEA”). VTEA federal funds are used to improve career and technical education programs designed to prepare students to work in high-skill, high-wage, high-demand careers. Currently all programs, approved or not yet approved, are eligible for these funds. After June 2014, programs that serve all grades nine through twelve must have earned SED approval to remain eligible for VTEA funding. As SED approval is necessary for VTEA funding eligibility, 06M211 will have to receive SED approval for its CTE programs in order to apply for and receive VTEA funding following its fourth year of operation.

Comments 6(c), 8(e), 8(f), 33, and 51(j) concern the shared space scheduling in the building with particular concern for the cafeteria.

The specific shared space schedule will be agreed on by the Building Council if the PEP approves this proposal. As per the Campus Policy Memo 2011, co-located schools on campuses must actively participate in a Building Council, which is a campus structure for administrative decision-making for issues impacting all schools in the building. The Building Council meets at least once a month to discuss and resolve issues related to the smooth daily operation of all schools in the building and the safety of the students they serve. The Building Council makes decisions about overall use of the shared space and shared space schedules including the use of the cafeteria and scheduling of lunch periods for students in each co-located school organization. The Building Council principals, where applicable, communicate their decisions campus-wide to staff, students and parents, especially for issues of safety, shared space, campus schedules, split-staff agreements and extended facility use. If the principals are unable to agree upon a schedule for shared spaces, there is a mediation process outlined in the Campus Policy Memo, which is available at <http://schools.nyc.gov/community/campusgov>.

In regard to the comments 6(b), 8(g), 12(d), 13(e), 29, and 51(c) about students of different age groups sharing bathrooms, the toilet facilities in M052 exist on each floor of the building in such a way that the three schools in M052 could split and share appropriately. In many buildings where schools are co-located, each school is assigned bathrooms on the floors or hallways of their classrooms and specific stairways for students to use. These measures are taken to cultivate cohesive cultures within each school. Separation between schools is intended to limit any issues that might arise from groups of students who may not know each other well and to nurture school unity. The intention is not to be punitive to any one group of students. If the assignment of specific bathrooms is not working or is inadequate, the Building Council may discuss alternative arrangements. Those enrolled at 06M211 will be DOE students throughout the six years of their enrollment, so there can be no issue with them using student restrooms.

Comment 5(e), 10(o), 10(p), 11(j), and 51(h) expresses concern that building M052 does not have adequate internet service and electrical power to accommodate a new high school whose CTE strand will be information technology.

The School Construction Authority, Division of School Facilities, and the Office of Space Planning, believe that M052 has the capacity to support all three schools’ technology needs. Projects proposed in the capital plan that will benefit all the schools in M052 include an auxiliary signal/bell system, fire alarm system, public address system, cafeteria lighting, local sound system and floor finish.

Completed facilities upgrades to the M052 building include:

- Classroom connectivity project that ensures that Wi-Fi and internet are made available in all classrooms of the building
- New telephone and intercom systems
- Cafeteria, multi-purpose room, and library upgrades
- Low voltage electrics systems construction

Comments 1(a), 1(b), 1(d), and 11(a), discuss the Panel for Educational Policy. The Panel for Educational Policy consists of 13 appointed members and the Chancellors. Each borough president appoints one member and the mayor appoints the remaining eight. Patrick Sullivan has served on the Panel for Educational Policy since his appointment by Manhattan Borough President Scott M. Stringer in June of 2007. The members of the Panel for Educational Policy perform duties and have responsibilities assigned to them by Education Law 2590-g, which include voting on proposals for significant changes in school utilization such as this one.

Comments 7(b) and 46 suggest that this proposal aims to close J.H.S. 052. As stated in the EIS, this proposal is for the co-location of a new district early college/CTE school. This proposal will not close or phase-out J.H.S. 052. The DOE has no plans to close, phase-out, or otherwise reduce enrollment at J.H.S. 052.

Comment 10 (b), 11(d), and 11(i) suggest that the early college/CTE programming of the proposed new school will not achieve the intended goals of college readiness and industry employment.

The proposed school's model is designed to be an option for students interested in early participation in the information technology industry, and specifically, the healthcare information technology field, and the opportunity to earn an associate's degree free of charge. The DOE believes that providing students with the opportunity to graduate from high school with industry-specific competencies and skills will lead to post-secondary education, further industry training and/or entry into the workforce. This model is not intended to limit students' options to workforce entry or an associate's degree, but rather put them on the path to those and many more options, which could include four-year colleges and other post-secondary educational options. Further, 06M211 will prepare students for a variety of careers in the information technology sector including: network and computer system administrators (median income: \$88,000), computer user support specialist (median income: \$57,000), and network support specialist (median income: \$73,000).

In regard to comment 12(e), these proposals represent a continuation of DOE's strategy to increase access to high quality schools in communities that need better options for the 2014-2015 school year. This timeline is not new. The PEP already approved 23 proposals for September 2014 implementation during the May and June PEP meetings. The development of these 2014-2015 proposals reflects our extensive strategic planning to advance our proven strategy of bringing high quality district and charter schools online, as well as our desire to allow the maximum allotment of time for communities and educators to work towards their successful implementation.

Forward planning allots more time for:

- School/leaders to meet each other; and
- OSP to plan school placement and implement any needed facilities upgrades; and
- Charters to submit proposals for facilities matching; and
- Division of Facilities to review and conduct work on approved proposals.

### **Changes Made to the Proposal**

No changes have been made to the proposal in response to public feedback.