

### **Public Comment Analysis**

Date: March 19, 2013

Topic: The Proposed Opening and Co-location of a New District Elementary School, 06M103, with Existing School P.S. 132 Juan Pablo Duarte (06M132) in Building M132 Beginning in 2013-2014

Date of Panel Vote: March 20, 2013

---

### **Summary of Proposal**

The New York City Department of Education (“DOE”) is proposing to open and co-locate a new district elementary school 06M103 (“06M103”), with existing district elementary school, P.S. 132 Juan Pablo Duarte (06M132, “P.S. 132”) in building M132 (“M132”) beginning in the 2013-2014 school year. Building M132 is located at 185 Wadsworth Avenue, New York, NY 10033, in Community School District 6 (“District 6”). If this proposal is approved, 06M103 will be co-located with P.S. 132 and will share an elementary school zone with P.S. 132. Future students in that residential zone will have admissions priority to the new zoned elementary school, 06M103, and the existing zoned elementary school, P.S. 132, in accordance with Chancellor’s Regulation A-101. Families will be asked to submit an application indicating their preference for P.S. 132 or 06M103. If this proposal is approved, 06M103 will begin enrolling kindergarten students in 2013-2014 and will add one grade per year until it reaches full scale and serves students in kindergarten through fifth grade in 2018-2019. In addition, building M132 also houses two community-based organizations, Columbia Presbyterian Mental Health Clinic and Alianza Dominicana. This proposal is not expected to impact the continued siting of Columbia Presbyterian Mental Health Clinic and Alianza Dominicana.

Concurrently, the DOE is planning an enrollment reduction at P.S. 132 beginning in September 2013. P.S. 132’s enrollment will decrease gradually until the 2018-2019 school year, when enrollment will stabilize at a new, lower level. Beginning in September 2013, P.S. 132 will enroll 45-55 kindergarten students, as opposed to the 107-136 kindergarten students it has enrolled in recent years. This enrollment reduction is primarily driven by P.S. 132’s performance. P.S. 132 received an overall D grade on its Progress Report in 2011-2012 for the second consecutive year. The school received a “Developing” on its most recent Quality Review in 2011-2012. As a result, the DOE initiated a comprehensive review of P.S. 132, with the goal of determining what intensive supports and interventions would best benefit its students and the P.S. 132 community. During that review, the DOE looked at recent historical performance and demand data from the school, consulted with superintendents and other experienced educators who have worked closely with the school, and gathered community feedback.

After completing that review, the DOE believes that a planned enrollment reduction will help address the school’s performance struggles as it will be able to focus on a smaller student population. In addition, this will allow for a new school to develop in building M132 that the DOE believes will better serve students and the broader community. If this co-location proposal is not approved, the DOE will reconsider the enrollment reduction at P.S. 132 beginning in September 2013.

The proposed opening and co-location of 06M103 in M132 is part of the DOE’s central goal to create new school options that will better serve current and future students and the community at large. In addition, due to the high percentage of English Language Learner (“ELL”) students in P.S. 132’s current

zone, the DOE intends to offer a Spanish dual-language program at 06M103, though ELL programming offered at a given school is always subject to demand. The dual-language program at 06M103 will complement the existing Spanish dual-language program at P.S. 132, which will serve fewer students as enrollment is reduced at P.S. 132.

According to the 2011-2012 Enrollment, Capacity, Utilization Report (“Blue Book”), M132 has a target capacity of 796 students. The building is currently serving 763 students, all at P.S. 132, yielding a building utilization rate of 96%.

The DOE believes there is sufficient space in building M132 to accommodate 06M103 and P.S. 132 over the course of this proposal. If this proposal is approved, 06M103 will open during the 2013-2014 school year, when it will serve approximately 70-80 students in kindergarten. 06M103 will gradually phase in by adding one grade per year. The school is expected to reach full scale in 2018-2019 and will serve approximately 420-480 students in grades kindergarten through five. In 2018-2019, once P.S. 132 has completed its enrollment reduction and 06M103 is at full scale, it is projected that there will be approximately 690-810 students served in M132, thereby yielding an estimated utilization rate of 87%-102%. Although a utilization rate in excess of 100% may suggest that a building will be over-utilized or over-crowded in a given year, this rate does not account for the fact that rooms may be programmed for more efficient or different uses than the standard assumptions in the utilization calculation.

If this proposal is approved, in 2018-2019, 06M103 will serve 420-480 students in grades kindergarten through five and P.S. 132 will serve 270-330 students in grades kindergarten through five, collectively serving 690-810 students in grades kindergarten through five. The future combined enrollment projection for building M132, 690-810 students in grades kindergarten through five, could exceed the current enrollment of P.S. 132. Therefore, the DOE believes that together, P.S.132 and 06M103 can accommodate future demand among zoned elementary students.

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

A joint public hearing regarding this proposal was held at building M132 on March 6, 2013. At that hearing, interested parties had an opportunity to provide input on the proposal. Approximately 128 members of the public attended the hearing, and 15 people spoke. Present at the meeting were: Community School District 6 Superintendent Elsa Nunez; P.S. 132 Principal Xiomara Nova; P.S. 132 School Leadership Team (“SLT”) Representatives Janet Duran, Emerito J. Beltran, Melina Sachy, and Ana Melia Burgos; Jackie Jones representing District 6 President’s Council; Community Education Council 6 (“CEC 6”) Representatives Judith Amaro, Tory Frye, and Tony Kelso; Sara Morgridge and Russell Murphy representing New York City Council Member Robert Jackson; New York City Council Member Ydanis Rodriguez; and Meera Jain from the DOE’s Division of Portfolio Planning.

### **The following comments and remarks were made at the Joint Public Hearing**

1. New York City Council Member Ydanis Rodriguez, opposed the proposal and commented as follows:
  - a. Students in our community deserve a quality education.
  - b. He has been working to allocate money from the capital amendment for facilities upgrades.
  - c. Everyone should support P.S. 132 and Principal Nova.
  - d. He worked with officials in the DOE to remove P.S. 132 from the early engagement list.
  - e. In regards to the current proposal, he does not believe co-location is the right option.
  - f. Charter schools are not the only solution.

- g. Eva Moskowitz wants space for her charter schools, but he will not support this.
        - h. He wants the DOE to provide an assessment of the available space in M132 and how it is currently being used.
        - i. He has been advocating for schools to have more resources and for a new dual-language elementary school and career and technical education high school in District 6.
        - j. He will support the new dual-language school if there is proof that there are available seats in this building.
        - k. Don't close P.S. 132.
2. Sara Morgridge, representing New York City Council Member Robert Jackson, opposed the proposal and commented as follows:
  - a. The sense of community in this school has been strong and vocal.
  - b. P.S. 132 has produced solid citizens that have held down jobs and been active in this community, which cannot be measured on a test.
  - c. P.S. 132 serves students who are ELLs and does not have the resources to serve these students.
  - d. P.S.132 should be provided with more resources, mentoring, and leadership development.
  - e. The classes in P.S. 132 are over capacity and need to be reduced.
  - f. The DOE should create an early childhood school so that when students enter P.S. 132 they will be on par with their classmates.
  - g. M132 should not be split up between two schools which will offer the same programming.
3. Judith Amaro, CEC 6 president, opposed the proposal and commented as follows:
  - a. Building M132 is inadequate and should not be used to educate children.
  - b. The building has numerous documented infrastructural problems.
  - c. How will the new school, which will offer almost identical programming and serve the same students, be considered higher quality than P.S. 132?
  - d. Creating smaller schools out of larger ones does not increase test scores.
  - e. There are several examples of larger schools broken into smaller schools which are now indistinguishable from each other in terms of state test score performance.
  - f. This co-location will result in a decrease of space for P.S. 132.
  - g. Co-locations cause parents to fight for adequate space and use of equipment.
  - h. Co-locations send children the message that they are not worth creating adequate and unique spaces for and there aren't enough resources for every child.
4. Tory Frye, CEC 6 member, opposed the proposal and commented as follows:
  - a. We recognize that P.S. 132 is struggling.
  - b. The proposal states that P.S. 132 will lose enrichment programming.
  - c. What supports will be offered to address the needs of P.S. 132?
  - d. Building M132 has inadequate facilities, but nothing has been done to fix this.
  - e. Many large schools have been split into smaller ones, but this method does not work.
  - f. The co-location of Castle Bridge with P.S. 128 caused the community to fight each other rather than find solutions.
  - g. Invest the money being put into the new school into P.S. 132 instead.
5. Janet Duran, P.S. 132 SLT member and President of the Parents Association, opposed the proposal and commented as follows:
  - a. Co-locating a new school is not the answer and will not bring positive results.
  - b. DOE should give P.S. 132 resources to help us move forward.
  - c. Do not co-locate another school in this building.
  - d. Why doesn't the DOE build a new building for the new school?

- e. P.S. 132 students are already eating lunch at 10:00 a.m., and with a new school co-located in the building, what will happen to their lunch time?
  - f. Building M132 is overcrowded and cannot fit another school.
  - g. Why did the DOE pick P.S. 132 instead of another school for co-location?
  - h. Students and families are stressed because of this proposal.
  - i. P.S. 132 wants its students to have the opportunity to learn, to go to college, and be a part of the community in the future.
  - j. Mayor Bloomberg needs to help improve our schools.
  - k. Is the DOE doing this to this community because it is poor and Latino?
  - l. This community pays high taxes so why can't they get a better education?
6. Ana Melia Burgos, P.S. 132 SLT member, opposed the proposal and commented as follows:
- a. Co-locations cause bickering, arguing, fighting between teachers and children and students feel the difference.
  - b. The new school will receive better resources, but P.S. 132 will not get anything from the DOE.
  - c. If P.S. 132 received more money, it would help improve the learning environment.
  - d. She is doing the best she can to teach a class with 29 students in first grade.
  - e. P.S. 132 needs lower class sizes to effectively serve its students.
  - f. Mayor Bloomberg is not our friend because he divides and conquers.
7. Emerito Beltran, on behalf of P.S. 132's SLT, opposed the proposal and commented as follows:
- a. After P.S. 132 landed on the early engagement list, the community and school developed Saturday enrichment classes for students.
  - b. P.S. 132 was never given the opportunity to improve.
  - c. A large percentage of the school community speaks Spanish, but did not receive Spanish documents when English ones were distributed.
  - d. The Office of Portfolio Planning assessed the space in the building without consultation of the SLT and in direct violation of Title I regulations stating that on all school issues the SLT must be engaged.
  - e. The DOE has not adequately engaged with the school and community about this proposal.
  - f. There is no space in the building to accommodate two schools while expecting them to be successful.
  - g. Many of P.S. 132's classes have 32 students and the shared spaces are already over capacity.
  - h. Only two classrooms are not being used for instructional purposes, one is for storage and another as a multi-purpose room.
  - i. We have asked the DOE to address necessary repairs and concerns about asbestos, mold, and lead in the school building.
  - j. The School Construction Authority has not included P.S. 132 in their five-year plan and has not told us when they will address these facilities concerns.
  - k. P.S. 132 has lost \$1.5 million dollars in school funding, resulting in a loss of teachers, special programming and school-based support.
  - l. The reduction in funding had detrimental effects on the school.
  - m. The proposed new school does not bring any new, innovative programs as they will provide a similar curriculum to P.S. 132.
  - n. The DOE is trying to close P.S. 132 in a more subtle way by reducing our enrollment.
  - o. Give P.S. 132 resources, funding and smaller class sizes to help the school be successful again.
  - p. Do not co-locate a new school with P.S. 132.
  - q. The community must fight the PEP vote on March 20, 2013 by showing support for P.S. 132.

8. Jackie Jones, representing District 6 President's Council, opposed the proposal and commented as follows:
  - a. It is disrespectful that only one representative from the Division of Portfolio Planning is here.
  - b. She is against co-location because it causes disparity.
  - c. Everyone in the community should come out to these hearings.
9. One commenter suggested that the DOE has failed under Mayor Bloomberg.
10. One commenter suggested that Mayor Bloomberg has unchecked power.
11. One commenter suggested that it is very easy for people to sit here and give their opinions when their children attend private school.
12. Multiple commenters questioned why M132 was chosen for a co-location.
13. Multiple commenters expressed their opposition to co-locating a new school in the building.
14. Multiple commenters suggested that co-locating schools divides the school and community.
15. One commenter suggested that in a co-location you no longer get to decide when your child has gym or other specialized programming because it is up to the Building Council, and parents are not included.
16. Multiple commenters suggested the co-locations take resources away from the school and building.
17. Multiple commenters stated that P.S. 132 has lost \$1.5 million dollars which the DOE should restore.
18. Multiple commenters stated that P.S. 132 needs additional funding to provide a better education and offer better enrichment programming.
19. Multiple commenters questioned why the DOE is not providing additional support and financial resources to P.S. 132.
20. Multiple commenters suggested that the DOE should be spending money to make repairs in the building.
21. One commenter questioned how it's possible that there is \$100,000 for a new school, but not \$100,000 to fix P.S. 132.
22. Multiple commenters suggested that the DOE is not following protocol because there is no representative here from the Division of Portfolio Planning
23. Multiple commenters suggested that the Division of Portfolio Planning is disrespecting the community by not facing the audience and offering answers to their questions.
24. One commenter suggested that the DOE is not being held accountable for its decisions by forcing the District 6 Superintendent to facilitate this meeting.
25. One commenter stated that District 6 needs better middle schools, not more elementary schools.
26. Multiple commenters suggested that they want every child to receive a high-quality education.
27. One commenter suggested that arts programming at P.S. 132 will be lost as a result of the co-location.
28. Multiple commenters suggested that there is no proof that a new school will perform better than P.S. 132.
29. Multiple commenters suggested that small schools cannot provide better resources and support than larger ones.
30. One commenter suggested that the proposal does not state how reducing enrollment at P.S. 132 will help it succeed.
31. One commenter suggested that the decision to co-locate a new school in the building was made without community input.
32. One commenter suggested that this proposal was already approved without a formal vote by the PEP.
33. Multiple commenters suggested that P.S. 132 should be given more time to turn around.
34. One commenter suggested that P.S. 132 should not be closed.

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

35. A petition with 500 signatures expressing opposition to the proposal was received at the joint public hearing.
36. A letter addressed to Chancellor Walcott expressing opposition to the proposal was received at the joint public hearing from P.S. 132's Parents Association.
37. A resolution calling on the DOE to retract the proposal was received at the joint public hearing from P.S. 132's SLT.
38. A document containing 11 images of the bathrooms, floors, cafeteria, furniture, gymnasium, and pipes in building M132 was received at the joint public hearing.
39. Four oral comments were received via voicemail.
  - a. One commenter questioned why the date of the PEP vote was changed from March 11, 2013 to March 20, 2013.
  - b. One commenter questioned why the Analysis of Public Comments was not published on March 8, 2013 in advance of the PEP vote that was originally scheduled for March 11, 2013.
  - c. One commenter inquired when the Analysis of Public Comments would be available.
  - d. One commenter questioned whether the Analysis of Public Comments would be translated and available in Spanish.
40. The DOE received one comment via email in opposition to the proposal and raised the following questions:
  - a. Are there plans that show the existing use of M132 by P.S. 132 and proposed use of M132 by P.S. 132 and 06M103 after the co-location?
  - b. Does the plan explain what spaces P.S. 132 will need to consolidate or eliminate to accommodate the new school?
  - c. How will the two schools use the shared spaces in M132, such as the library and cafeteria?
  - d. After the co-location, could the youngest students be served lunch in the cafeteria at an earlier or later time than they are currently served?
  - e. What impact will the proposed co-location have on class sizes at P.S. 132?
  - f. What will be the proposed class sizes for the new school?
  - g. Will these class sizes comport with the Contracts for Excellence signed by the City of New York?
  - h. What impact will the proposed dual-language program at the new school have on P.S. 132's dual-language program?
  - i. If there are an insufficient number of English and Spanish speaking students for the dual-language program, could this jeopardize the availability of dual-language programming?
  - j. Will P.S. 132 recoup the \$1.5 million dollars it has lost?
  - k. Was the loss of \$1.5 million dollars unrelated to the decline in student performance at P.S. 132?
  - l. Will the budgets of these schools be equal to P.S. 132's budget, or more or less?
  - m. Does the DOE expect that results at P.S. 132 will be different than what they have been?
  - n. Does the DOE believe that the new school will offer different results than P.S. 132?
  - o. Does the DOE believe that the proposed budget for the new school is equitable?
  - p. Will the proposed budget for the new school allow it to offer additional programs compared to what P.S. 132 offers?
  - q. If more students seek entry to the new school than seats available, could a feeling of being a "second class citizen in the same building" arise for these students that have to attend P.S. 132?
  - r. Does the DOE value having an additional school choice in M132 over offering financial support to P.S. 132?

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

- Comments 1(e), 5(c, j), 6(f), 7(p), 9, 10, 25, and 35-37 state general opposition to the proposal. While some members of the P.S. 132 community object to the possibility of co-locating 06M103 and the planned enrollment reduction, the DOE is committed to providing a portfolio of high quality school options to students and families. The DOE strives to ensure that all students in New York City have access to a high-quality school in an appropriate environment at every stage of their education. The DOE assess seat needs at all levels – elementary, middle, and high – and have determined that P.S. 132 is not meeting the needs of elementary students and this proposal aims to provide P.S. 132 and the District 6 community with a new elementary school option in the M132 building.
- Comments 5(k, l) suggest that the DOE is targeting the Latino community by co-locating 06M103 and reducing enrollment of P.S. 132 and that the community deserves a quality education because it is paying taxes. The DOE proposed to reduce enrollment of P.S. 132 and co-locate a new school in the M132 building to offer students in M132’s zone a new option given P.S. 132 long-standing performance struggles. The DOE does not evaluate schools for such proposals based on the racial composition of the community; rather it uses space information, performance metrics, school survey data, and feedback from the community. The DOE agrees that the community deserves a quality public education. P.S. 132’s current outcomes cannot be permitted to persist, as P.S. 132 students will fall further behind their peers in other elementary schools. Therefore the DOE proposed to reduce the enrollment of P.S. 132 and offer a new elementary school option in the M132 building.
- Comments 1(k), 7(n), and 34 suggest that this proposal is for the phase-out or closure of P.S. 132. As stated in the EIS, this proposal is for the co-location of a new district elementary school, 06M103. This proposal will not close or phase-out P.S. 132.
- Comments 1(c), 2(a), 2(b), 5(i), 6(d), and 7(a) discuss the positive aspects of P.S. 132, its school leadership, partnerships and standing in the community. The DOE acknowledges the positive experiences of some students and staff at P.S. 132 over the years. However, the decision to propose the co-location of a new school and enrollment reduction at P.S. 132 is driven by a commitment to helping all future and current students succeed. The performance of P.S. 132 over the past several years suggests that many students are not being well served. In addition, the DOE recognizes the important role that schools play in their communities and knows that schools throughout the city are not just educational institutions, but rich and tight-knit communities. The DOE expects that the school proposed to co-locate in M132 will be fully engaged with the community and will play a vital role as an anchor for the community.
- Comments 4(b), 27, 40(h,i) asserts this proposal will have a negative impact on P.S. 132’s academic, dual-language and enrichment programming. As stated previously and in the EIS, the proposed co-location of 06M103 is not expected to impact future instructional and enrichment programming, or the admissions process for P.S. 132. Both schools will offer programming based on student interests, available resources, and staff support for those programs. Students will continue to have the opportunity to participate in a variety of extracurricular programs, though the specific programs offered at a given schools are always subject to change. P.S. 132 has a Spanish dual-language program, an English as a Second Language (“ESL”) program, and a bilingual program for ELL students. All students enrolled in P.S. 132 will continue to receive appropriate ELL services if this proposal is approved. With respect to academics, P.S. 132 will continue to offer all necessary classes to support current and future students as they work to meet promotional requirements. As total enrollment at the school decreases, the school may scale back its special programs and initiatives or enrichment classes. It is difficult to predict how those changes might be implemented as decisions

will rest with school administrators and will be made based on student demand as well as staff and budget conditions at the school. In addition, due to the existing Spanish dual-language program at P.S. 132 and high percentage of ELL students in P.S. 132's current zone, the DOE intends to offer a Spanish dual-language program at 06M103, though ELL programming offered at a given school is always subject to demand.

- Comment 7(d) suggests that the SLT was improperly not involved in a walkthrough of building M132. The Manhattan Director of Space Planning conducted a walkthrough of building M132 on January 18, 2013 with Principal Nova, who is a member of the SLT.
- Comments 39(a,b,c) concern the change in the date of the PEP vote from March 11, 2013 to March 20, 2013. Our decision to move these proposals was based on feedback from community members that the very large number of proposals slated for the March 11, 2013 PEP agenda would not provide for a productive opportunity for public comment. The DOE moved some proposals in order to allow the public to focus on fewer items at each PEP meeting and provide more time for public comment at each upcoming PEP meeting. By moving this proposal to the March 20<sup>th</sup> vote, the DOE also extended the time the public had to submit comments about the proposal. This analysis was not posted until after the new deadline for such comments had passed. The analysis of public comment is not posted until after the period for public comment has ended and before the PEP votes on the proposal. This comment analysis was published consistent with that schedule.
- Comments 7(b) and 33 suggest that P.S. 132 be given more time to improve. The DOE counts on each of the city's schools to provide a high-quality education to its students and holds all schools to the same high standard. As a result of P.S. 132's struggles, the DOE believes that reducing the enrollment at P.S. 132 and co-locating a new elementary school in the building will offer current and future students a better educational option. The DOE also believes that P.S. 132's performance may improve once it has fewer students to focus on. Thus, this proposal gives P.S. 132 more time to improve.
- Comment 40(q) asserts that this proposal will cause students who cannot be accommodated at 06M103 to feel like "second class citizens." 06M103 will likely accept more zoned kindergarten students than P.S. 132 because of P.S. 132's planned enrollment reduction; the DOE believes that all zoned demand will be accommodated in building M132 between 06M103 and P.S. 132. At full scale, the future combined enrollment projection for building M132, 690-810 students in grades kindergarten through five, could exceed the current enrollment of P.S. 132. Therefore, the DOE believes that together, P.S.132 and 06M103 can accommodate future demand among zoned elementary students and will work together to offer future students the best educational environment in M132, whether they attend P.S. 132 or 06M103. The DOE will continue to offer support to P.S. 132 and to ensure that it is helping us deliver on the core promise we make to NYC families to provide all students with an excellent education.
- Comments 2(d), 4(a, c), and 5(b) concern supports and resources offered to P.S. 132. All schools receive support and assistance from their superintendent and Children First Network, a team that delivers operational and instructional support directly to schools. Struggling schools receive supports as part of system-wide efforts to strengthen all schools; and they also receive individualized supports to address their particular challenges. We do everything we can to offer struggling schools leadership, operational, instructional, and student supports that can help turn a struggling school around. We owe it to our families to give them the best possible options, and in some cases that means reducing

enrollment at low-performing schools and co-locating them with new ones. Regarding P.S. 132's efforts to improve performance, the DOE offered numerous supports, including:

**Leadership Support:**

- Supporting school leadership in aligning curriculum to citywide instructional expectations to raise standards for teacher practice and student learning.
- Coaching the principal and assistant principals in the use of classroom observations and feedback to enhance teacher effectiveness.
- Coaching the principal and assistant principals on utilizing accountability data to identify areas in need of improvement in order to strengthen school-wide performance.
- Assisting the principal and assistant principals in the development of instructional plans and goals for the school year, in support of the school's Comprehensive Education Plan.

**Instructional Support:**

- Training teachers in research-based instructional practices aimed at increasing academic achievement among English Learners and special education students.
- Providing professional development opportunities for teachers in the use of student performance data to identify student needs, differentiate instruction, and target additional support to struggling students.
- Coaching instructional staff in the development of rigorous literacy and math curriculum that aligns with citywide instructional expectations.

**Operational Support:**

- Advising school staff on budgeting, human resources, staff recruitment and building management.
- Supporting school staff in meeting compliance requirements for students with disabilities in order to ensure that students receive mandated services.
- Coaching the school in the development of strategies to increase student attendance.

**Student Support:**

- Assisting the school administration in the development of a school safety plan in order to reduce safety incidents and suspension rates and promote best practices for dealing with difficult behavior patterns to improve the school's culture and learning environment.
  - Coaching the school in evidence-based guidance and counseling strategies to build the school's capacity to offer social and emotional support to students.
- Comments 1(h), 7(h), and 40(a,b) are in reference to space allocations. 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 elementary schools serving grades kindergarten through five (and for all pre-kindergarten programs), the Footprint assumes that classes are self contained. Therefore, the Footprint allocates one full-size room for each general education or ICT section and a full-size or half-size room to accommodate each SC special education section served by the school. In addition to these rooms, schools serving grades kindergarten through five receive an allocation of cluster or specialty rooms proportionate to the number of students enrolled. These spaces can be used at the principal’s discretion for purposes such as art and/or music instruction, among other things.

The Footprint allocates the number of baseline rooms for student support services, resource rooms, and administrative space based on the grades a school serves and its enrollment at scale. As in other situations where schools are co-located, the schools would need to share large common and specialty rooms in the building, such as the cafeteria, the gymnasium, and the library. Specific decisions regarding the allocation of the shared spaces will be made by the Building Council, consisting of principals from all co-located schools, in conjunction with the DOE’s Office of Space Planning. 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).

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 table below provides the instructional baseline footprint allocation of full-size rooms throughout 06M103’s phase-in and planned enrollment reduction at P.S. 132:

DBN	School Name	2012-2013 (current)	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
06M132	P.S. 132 Juan Pablo Duarte	32	30	27	24	21	18	15
06M103	New School	N/A	4	7	11	15	18	21
<b>Total Full-Size Rooms</b>		<b>32</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Excess Full-Size Rooms Available in M132</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>

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 3(f-h), 5(a, d, g), 6(a), 8(b), 12-16, 40(c) relate to co-locations. Building M132 currently has one school, P.S. 132, and if this proposal is approved, a second school, 06M103 will be co-located in M132. 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. Unfortunately, the DOE does not have the space and funds to construct a new building for the new school, 06M013. 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 M132 will be able to create a collaborative and mutually respectful environment for all students, staff, and faculty members in the building.

Although the DOE recognizes that people in the community may have strong feelings against this proposal, the DOE believes that, if this proposal is approved, the school communities at M132 will be able to create productive and collaborative partnerships.

In addition, due to space limitations, it is not unusual for multiple schools to be co-located in a building together. There are successful examples of co-located school buildings or campuses in New York City.

These examples include:

1. The Louis D. Brandeis Educational Campus, which houses five schools: Innovation Diploma Plus, a transfer high school; The Urban Assembly School for Green Careers, a career and technical high education school; The Global Learning Collaborative, a high school; Frank McCourt High School; and Success Academy – Upper West, a public charter elementary school;
  2. The Julia Richman Educational Complex, which houses six schools: Urban Academy High School; Talent Unlimited High School; Vanguard High School; Manhattan International High School; The Ella Baker School, a kindergarten through eighth grade school; and a District 75 program serving students with autism;
  3. Building M113 currently houses three schools: STEM Institute of Manhattan, a district elementary school; Success Academy—Harlem 4, a charter elementary school; and Opportunity Charter School, which serves sixth through twelfth grade in District 3;
  4. Building M092 currently houses three schools: St. Hope Leadership Academy Charter School, a charter middle school serving students in grades five through eight; P.S. 92, a district elementary school which serves students in grades K-5; and Democracy Prep Charter School, a charter middle school serving students in sixth through eighth grade.
  5. 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 K-5; and Bedford Stuyvesant Collegiate, an existing charter secondary school, which is currently in the process of growing to serve students in grades 5-12. 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.
- Comments 5(e) and 40(c,d) regard shared space scheduling. 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. Only principals and charter school leaders serve on the Building Council. 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 principals and charter school leaders, 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 conflicts emerge and progress is impaired, the Building

Council will follow the dispute resolution procedures outlined in the Campus Policy Memo available at the following link: <http://schools.nyc.gov/community/campusgov/KeyDocuments/CampusMemo>. The DOE anticipates that all school organizations will work collaboratively in order to ensure the most safety of all students, and work together to create a supportive learning environment for all students served in the M132 building.

- Comment 40(g) questions whether class sizes agree with the Contracts for Excellence, (“C4E”). Contracts for Excellence are funds that New York City schools receive from New York State and must be distributed to certain schools and must be spent by those schools in specific program areas. For more information about C4E, please visit the DOE’s Web Site at: <http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/funding/c4e/default.htm>. Not all C4E funding is dedicated to class size reduction. It is not known whether 06M103 will receive C4E funding, or whether any such funding would be dedicated to class size reduction. Class size at the new school will depend primarily on enrollment demand and the programming decisions made by the school’s principal.
- Comment 2(c) asserts that P.S. 132 does not have adequate resources and support to serve ELLs. 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, including incoming proficiency level and ELL status. Thus, a school’s budget increases for each additional ELL student it serves. Please refer to the FSF Guide and FY13 School Allocation Memoranda 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 P.S. 132.

The FSF Guide is available at:

[http://schools.nyc.gov/offices/d\\_chanc\\_oper/budget/dbor/allocationmemo/fy12\\_13/FY13\\_PDF/FSF\\_Guide.pdf](http://schools.nyc.gov/offices/d_chanc_oper/budget/dbor/allocationmemo/fy12_13/FY13_PDF/FSF_Guide.pdf).

The FY13 School Allocation Memoranda is available at:

[http://schools.nyc.gov/offices/d\\_chanc\\_oper/budget/dbor/allocationmemo/fy12\\_13/AM\\_FY13\\_CAT.html](http://schools.nyc.gov/offices/d_chanc_oper/budget/dbor/allocationmemo/fy12_13/AM_FY13_CAT.html)

- Comment 7(k), 17, and 40(j) request that the DOE increase P.S. 132’s budget. Fair Student Funding (“FSF”) dollars – approximately \$5.0 billion in the 2012-2013 school year based on projected registers – are used by all district schools to cover basic instructional needs and are allocated to each school based on the number and need-level of students enrolled at that school. All money allocated through FSF can be used at the principals’ discretion, such as hiring staff, purchasing supplies and materials, or implementing instructional programs. As the total number of students enrolled changes, the overall budget will increase or decrease accordingly, allowing the school to meet the instructional needs of its student population. P.S. 132’s enrollment has declined in recent years, which, in combination with a reduction in overall state educational funding, has led to a decline in the school’s budget. However, throughout that period P.S.132’s budget has been determined by the same process as all other DOE schools.
- Comments 4(g), 6(b, c), 7(l, o), 18, 19, 40(r) pertain to funding resources at P.S.132 and indicate that more resources or supports should be provided to P.S. 132 rather than the new school. In New York City, we fund 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 2,100 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. As we've seen, P.S. 132's enrollment has declined, between 2007-2008 and 2012-2013, P.S. 132's audited register enrollment dropped by 16%, or 148 students, which resulted in a decrease in FSF.

- In response to comment 40(k), while every school across the city receives funding via the same formula, some schools have been less successful in serving students than their peer schools that serve similar populations. After the comprehensive review of school data and community feedback, the DOE believes that reducing the enrollment of P.S. 132 will enable the school to improve more quickly and provide its students with the best educational options. In terms of the network supports also provided to P.S. 132 and other District 6 schools, all schools receive support and assistance from their superintendent and Children First Network (<http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/schools/support/default.htm>), a team that delivers operational and instructional support directly to schools. Struggling schools receive supports as part of system-wide efforts to strengthen all schools; and they also receive individualized supports to address their particular challenges. The DOE does everything it can to offer struggling schools leadership, operational, instructional, and student supports that can help turn a struggling school around. The DOE believes that offering a new choice in building M132 and reducing the enrollment at P.S. 132 will best serve students and the District 6 community.
- Comments 40(l, o, p) relate to funding at the new school in building M132. As stated above, all public schools in the city 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). New district schools, such as 06M103, are provided with a fixed per-school allocation and a variable per-pupil Other Than Personal Services (“OTPS”) allocation of funds to cover start-up costs. Based on current one-time allocations for new schools, 06M103 will receive a fixed allocation of \$80,000 and approximately \$27,370 - \$31,280 in new school OTPS start-up per-pupil allocations during its first year. In addition, 06M103's basic operating budget will be determined by the FSF formula used at all other New York City district public schools. Under FSF, schools receive City tax levy funding on a per pupil basis. Each student receives a per-pupil entitlement based on the grade level of the student. As the total number of students enrolled changes, the overall budget will increase or decrease accordingly, allowing the school to meet the instructional needs of its student population. In addition to the FSF student-need-based dollars a school receives, all schools receive a fixed lump sum of \$225,000 in FSF foundation and \$50,000 in Children First Network support to cover administrative costs. All money allocated through FSF can be used at the principals' discretion, such as hiring staff, purchasing supplies and materials, or implementing instructional programs.
- Comments 1(j), 2(e), 5(f), 6(e), 7(f, g), and 40(e,f) assert M132 and its classrooms currently are and/or will be overcrowded as a result of the proposal. As stated in the EIS, M132 has the capacity to serve a total of 796 students. In 2012-2013, 763 students are being served in M132. This yields a utilization rate of 96%. If this proposal is approved, 06M103 will open in September 2013 serving approximately 70-80 students in kindergarten. At scale, 06M103 will serve approximately 420-480 students in grades kindergarten through five. When 06M103 completes its phase-in and achieves full-scale and P.S. 132 has completed its planned enrollment reduction in 2018-2019, the DOE projects that building M132 will serve 690-810 students, yielding a comparable utilization rate of 87%-102%.

Class size is primarily a function of student enrollment, and is affected by how principals allocate their resources. Principals have discretion over their budget and make choices about how to prioritize their resources. The DOE also notes that the number of class sections at each school is determined by the principal based on enrollment, budget, and student needs and there is a target class size based on the number of students in a class section for each grade level. Thus, the DOE does not expect that this proposal will cause increased class sizes at P.S. 132.

- Comments 8(a), 22-24 pertain to the joint public hearing process and how the DOE considers community feedback when creating and voting on proposals; multiple commenters expressed concern about the inclusion of immigrant families who face language barriers and the lack of representatives from the Division of Portfolio Planning at the joint public hearing. The DOE considers all feedback from the community regarding a proposal. At the joint public hearing on March 6, 2013, Community School District 6 Superintendent Elsa Nunez, an employee of the DOE, facilitated as Chancellor's Designee. In addition, a representative from the Division of Portfolio Planning was in attendance to record public comments made throughout the hearing. Questions asked during public comment were not answered at the joint public hearing, but are answered in this Analysis of Public Comment, which was published on March 19, 2013. In the case of this proposal, the DOE solicited feedback from parents at the hearing, as well as through voicemail and email since the proposal was posted on January 23, 2013. While some parents disagree with the proposal, the DOE believes it is the right decision for students.
- With respect to comment 7(c, q) and 39(d) 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 translated versions of all documents relevant to the proposed changes for building M132. The DOE offered translation services at the joint public hearing, but when one translator fell and was injured in the P.S. 132 auditorium before the hearing started, both translators left. However, because P.S. 132 had hired their own translation services, the DOE was able to use those services to translate for the joint public hearing. Translation services will also be available for community members at the PEP vote where there will be a vote regarding the proposal for the co-location of 06M103 in M132. However, the analysis of public comment will not be translated into Spanish before the PEP vote on March 20.
- Comment 32 suggests a decision has already been made regarding the proposal. While the DOE supports the co-location of 06M103 and planned enrollment reduction of P.S. 132, the DOE notes that no decision has been made on this proposal. Any proposed change to school utilization must be approved by the PEP before it can take effect.
- Comments 2(d, e, g), 3(c-e), 4(e), 7(m), 28-30, and 40(m,n) concern new and smaller schools. The DOE believes that the new school and smaller P.S. 132 will better serve students and the broader community. In regards to the new, small schools approach, MDRC, a nationally recognized nonprofit, nonpartisan education and social policy research organization, has analyzed the effect of New York City's new schools created since 2002. They have found repeated evidence that the new schools created under this administration have helped students graduate, be better prepared for college, complete required Regents exams, and earn credits at a higher rate than schools created before 2002—not to mention schools we've closed with graduation rates that were below 50, and sometimes 40, percent. In June 2010, MDRC issued a report on NYC's new small schools strategy. MDRC concluded: "it is possible, in a relatively short span of time, to replace a large number of

underperforming public high schools in a poor urban community and, in the process, achieve significant gains in students' academic achievement and attainment. And those gains are seen among a large and diverse group of students — including students who entered the ninth grade far below grade level and male students of color, for whom such gains have been stubbornly elusive.” (MDRC, “Transforming the High School Experience,” June 2010.) Findings released in January 2012 from MDRC showed that these schools are having a *sustained* effect on graduation rates with positive impacts for virtually every subgroup. In addition, the small high schools show positive impacts on five-year graduation rates and on a measure of college readiness.

We can dramatically improve student achievement across the City when we open new schools in traditionally underserved communities that need high-quality educational options. That’s why we have an extremely detailed and rigorous process for creating new schools. Our top priority is ensuring that the new schools we open have strong leaders with clear and visionary plans, and that these leaders are supported as they get their new schools up and running. Our new schools process is based on three core principles:

- A great school starts with a great principal. Over the past ten years we have learned the powerful role a principal can play as change agent. Through our new schools process, we seek principals who demonstrate the qualities of visionary and effective leadership and who are poised for the privilege and challenge of opening a new school.
- We need community partners to help us develop great schools. We have worked with local and national intermediary organizations to help us develop and scale new schools. These partners provide critical start-up support and help push the thinking of our new school leaders. We have also attracted high-performing public charter schools to New York City to bring an even greater breadth of quality options to public school families.
- There isn’t one “recipe” for what makes a great school. Certainly there are conditions that contribute to an effective school – a mission, leadership, and great teachers devoted to student success – but there are different ways of organizing a school to create these conditions, especially given the need to serve diverse student populations. We encourage leaders to be entrepreneurial and to leverage their expertise to develop innovative models.

Among applicants are a mix of sitting principals, assistant principals, Network staff, and teacher leaders who are assessed using the Office of New Schools’ leadership rubric. The new schools selection process, called Design and Development, is a rigorous process comprised of four major components. The Design and Development process was created to gauge a candidate’s readiness to master the challenges of running a school.

- Written Submissions:
  - Candidates will draft a new school proposal, which is a comprehensive document developed over the course of the four to five month process. The new school proposal will contain information on Mission/Vision, Curriculum & Instruction, Professional Development, Data, Academic Support, and Community Leadership & Culture.
- Design & Development Sessions
  - Applicants are assessed as they engage in a number of activities focused on different aspects of school leadership. These activities take place during 2-hour

sessions held at different points throughout the process, including an assessment of a teaching video and a role play.

- Individual Assessments
  - The first Individual Assessment is one hour interview led by two coaches from the Office of New Schools. The conversation may touch the applicant's vision for curriculum, instruction and professional development, as well as personal leadership skills. Applicants receive critical feedback during this session and are expected to incorporate that feedback into their final proposal.
  - During the second Individual Assessment session, the two coaches from the Office of New Schools visit the applicant's school, conduct classroom observations, and then debrief on instruction and other related findings.
  - At the visit, coaches will talk with the candidate about his or her observations of the school, discuss instruction, and take time to speak with the candidate's colleagues and students.
  - During the final assessment, both coaches probe the applicant on areas of concern and evaluate the applicant on their ability to respond and address concerns raised.
- The Panel Interview
  - Applicants present their final proposal before a panel consisting of staff from the Office of New Schools, in addition to members from other offices in the Department of Education, including staff from Portfolio Management, Office of Student Enrollment, Division of Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners, and members of the Chancellor's Cabinet.
  - Following the presentation, each prospective new leader will undergo 45 minutes of Question and Answer with the Panel.

Final recommendations are made to the Chancellor regarding which school leaders should be approved. For schools that are expected to open in September 2013, we approved 52 of 369 applicants who submitted letters of intent, or approximately 1 new school will open for every 7 applications received. This is compared to schools that opened in September 2012 where we approved 31 of 159 applicants, or approximately 1 in 5 applications. Through this thoughtful and objective process we selected only the best leaders with the highest quality plan to create a successful school.

- Comment 5(h) pertains to the socio-emotional impact of this proposed co-location and enrollment reduction. The DOE recognizes that co-locating and reducing enrollment at a school may be a challenging experience for students, staff, and community members. P.S. 132 will continue to receive support in the areas of budget, staffing, programming, community engagement, guidance, and enrollment including, but not limited to:
  - Helping the school provide students with options that support their advancement and fully prepare students for their next transition point.
  - Working with school staff to foster a positive culture.
  - Supporting school leadership in efficiently and strategically allocating resources to ensure a consistent and coherent school environment focused on student outcomes.

Although the DOE recognizes that people in the community may have strong feelings against this proposal, the DOE believes that, if this proposal is approved, the school communities at M132 will be able to foster a collaborative and mutually respectful environment for all students, staff, and faculty members in the building.

- Comments 1(b), 3(a,b), 4(d), 7(i,j), 20, 21 and 38 pertain to the facilities and general condition of M132. The DOE believes that building M132 is compliant with building code and is adequate for students to attend school in the building. The School Construction Authority's comprehensive capital planning process includes developing and analyzing quality data, creating and updating the Department of Education's Five-Year Capital Plans, and monitoring projects through completion. The School Construction Authority prioritizes capital projects to best meet the capacity and building improvements needs throughout the City. Additionally, the School Construction Authority assures that the Capital Plan aligns with New York State and City Department of Education mandates, academic initiatives, and budgetary resources. Through the quarter ending September 30, 2012, the Division of Instructional and Information Technology purchased and installed technology worth \$150,000 for P.S. 132. Regarding specific upgrade projects, there are plans to upgrade the kitchen, electrical network and classroom connectivity in the current capital plan. In regards to the toilets, there are sufficient toilets per building code to meet the maximum capacity of the building. The toilet facilities in M132 are on the first and fourth floor of the building, thus it is likely that P.S. 132 and 06M103 will need to share the toilet facilities given the current location of the toilet facilities. At this time, these are the only projects included in the current capital plan.
- Comments 1(a,d,f,g,i), 2(f), 8(c), 11 and 26 are not directly related to this proposal and thus do not require a response.

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

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