

### **Public Comment Analysis**

Date: November 18, 2015

Topic: The Proposed Consolidation of M.S. 334 Middle School for Academic and Social Excellence (17K334) with M.S. 354 The School of Integrated Learning (17K354) in Building K390 Beginning in the 2016-2017 School Year

Date of Panel Vote: November 19, 2015

---

### **Summary of Proposal**

On October 5, 2015, The New York City Department of Education (“DOE”) issued a proposal to consolidate Middle School for Academic and Social Excellence (17K334, “M.S. 334”), an existing Renewal middle school that currently serves students in sixth through eighth grades, with M.S. 354 The School of Integrated Learning (17K354, “M.S. 354”), an existing middle school serving students in sixth through eighth grades, in building K390 (“K390”), located at 1224 Park Place, Brooklyn, NY 11213, beginning in the 2016-2017 school year. The DOE proposed to consolidate M.S. 334 and M.S. 354 because both schools have struggled with low enrollment, which creates budgetary and programmatic challenges. A “consolidation” means that two or more existing school organizations are combined into one school to operate and serve students more effectively. If this proposal is approved, M.S. 334 and M.S. 354 will be combined such that students, staff, and resources of M.S. 334 will become part of M.S. 354 and M.S. 334 will no longer exist as a distinct school option as of the 2016-2017 school year.

M.S. 334 and M.S. 354 are currently co-located in K390 with KIPP AMP Academy (84K357, “KIPP AMP”) an existing public charter school that will serve kindergarten through eighth grade by the 2017-2018 school year. A “co-location” means that two or more school organizations are located in the same building and may share common spaces like the auditorium, gymnasium, library, and cafeteria. The District 17 Superintendent’s office is also located on the first floor of the building.

The DOE proposed to consolidate M.S. 334 with M.S. 354 based primarily on the benefits students would derive from the additional resources made available by consolidating the two school organizations into one. If this proposal is approved, students attending the consolidated M.S. 354 will have access to a variety of academic and enrichment opportunities, interventions, extended day learning, and supports that M.S. 354 will provide as a PROSE school and Community School. As a PROSE School, administrators and teachers collaboratively engage in school improvement efforts guided by the Framework for Great Schools and leverage flexibilities granted to them in the United Federation of Teachers and/or Council of School Administrators contracts, as well as Chancellor’s and/or State regulations in order to increase student achievement. As a community school M.S. 354 is intended to be a neighborhood hub where students receive high-quality academic instruction, families can access social services, and communities congregate to share resources and address their common challenges. In addition to increased resources, the consolidation will allow the schools to combine the strengths and best practices of each individual school into a single, larger organization.

This proposal was developed by the District 17 Superintendent in conjunction with the principals of the consolidating schools and the school communities through a collaborative planning process. In addition to working with the school communities, the District 17 Superintendent worked closely with various DOE offices and the principals of M.S. 334 and M.S. 354 to determine the best path to support the students at both schools. The collaborative planning process culminated in a decision to consolidate these schools into one, stronger middle school.

If this proposal is approved, in 2016-2017, M.S. 334 and M.S. 354 will be combined such that students, staff, and resources of M.S. 334 will become part of M.S. 354 and M.S. 334 will no longer exist as a distinct school option as

of the 2016-2017 school year. In K390 the consolidated M.S. 354 will be co-located with KIPP AMP Charter School and will serve approximately 1,030-1,140 students in K390, yielding a projected building utilization rate of 71%-78%. By 2017-2018, when KIPP AMP's enrollment is projected to be at scale, K390 will have an estimated building utilization rate of 78%-86%.

The details of this proposal have been released in an Educational Impact Statement ("EIS") and Building Utilization Plan ("BUP"), which can be accessed here: <http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/leadership/PEP/publicnotice/2015-2016/November2015SchoolProposals>

Copies of the EIS and BUP are also available in the main offices of M.S. 334, M.S. 354, and KIPP AMP Charter School.

### **Summary of Comments Received**

Public engagement was conducted by the DOE in the course of creating this proposal, which included:

- A Parent Information Session hosted by the District 17 Superintendent and the principals of M.S. 334 and M.S. 354 on April 28, 2015.
- A letter discussing the potential consolidation sent home with students in May 2015.
- A walkthrough of K390 with a member of DOE Senior Leadership on September 30, 2015 to discuss the proposal further and a School Leadership Team ("SLT") Debrief which occurs where DOE Senior leadership takes questions and concerns from representatives of the school communities in advance of the Panel for Education Policy ("PEP") vote. Participants included representatives from the Office of District Planning ("ODP"), the Office of Space Planning ("OSP"), the District 17 Community Education Council ("CEC 17"), M.S. 334's SLT, and M.S. 354's SLT.

The DOE also held a Joint Public Hearing ("JPH") regarding this proposal at K390 on November 9, 2015. At that meeting, interested parties had an opportunity to provide input on the proposal. Approximately 90 members of the public attended the hearing. There were eight (8) speakers. Individuals present at the meeting included: Deputy Chancellor Dorita Gibson; District 17 Superintendent Clarence Ellis; CEC 17 President Nicole Job; CEC 17 member Celia Green; M.S. 354 Principal Monique Campbell; M.S. 334 Principal Betsie Green; M.S. 334's SLT member Jason Varon; KIPP AMP Charter School Principals Emily Carroll and Latasha Williams; and Jamie Dollinger, Jyoti Folch, Brandon Bloomfield, Anderson Reyes and Tyeshia Smith from the DOE.

#### **The following comments and remarks were made at the Joint Public Hearing on November 9, 2015:**

1. CEC 13 president, Nicole Job, commented that CEC 17 supports the consolidation and has worked closely with the principals of both schools since last year to discuss the consolidation. The CEC also believes there are benefits to this consolidation and that this will create a stronger middle school option in District 17.
2. One commenter said that he is a supporter of KIPP AMP Expansion, which will provide more African American students the ability to not only attend college but graduate with a degree.
  - a. He also commented that he supports the proposal.
  - b. He also supports the growth of KIPP AMP.
3. One commenter stated the following:
  - a. He supports the proposal.
  - b. The DOE should give KIPP AMP the space to grow because it has done wonders for his child.
  - c. He commends KIPP AMP for the amazing work they have done with his child.
4. One commenter, an alumnus of KIPP and current KIPP AMP Teacher, stated that he completely supports KIPP.
  - a. He also stated that he supports the proposal.
5. One commenter made the following comments:
  - a. He didn't believe in charter schools until sending his child to KIPP AMP.
  - b. He believes his child is learning at a different rate and thanks KIPP AMP for all of their patience and hard work.
  - c. He thanks the Chancellor for being dedicated to all children.
  - d. He supports this proposal.
6. One commenter made the following comments:

- a. She is a proud parent of three (3) “KIPP’ers” and her children had a great experience and now are all in college, including her child with an Individualized Educational Plan (“IEP”).
  - b. KIPP AMP creates possibility for all children.
  - c. She requested that the DOE give KIPP the space to grow.
7. One commenter stated that her child was not accepted by other schools because of his IEP and was labeled as a trouble child. Bringing her child to KIPP AMP made a great difference in her child’s life. He has progressed tremendously from his previous school.
  - a. She requested that the DOE give KIPP AMP the space to grow.
8. One commenter made the following comment:
  - a. He is frustrated with engagement that does not involve PEP members or decision makers.
  - b. He is happy that the schools engaged the community and those who are concerned about the children, to come up with this proposal that can work for students.
  - c. He has concerns with members of the PEP not being in attendance at the JPH so that members of the public could speak directly to those who will be voting on the proposal.
  - d. He feels that families are not involved enough with their students in elementary school and then complain that students are failing in middle school.

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

The DOE received zero (0) voicemails through the dedicated phone number for this proposal.

The DOE received zero (0) emails through the dedicated email address for this proposal.

### **Analysis of Issues Raised, Significant Alternatives, Significant Alternatives Proposed**

Comments 1, 2(a), 3(a), 4(a), 5(d), and 8(b) express support for consolidation of M.S. 334 and M.S. 354. As these comments were issued in support of the proposal, they do not require a response.

Comments 3(c), 5(a-b), 6(a-b), and 7 express support for KIPP AMP Academy and thus do not require a response.

Comments 2(b), 3(b), 6(c), and 7(a) pertains to the growth of KIPP AMP and ensuring it receives the space to grow within the building.

As a part of a previously approved proposal from May 10, 2012, KIPP was approved to expand to serve students in grades K-8 and this consolidation proposal does not impact KIPP’s ability to do so. More information on the expansion proposal can be found here: [http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/E0EFAEF0-C8E5-465C-B327-5E9476B48AEF/124892/EIS\\_KIPPAMP\\_K390\\_vFINAL.pdf](http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/E0EFAEF0-C8E5-465C-B327-5E9476B48AEF/124892/EIS_KIPPAMP_K390_vFINAL.pdf).

As stated in both the EIS and BUP, if this proposal is approved KIPP AMP will receive space according to its baseline Footprint allocation of space pursuant to the Citywide Instructional Footprint. The amount of additional space that each school in K390 will receive is outlined within the BUP which can be accessed on the proposals website as noted above.

Comment 8(a) expresses concerns with engagement that does not include PEP members when discussing this proposal.

The DOE understands that there are a range of opinions and ideas that the District 17 community has regarding types of engagement with stakeholders. For this proposal, dedicated phone and email lines were open to accept public comment after the posting of this proposal. Comments can be submitted in any language by calling 212-374-0208 or emailing in any language to [D17Proposals@schools.nyc.gov](mailto:D17Proposals@schools.nyc.gov). All comments received at the above-noted hearing or through phone or email lines by 6 p.m. on the day before the PEP meeting will be addressed by the DOE in this document, which is made available to the public after 6 p.m. on the day before the PEP Meeting. The public is also welcomed to attend the PEP vote on November 19<sup>th</sup> and provide comments on the proposal to the PEP

Members.

Additionally Comment 8(c) expresses frustration that members of the PEP were not in attendance at the JPH.

PEP members are invited but not required to attend the JPH, however they receive proposal information throughout the process, and they are invited to participate in certain building level engagement and walkthroughs prior to posting a proposal.

The public is also welcomed to provide comments during the public comment period at the PEP meeting on November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2015.

Comments 5(c) and 8(d) does not relate to the contents of this proposal and does not require a response.

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

No changes have been made to this proposal.