



**Dennis M. Walcott**  
*Chancellor*

### **Public Comment Analysis**

Date: April 25, 2012

Topic: The Proposed Closure of Bread and Roses Integrated Arts High School (05M685) and the Opening and Co-Location of a New High School (05M532) with KAPPA IV (05M302) and Mott Hall High School (05M304) in Building M136 Beginning in 2012-2013

Date of Panel Vote: April 26, 2012

---

### **Summary of Proposal**

The New York City Department of Education (“DOE”) is proposing to close Bread and Roses Integrated Arts High School (05M685, “Bread and Roses”) an existing district high school in building M136 (“M136”), located at 6 Edgecombe Avenue, New York, NY 10030, within the geographical confines of Community School District 5. Bread and Roses currently serves students in grades nine through twelve. The DOE is proposing to immediately replace Bread and Roses with New School (05M532, “New School”), a new district high school serving students in grades nine through twelve in M136.

If this proposal is approved, Bread and Roses will close at the conclusion of the 2011-2012 school year. All current students who have not graduated before the start of the 2012-2013 school year will be guaranteed a seat at and automatically enrolled in New School.

Bread and Roses is co-located with KAPPA IV (05M302, “KAPPA IV”), an existing district middle school that currently serves students in grades six through eight, and with Mott Hall High School (05M304, “Mott Hall”), an existing high school that currently serves students in grades nine through twelve. New School would also be co-located with KAPPA IV and Mott Hall. 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.

Bread and Roses and Mott Hall admit students through the Citywide High School Admissions Process. Bread and Roses uses the educational option method to admit students through that process. Mott Hall uses the limited unscreened method to admit students through the High School Admissions Process. KAPPA IV admits students

through the District 5 Middle School Choice Process.

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. By closing Bread and Roses and replacing it with New School, the DOE is seeking to expeditiously improve educational quality at building M136. If this proposal is approved, New School will develop rigorous, school-specific competencies to measure and screen prospective staff, including Bread and Roses' staff who apply to work at New School. Based on these criteria, and in accordance with the staffing requirements in Article 18-D of the DOE's existing contract with the United Federation of Teachers ("UFT"), New School will put in place a process aimed at hiring the best possible staff, thus immediately improving teacher quality and, by extension, improving the quality of learning. New School plans to develop new programs and school supports that are intended to improve student outcomes. Doing this important work to improve the quality of teaching and learning in the school will also maximize New School's chance of receiving up to \$850,510 in supplemental federal funding under the federal School Improvement Grant ("SIG") program. New School will build on the strongest elements of Bread and Roses and incorporate new elements, including new talent designed to better meet student needs. Thus, the immediate closure and replacement of Bread and Roses with New School should give students access to a higher-quality educational option while they continue to attend school in the same building.

The details of this proposal have been released in an EIS which can be accessed here: <http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/leadership/PEP/publicnotice/2011-2012/April2012Proposals.htm>.

Copies of the EIS are also available in the main offices of Bread & Roses Integrated Arts High School, KAPPA IV, and Mott Hall High School.

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

A joint public hearing regarding this proposal was held at school building M136 on April 3, 2012. At that hearing, interested parties had an opportunity to provide input on the proposal. Approximately 60 members of the public attended the hearing, and 10 people spoke. Present at the meeting were Bread and Roses School Leadership Team Representatives Kurt Jones, Aimee Hernandez, Louisa Grogue, and Sharon Davis; Community Education Council ("CEC") 5 Representatives Sonja Jones, Ernest Bryant, and Maurice Horne; Juan Pagan, Representative for the Citywide Council for High Schools ("CCHS"); the Representative for New York City Council Member Inez Dickens; and the Representative for New York City Council Member Robert Jackson.

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

1. District 5 CEC Member, Maurice Horne, opposed the proposal and expressed the following concerns:

- a. Bread and Roses is in need of change, but closing the school and changing its name does not actually implement any change.
  - b. Closing the school will only be at the expense of its students.
2. District 5 CEC President, Sonja Jones, opposed the proposal and expressed the following concerns:
  - a. The goal should be to provide Bread and Roses with the support it needs.
  - b. The turnaround model is a questionable method for implementing change.
  - c. If the proposal is approved, the CEC respectfully requests that the school be able to keep its name as it is rooted in the community.
3. SLT member Kurt Jones supported the proposal.
4. A representative for Council Member Robert Jackson opposed the proposal and expressed the following concerns:
  - a. The rationale for the turnaround model has to do with a failure to achieve an agreement with the UFT on teacher evaluation.
  - b. The DOE should provide a less disruptive means to achieve academic success at the 33 schools proposed for turnaround.
5. A representative for Council Member Inez Dickens opposed the proposal and expressed the following concerns:
  - a. Bread and Roses has undergone multiple leadership changes in a short period of time. These administrative changes have been disruptive to the school and have not allowed the school to turn student achievement around.
  - b. Bread and Roses served a large population of developmentally challenged students and English Language Learners. The DOE has not provided adequate support to the school to best serve these students.
6. District 5 CEC Vice President, Ernest Bryant, opposed the proposal and expressed the following concerns:
  - a. Student achievement is low for a variety of reasons outside of school walls, and the DOE does not take into account the various factors that drive student performance.
  - b. The turnaround model is a result of Mayor Bloomberg's battle with the UFT and support of charter schools.
  - c. Resources for the replacement schools should be put into the existing school.
7. The Manhattan Representative for the CCHS, opposed the proposal and questioned the morality of Mayor Bloomberg and the DOE.

8. Multiple commenters called for teachers, students, parents, and community members to oppose the proposal to turnaround Bread and Roses.
9. Multiple commenters questioned the general effectiveness turnaround model and stated that closing a school and opening it under a new name is not a solution.
10. Multiple commenters suggested that the turnaround model is a political decision that resulted from Mayor Bloomberg's inability to come to an agreement with the UFT.
11. One student cited a positive educational experience at Bread and Roses and opposed closure of the school.
12. One commentator stated support for the proposal if it was going to make real and needed changes to the school.
13. Multiple commenters spoke of the leadership changes the school has experienced and argued that the instability of the school's administration hindered student achievement.
14. Multiple commenters explained that Bread and Roses's student achievement levels cannot be compared to other schools because Bread and Roses serves many students with special needs, English Language Learners, and students who have been incarcerated.
15. One commenter spoke in support of Bread and Roses teachers, underscoring that the teachers have worked hard to support their students.

The following questions, comments, and remarks were made at the Joint Public Hearing and are not related to the proposal:

16. Is this building being renovated for purposes other than education?
17. When can the proposed new school expect to receive funds from turnaround model?
18. Instead of closing, why aren't proper programs being provided?
19. Why is the DOE proposing to close and replace this school?
20. Why is the parent association not at the table?
21. What happens to the staff?
22. Has the DOE reached agreement with the UFT?

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

The DOE received the following written and oral comments through the dedicated Web site and phone line for this proposal.

23. One commenter asked if there will be delays in the implementation of the Common Core Learning Standards as a result of these proposals.
24. One commenter asked about the DOE's engagement process for proposing to close the existing school and open a new school, and what part students, parents, and the community have in the process.
25. One commenter stated that all of the closure/replacement proposals will result in the shuffling of teachers from one school to the other.
26. One commenter asked about which schools have implemented the 18-D process successfully, how this was done, and how the success was measured.
27. One commenter asked about what evidence the DOE has that this approach works, and whether a short-term measuring tool can be part of the model.
28. One commenter asked what supports are being offered to schools being closed and replaced.
29. One commenter asked what measures will be used to evaluate the progress of the new schools, apart from progress reports and quality reviews. The commenter also asked about what evaluations the DOE has done to assess progress made under previous interventions (i.e., transformation and restart).
30. One commenter asked about the timeline for the implementation of the new model.
31. One commenter asked about the supports that networks and other entities have provided to the schools that are in PLA/SINI status or have declining progress report grades.
32. One commenter asked about how summer school will be implemented.
33. One commenter asked about how quickly new replacement schools will receive progress report grades, what short-term benchmarks are built into the Turnaround plan, and whether performance goals are built into the Turnaround plan.

34. One commenter asked about the impact of the new schools and implementing the closure/replacement approach.
35. One commenter asked about who makes up the planning team for each school.
36. One commenter asked if the state mandates a JIT review for every school that is Restructuring, Year 1; Restructuring, Advanced; and Persistently Lowest Achieving.
37. One commenter asked if a JIT review was done for each of the 25 high schools on the turnaround list before the earlier intervention model (transformation or restart) was selected and before the Turnaround model was selected.
38. One commenter asked if the JIT reports are available to the public.
39. One commenter asked if the proposed new school will receive over-the-counter, ELL, and over-age under-credited students.
40. One commenter asked if rising ninth-grade students can opt out of a turnaround school.
41. One commenter asked about the \$58 million designated to New York City schools as SIG funding. Does this figure represent what was suspended as of January 3, 2012, or does it date back further?
42. One commenter asked if a school goes into turnaround, does it automatically get funding or is there a competitive process that takes place afterwards. The commenter also asked about how much funding each school would receive.
43. One commenter asked if the DOE will have to repay the funding spent on the contracts for restart schools.
44. The DOE received a petition opposing the proposals to close and replace schools, which was signed by approximately 1,300 people, on the following grounds:
  - a. The DOE should not close schools and instead support them, including providing proven programs and curricula, professional development, health services for students, and additional student time for tutoring and enrichment.
  - b. End the policy of sending large concentrations of high needs students to schools then targeted for closure.
  - c. End the policy of co-locating charter schools in buildings with struggling district schools or district schools assigned large numbers of high needs students.

- d. Create a new chancellor's district to support struggling schools and schools with large populations of high needs students, such as the one in place before the current administration.

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

Comments 3 and 12 are in support of the proposal and therefore do not require a response.

Comments 1(a, b), 2(a, b), 4(b), 6(b, c), 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 question whether the turnaround model will improve outcomes for current or future students enrolled at Bread and Roses, assert that the DOE is pursuing the turnaround model for reasons other than improving student achievement, and/or express general disagreement with the turnaround model.

In a concerted effort to ensure that all students have access to high-quality schools, the DOE annually reviews the performance of all schools Citywide. Schools designated as Persistently Lowest Achieving (PLA) by the State Education Department receive special attention during this review. Specifically, for PLA schools, the Department looks at whether one of the federally-approved intervention models can adequately address the school's needs or whether another intervention is more appropriate.

Bread and Roses was first designated as a PLA school during the 2009-2010 school year and then again in the 2010-2011 school year. Under the Restart model, schools are partnered with a non-profit Educational Partnership Organization (EPO) that makes recommendations to the DOE for specific school-based interventions to raise student achievement. This model required the implementation of a comprehensive teacher evaluation system, something the DOE has been unable to agree upon with the United Federation of Teachers. As a result, Bread and Roses is now at risk of losing its eligibility for SIG funding.

The Department is proposing to close and replace Bread and Roses because we believe that doing so will provide a better educational option to current students more rapidly and with more certainty than current interventions, which were simply not adequate in order to make the school an acceptable choice for current and future students.

The DOE has implemented the Turnaround model in the past, in connection with its phase-out and replacement of other low-performing schools. While data is not yet available for many of these new schools, in general the DOE has improved student outcomes by replacing low-performing schools with new schools. See response to comments 26/27 for more information.

As stated above, the DOE believes that closing Bread and Roses and replacing it with New School will provide a better educational option to current and future

students, which is expected to prompt student improvement more rapidly and with more certainty than previous interventions and supports, which have not led to adequate gains. Thus, this proposal is squarely aimed at improving student achievement and furthered by no other agenda, political or otherwise. Further, to the extent that this proposal may help secure SIG funding for DOE students, this is an educational aim, not a political one, as these resources are crucial to helping students succeed. However, even if the DOE does not receive SIG funding as a result of this proposal, the DOE believes New School will be better positioned to promote student achievement than is Bread and Roses, in light of the school's inability to improve.

Comment 2(c) relates to the name of Bread and Roses.

The proposal calls for Bread and Roses to be closed and replaced with a new school. While the DOE acknowledges the history of the Bread and Roses name, a new school needs a new name and school identification number (DBN). Consistent with Chancellor's Regulation A-860, parents and community members associated with the proposed new school will be able to make suggestions for the name of the new school. As with all school names, the Chancellor retains final decision-making authority.

Comments 4(a) and 10 relate to the DOE's failure to reach a negotiated agreement with the United Federation of Teachers on a teacher evaluation model for New York City schools.

As noted above, Bread and Roses' ability to retain eligibility for School Improvement Grant (SIG) funding under the Restart model was predicated on the DOE's ability to reach a comprehensive agreement on teacher evaluation with the United Federation of Teachers. The parties have been unable to reach such an agreement on. As discussed in the EIS, the DOE believes that the closure and replacement of Bread and Roses gives the best chance to quickly improve outcomes for current students.

Comments 5(a), 13 and 15 relate to staff and personnel changes at Bread and Roses.

If this proposal is approved, the New School will go through a process – in accordance with the DOE's existing contract with the United Federation of Teachers – to hire the best possible staff including current staff and new teachers. All teachers who apply to work at New School will be reviewed by a school-based Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee will consider each candidate's teaching abilities and qualifications to contribute to a rigorous new school culture where every child is expected to succeed.

We will encourage the most effective teachers at the current school to join the New School to anchor the school with their commitment to effective teaching and focus on student achievement. In addition, New School may have the opportunity to hire highly-qualified new teachers who will infuse new talent into the community.

The school-based Personnel Committee has the discretion to determine whether a candidate meets the school's qualifications.

Comments 5(b), 6(a) and 14 relate to reasons why student achievement at Bread and Roses is unacceptably low, including current or future special populations served at Bread and Roses or anticipated to be served at New School.

The DOE is committed to providing high quality public school options to children of all backgrounds. The DOE's review of Bread and Roses has determined that the school lacks the capacity to turn around quickly enough to provide a high quality program to students, including those identified in this comment. The DOE is confident that the turnaround model will allow New School to make the staff changes necessary to create an improved educational environment.

Bread and Roses was designated as PLA by the New York State Department of Education based on its consistently low graduation rates. The school was proposed for closure and replacement due to this measure, as well as several other low measures discussed in the EIS.

As stated in the EIS, Bread and Roses' most recent Progress Report was released at the end of October 2011, after the DOE's decision to implement the Restart model at the school. While Bread and Roses' 2009-2010 performance was weak and showed a decline over 2008-2009 performance in a number of areas, there were some indicators of the potential for improved performance. The DOE determined that the Restart model, a relatively less intensive intervention, was the best fit for the school. However, Bread and Roses' performance continued to decline during the 2010-2011 school year, with a decline in the school's graduation rate and a number of indicators measuring students' progress towards graduation. This data showed that the school was struggling even more than the DOE had thought at the time it chose the Restart model for the school.

Based on this most recent data, the DOE believes that students at Bread and Roses will be better served by implementation of a more intensive intervention. Thus, the DOE is now proposing that Bread and Roses be closed and replaced with a new school that would incorporate the strongest elements of Bread and Roses, while also allowing new staff to be put in place.

Students with special needs will continue to be offered services in accordance with their IEPs. More information on enrollment of special populations at New School is available in the EIS accompanying this proposal, available here: <http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/leadership/PEP/publicnotice/2011-2012/April2012Proposals.htm>

Comment 23 asks about delays in implementation of Common Core as a result of these proposals.

This proposal will not delay the implementation of the Common Core Learning Standards into curriculum and classroom instruction. In fact, the DOE believes that by closing and replacing the school, the Common Core will be implemented in a more thoughtful and substantial way. In particular, as part of this process, the new school has the opportunity to determine where there were instructional gaps in the old school's curriculum, and develop a plan to support teachers in implementing the Common Core Learning Standards effectively in the new school.

Comment 24 asks about the engagement process and what part students, parents, and the community play in the process.

Last Spring, the Department held meetings to begin or continue conversations with PLA schools and their communities about the schools' performance and possible improvement strategies. In January 2012, after taking into account a number of factors, the DOE decided to implement different, more intensive interventions at some PLA schools. At that time, Superintendents and Children First Network staff met with school communities to talk about the DOE's proposal to close and replace the school.

Comment 25 suggests these plans will result in teachers moving between PLA schools.

The guiding principle of this work is to effectively match teacher capacity to the needs of the students in a specific school. The new replacement schools will seek to hire those teachers they believe will be effective and well-matched to their new school missions.

The schools will accomplish this through the staffing process set forth in Article 18-D of the DOE's existing contract with the United Federation of Teachers ("UFT"). All teachers who apply to work at New School will be reviewed by a school-based Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee will consider each candidate's teaching abilities and qualifications to contribute to a rigorous new school culture where every child is expected to succeed.

The Personnel Committee consists of, at minimum, the following five representatives: the school principal, two designees of the UFT President, and two designees of the Chancellor. The school-based Personnel Committee will evaluate applicants' qualifications. The Personnel Committee should strive to seek consensus in its hiring decisions; however, if consensus cannot be reached, decisions are made by majority vote.

In this way, the DOE believes that only those teachers who will be most effective will be hired by the new schools. As stated in the EIS, current teachers from Bread and Roses who are not hired at New School will remain in excess.

Barring system-wide layoffs, excess teachers will be eligible to apply for other City positions, and any teachers who do not find a permanent position will be placed in the

Absent Teacher Reserve (“ATR”) pool, meaning that they will continue to earn their salary while serving as substitute teachers in other City schools. This will not count as a cost or savings to New School, but could increase overall ATR costs to the DOE.

Comments 26 and 27 ask about past implementation of the 18-D process, and specifically which schools have done this successfully, how, and what measurements of success were used.

As described above, the hiring process for new schools replacing a closing/phasing out school is implemented according to Article 18-D of the existing contract between the DOE and the UFT.

All teachers from the current school are eligible to apply for positions at the new school.

Since 2002, the DOE has opened approximately 200 new high schools as replacements for high schools that have been phased out or closed. Each of these new schools has hired its teachers through the 18-D process. As a group, these new schools have outperformed the schools they have replaced.

Below are a few examples:

- The new schools located on the Springfield Gardens Campus in Queens had a graduation rate of 68.0% in 2010, compared to Springfield Gardens High School’s graduation rate of 41.3% in 2002.
- The new schools located on the Evander Childs Campus in the Bronx had a graduation rate of 69.1% in 2010, compared to Evander Childs High School’s graduation rate of 30.7% in 2002.
- The new schools located on the Park West Campus in Manhattan had a graduation rate of 70.4% in 2010, compared to Park West High School’s graduation rate of 31.0% in 2002.
- In 2010, the schools on the Van Arsdale campus in Brooklyn had a graduation rate of 82.9%—nearly 40 points higher than the former Harry Van Arsdale High School’s graduation rate of only 44.9% in 2002.
- The Erasmus Hall Campus graduated only 40.7% of student in 2002. The new schools on the Erasmus campus are graduating 75.8% of students in 2010, a 35 percentage point increase over the closed school.

Comment 28 asks about the supports offered to the new schools.

The existing schools will continue to be supported by their networks through the end of the school year. The students will also be supported through the efforts of the Office of Student Enrollment to ensure that students have a guaranteed seat in the new school and receive a clear understanding of their enrollment options.

Replacement schools are being supported through several coordinated measures. Proposed principals for the replacement schools began working with the Division of Portfolio Planning, in February and March, as part of the Turnaround Principal Institute. In this intensive workshop, principals have been supported in planning for their schools along a wide spectrum, including such elements as mission-creation, curriculum planning, scheduling, and hiring, among other topics. Proposed leaders also continue to be supported by their Children First Network in this work. Finally, pending the availability of School Improvement Grant funding, Educational Partner Organizations (“EPOs”), which worked with schools previously implementing the Restart model, will continue to partner with replacement schools.

If these proposals are approved, during the 2012-2013 school year and beyond, as they implement the plans being made this spring and summer, new schools will be supported by their networks, the Division of Portfolio Planning, and, where relevant, their EPOs.

Comment 29 asks about the measures that will be used to evaluate new schools in addition to progress reports and quality reviews.

The Division of Portfolio Planning will work with the Networks that support each school to monitor the implementation of the curricula and structural plans for New School outlined in the EIS. The State Education Department will also evaluate New School based on its own criteria.

Comment 30 asks about the timeline for implementation of this proposal.

This proposal will be presented to the Panel for Educational Policy on April 26, 2012. If it is approved, the 18-D process will then begin. The new school, with its planned new elements and staff (made up of returning teachers and teachers new to the school), would open in September 2012 and would serve all students currently in the school who have not graduated by that time, as well as any new students who would have otherwise begun attending the closed school.

Each school has unique elements in its new school plan, many of which will be implemented at the start of the 2012-2013 school year. However, some schools have plans to phase in the new elements more gradually. For more information about the specific plans of the new school, please see the EIS posted here: <http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/leadership/PEP/publicnotice/2011-2012/April2012Proposals.htm>

Comment 31 asks about support given to PLA schools in the past.

PLA schools have been supported by their Children First Networks, as well as their EPOs, in the case of restart schools. As noted in the EIS accompanying this proposal, in the case of Bread and Roses, the DOE offered the following supports:

**Leadership Support:**

- Provided extensive leadership training, coaching, and mentoring for the principal and assistant principals to help them set clear goals for the school, including designing plans to improve instruction, developing teachers, and aligning assessments with instruction.
- Trained leadership on implementing plans in support of citywide instructional initiatives, including implementing Common Core Learning Standards.
- Supported leadership in addressing the process of tenure and probation procedures, teacher effectiveness, and legal compliance

**Instructional Support:**

- Facilitated training for teachers in developing lesson and curriculum plans aligned with citywide instructional initiatives, including in-depth sessions on writing in science and math classes and designing performance tasks based on Common Core Learning Standards.
- Provided workshops for teachers of special education students and ELL targeted to help them improve content-area instruction for these students and identify interventions and strategies to help them meet academic goals.

**Operational Support:**

- Supported teachers and staff in utilizing sophisticated data systems and analysis to tailor instruction and promote student progress.

**Student Support:**

- Coached counselors in providing extensive preparation for college and career to students, including assistance with completing FAFSA and other financial aid, college transition counseling, and career readiness programs and partnerships.
- Trained counselors and school leadership in implementing a new goal setting and monitoring model designed to help students stay on track to graduate from high school.
- Worked with parent coordinators and parent leaders to increase parents' participation in the school survey and incorporate their feedback in order to create a supportive school environment designed for student success.

Comment 32 relates specifically to summer school.

Summer school will continue to be implemented as in years past. Each year, a number of school buildings host summer school programs. Individual schools choose to affiliate to a particular building for summer school opportunities for their students, which may mean offering their own programs for their students, offering a summer school program in partnership with other schools.

Of the buildings that will be open to host summer school in 2012, some have schools which have been proposed for closure and replacement, though many do not. Regardless, all students currently attending a school proposed for closure and replacement will have

the opportunity to attend summer school, either in their home building or in the one with which their school has affiliated. Students are typically assigned to summer school during June, and this same process will be in place this year for students in all schools, whether they attend one proposed for closure or not.

For more information about summer school, please see the DOE's Web site at: <http://schools.nyc.gov/ChoicesEnrollment/SummerSchool/default.htm>.

Comment 33 asks about measurement of the new schools' student outcomes.

New schools replacing closed schools will receive a progress report after the 2012-2013 school year; in other words, a progress report will be issued in the 2013-2014 school year assessing the school's progress during the 2013-2014 school year. The reports issued in 2013-2014, although will only be based on those measures which provide "snapshots" of data over a one-year period, such as the percentage of students earning 10 or more credits in their first year for high schools and the percentage of students earning a 3 or 4 on the State Math exam for middle schools.

These schools will not, however, receive an overall progress report grade in 2012-2013, as this measure is dependent upon year over year growth, which will only be available after the schools' second year in existence. Therefore, these schools will receive an overall progress report grade for the first time after the 2013-2014 school year.

Regarding goals, performance benchmarks are included in the SIG application for each of these schools. These include:

- Reduce the percentage of students in the All Students subgroup who are performing below the Proficient level (Levels 1 and 2) on NYSED ELA and Math assessments by 10% or more from the previous year
- Attain a minimum Total Cohort graduation rate of 60% after one year of implementation; (or) annually reduce the gap by a minimum of 20% between the school's Total Cohort graduation rate and the State's 80% graduation rate standard (for high schools only).

Comment 34 asks about the impact of the new schools and the closure/replacement approach.

The DOE believes that the strategy of closing and replacing PLA schools will provide a better educational option to current students more rapidly and with more certainty than current interventions, which were simply not adequate in order to make the school an acceptable choice for current and future students. The closure/replacement strategy will preserve the elements of former school that have led to improvement, while giving the new school the wherewithal to build upon it and accelerate the pace of change.

By closing this school and replacing it with a new school, the DOE is seeking to quickly create a high-quality school environment that children need to prepare for success in college, work, and life. Schools that have historically undergone this process have track records of shifting the culture of the school further toward one that sets high expectations that support student learning and achievement.

For more specific information regarding the anticipated impact of a proposal, please refer to the Educational Impact Statement(s) (and Building Utilization Plan, where applicable) for the particular proposal.

Comment 35 concerns planning teams for the new schools.

Planning teams for each school are composed of the proposed leaders for the schools, as well as the schools' Children First Networks, and EPOs (where applicable). These teams are also receiving support from the Office of School Development, in the Division of Portfolio Planning.

Comments 36, 37, and 38 concern JIT reviews for the schools proposed for closure and replacement.

The DOE works with SED to conduct JITs for schools that become newly identified into one of the following categories.

- Restructuring, Year 1
- Restructuring, Advanced
- Persistently Lowest Achieving

JITs that were conducted during the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years may be found at [http://www.p12.nysed.gov/accountability/School\\_Improvement/JITReports.html](http://www.p12.nysed.gov/accountability/School_Improvement/JITReports.html). JIT reviews conducted during the 2009-2010 school year may be obtained from the District Superintendent's Office or Elizabeth Iadavaia, Senior Director of School Improvement, at [Eiadava@schools.nyc.gov](mailto:Eiadava@schools.nyc.gov)

Comment 39 concerns whether the new school will serve over- the- counter, ELL and/or over-age under-credited students.

As stated in the EIS, new schools replacing closed schools will serve all types of students, including over-the-counter ("OTC") students, English language learner ("ELL") students, students with disabilities, and over-age, under-credited students. For more specific information, please refer to the EIS describing the proposal.

Comment 40 asks about whether rising ninth graders can opt out of the replacement school.

All students who currently attend the school, as well as all of those who would otherwise have attended the existing school for the first time, will have a guaranteed seat in the new school. The DOE believes that New School will support student success at a level that the current school cannot, and therefore all students are encouraged to take advantage of their guaranteed seat in the new school.

As indicated in the EISs, students who listed a school proposed for closure on their high school admissions applications had the opportunity to submit a new application during Round Two. Schools with available seats as well as some new high schools designated to open throughout the City for the 2012-2013 school year were available for these students to consider in that round. If a student already received a match in Round One (whether to a school proposed for closure, or any other school), that match will be nullified if the student receives a Round Two match, which are issued at the end of April.

In addition, all students in non-terminal grades who currently attend Title 1 Schools in Need of Improvement (“SINI”) Year 2 status or worse (including PLA schools), such as Bread and Roses, are also eligible to apply for a transfer to another non-SINI school through the DOE’s existing No Child Left Behind (“NCLB”) Public School Choice Process. More information about this process can be found at the DOE’s Web site at:

<http://schools.nyc.gov/choicesenrollment/changingschools/default>.

Comment 41 and 42 concern the availability of SIG funding.

New York City received \$58,569,883 in funding from SED for 2011-2012 to support implementation of School Improvement Grants in 44 schools (19 Transformation, 14 Restart, and 11 phaseout replacements funded under the Turnaround model). As discussed in more detail in the EISs, outstanding funding for the Turnaround and Restart schools was suspended by the New York State Education Department after the DOE and UFT were unable to reach an agreement on a new teacher evaluation system by January 1, 2012. The DOE is hopeful that this SIG funding will be restored to some of these schools based on the new SIG proposals submitted to SED in March 2012. If the State approves the DOE’s application to place New School into the Turnaround model, New School will be eligible for up to \$2M per year as part the School Improvement Grant program. However, the challenges in these schools are too great, and the need to overcome those challenges is too urgent, to not take immediate action to address key aspects of the school’s culture, systems, and staffing, whether or not SED ultimately authorizes funding.

Comment 43 relates to funding spent on contracts for schools in the restart model.

The DOE is currently working with six Educational Partnership Organizations (EPO)s to support 14 schools.

The DOE has committed to provide funding for the EPO contracts through the conclusion of this school year. This commitment should ensure that the programmatic initiatives that EPOs have in place this year at Restart schools can be completed with fidelity. This commitment to fund the contracts regardless of SED's reimbursement is only for this school year. The future work of EPOs may not continue if the Department unable to gain access to SIG funding.

Comment 44 refers to signed by approximately 1,300 people opposing the proposals to close and replace schools. As stated earlier, the DOE has provided several supports to the schools in question, but believes only their closure and replacement will accelerate the pace of change needed to achieve the desired improvement for current students in these schools.

The DOE does not have a policy of concentrating high needs students at specific schools. However, the DOE works to support schools which have above average percentages of students with high needs, including ELLs, students with disabilities, overage and under-credited students, students who come into schools "over-the-counter," and others.

The DOE sites charter schools based on the availability of space, and these co-locations are not based on the quality of the schools already located within the buildings. The DOE believes that students should be provided with as many high quality options as possible.

The DOE currently supports struggling schools through the Children First Network selected by each school. In some cases, these schools work with the network to create an action plan for improvement. Also in some cases, such as for some of the schools approved for phase-out during the 2010-2011 school year, struggling schools are supported through a designated Transition Support Network. Additionally, schools are supported by the Division of Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners, as well as the Office of Postsecondary Readiness.

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

No changes have been made to this proposal.