



Public Comment Analysis¹

Date: March 8, 2013

Topic: The Proposed Phase-out of Business Computer Application & Entrepreneurship High School (29Q496) Beginning in 2013-2014

Date of Panel Vote: March 11, 2013

Summary of Proposal

On January 17, 2013, the New York City Department of Education (“DOE”) issued an Educational Impact Statement (“EIS”) which described a proposal to phase out Business, Computer Applications & Entrepreneurship High School (29Q496, “BCAE”), an existing high school located in school building Q490 on the Campus Magnet Educational Campus (“Q490” or “Campus Magnet”), beginning in the 2013-2014 school year. Campus Magnet is located at 207-01 116th Avenue, Queens, NY 11411, within the geographical confines of Community School District 29 (“District 29”). BCAE currently serves students in grades nine through twelve. The DOE proposed to phase out the school based on its poor performance and the DOE’s assessment that it lacks the capacity to improve quickly to better support student needs.

On February 22, 2013, the DOE issued an amended EIS which clarified the manner in which students who are currently attending BCAE can transfer through the Public School Choice (“PSC”) Process.

If the phase-out proposal is approved, BCAE will no longer admit new ninth-grade students after the conclusion of the 2012-2013 school year. The school will continue to phase out one grade level at a time until it closes at the conclusion of the 2015-2016 school year, and current students will be supported as they progress towards graduation while remaining enrolled at BCAE. In cases where students do not complete graduation requirements by June 2016, the DOE will help students and families identify alternative programs or schools that meet students’ needs so that they may continue their education after BCAE completes phasing out.

BCAE is co-located with the following three district schools: Mathematics, Science Research and Technology Magnet High School (29Q492, “MAST”), an existing high school serving students in grades nine through twelve; Law, Government and Community Service High School (29Q494, “LGCS”), an existing high school serving students in grades nine through twelve; and Humanities & Arts Magnet High School (29Q498, “Humanities & Arts”), an existing high school serving students in grades nine through twelve. In addition, building Q490 houses a School Based Health Center (“SBHC”) program.

¹ The DOE will continue to accept comments concerning this proposal up to 24 hours prior to the Panel for Educational Policy’s (“PEP”) vote on March 11, 2013. Those additional comments will be addressed in an amended Public Comment Analysis which will be provided to the PEP before it votes on this proposal.



BCAE has a Career and Technical Education (“CTE”) program. The program admits students in ninth grade through the Citywide High School Admissions process.

In a separate EIS posted on January 14, 2013, the DOE is proposing to phase out LGCS due to its poor performance and the DOE’s assessment that it lacks the capacity to improve quickly to better support student needs. That proposal can be found here:

<http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/leadership/PEP/publicnotice/2012-2013/Mar112013Proposals.htm>.

If that proposal is approved, LGCS would begin phasing out in September 2013 and eventually close at the conclusion of the 2015-2016 school year. In a separate EIS also posted on January 14, 2013, the DOE is proposing to co-locate a new school, 29Q243, in building Q490 beginning in the 2013-2014 school year as part of the replacement strategy for LGCS. If that proposal is approved, 29Q243 would enroll students beginning in the 2013-2014 school year and would be at full-scale during the 2016-2017 school year. 29Q243 will offer a rigorous academic program with a CTE component that will prepare students for post-secondary education and work. That proposal can be found here: <http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/leadership/PEP/publicnotice/2012-2013/Mar112013Proposals.htm>.

If the phase-out proposal is approved, BCAE will continue serving currently enrolled students, but will begin phasing out one grade at a time beginning in September 2013, and complete its phase-out after the 2015-2016 school year. If the proposal to phase-out BCAE, the proposal to phase out LGCS, and the proposal to co-locate 29Q243 are approved, it is likely that after BCAE and LGCS complete their phase outs and 29Q243 completes its phase-in, there may be underutilized space in building Q490. At this time, the DOE also anticipates opening a new school in September 2014 in Q490 as part of the replacement strategy for BCAE. The DOE would issue a separate EIS for such a proposal.

Summary of Comments Received

A joint public hearing regarding this proposal was held at building Q490 on February 26, 2013. Members of the School Leadership Team (“SLT”) from every school organization in the Q490 building were invited to participate. At that hearing, interested parties had an opportunity to provide input on the proposal. While representatives from the Citywide Council for Special Education, Citywide Council on High Schools, and Citywide Council for English Language Learners were invited, not all chose to participate in the hearing. Approximately 152 members of the public attended the hearing and 29 people spoke. Present at the meeting were: Deputy Chancellor Dorita Gibson; Queens High Schools Superintendent Juan Mendez; Community Education Council (“CEC”) 29 President Alicia Hyndman; Lynne Callender, Principal of BCAE; Donna Delfyett-White, Principal of LGCS; Jose Cruz, Principal of MAST; Rosemarie Omard, Principal of Humanities & Arts; SLT representatives from BCAE, Jovonne Campbell, Lenore Krieger, and Rosemary Reyes; Jamal Wilkerson representing Council Member Leroy Comrie; Nathaniel Hezekiah representing Congressman Gregory Meeks; and Savita Iyengar and Emily Ades from the DOE’s Office of Portfolio Management.



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

1. Alicia Hyndman, President of CEC 29, expressed her opposition to the proposed phase-out of BCAE:
 - a. She suggested a moratorium on school closures.
 - b. She questioned the supports offered from the Children's First Network ("CFN") for BCAE.
2. BCAE SLT Student Representatives gave a presentation during which they expressed their opposition to the proposed phase-out of BCAE:
 - a. They stated that BCAE has been negatively impacted by the previous proposed phase-out of BCAE and this proposed phase-out.
 - b. They stated that BCAE has had three principals in four years.
 - c. They stated that the Campus Magnet sports teams are 70% comprised of BCAE students.
 - d. They stated that with proper resources and supports, BCAE can remediate any difficulties.
 - e. They stated that the Virtual Enterprise program has been effective at BCAE.
3. Joel Vinn of the BCAE SLT gave a presentation during which he expressed his opposition to the proposed phase-out of BCAE:
 - a. He compared the progress of BCAE with other schools and stated that the data shows that the proposed phase-out is about credit accumulation and not graduation rates. He stated that a school with a 59% graduation rate received an overall "B" on the progress report.
 - b. He stated that BCAE has shown progress and that the school received a "B" in College and Career Readiness.
 - c. He stated that the DOE only considered the four-year graduation rate in their decision to phase-out BCAE and that sometimes it takes longer to graduate.
 - d. He stated that studies have shown that the phase-out policy is ineffective and he cited a Brown University study.
 - e. He stated that the percent of students receiving Instructional Support Services at BCAE rose from 14.7 % in 2008-2009 school year to 24.4% in 2012-2013 school year.
4. Jamal Wilkerson representing Councilman Leroy Comrie expressed opposition to the proposed phase-out of BCAE:
 - a. He stated that the DOE is responsible for the enrollment reduction at BCAE.
 - b. He stated that the principal has only been at BCAE for six months and has not been given the time to improve the school.
5. Dmytro Fedkowskj, Queens borough representative on the PEP, expressed opposition to the proposed phase-out of BCAE:
 - a. He stated that the principal needs more time and resources to improve the school.
 - b. He said he would not support the proposal at the PEP meeting on March 11, 2013 and is proposing a moratorium on school phase-outs in general.



6. James Vasquez representing the United Federation of Teachers (“UFT”) and multiple commenters expressed opposition to the proposal to phase-out BCAE.
 - a. They stated that they are in opposition to Mayor Bloomberg’ policy on school closures in general.
 - b. Some of these commenters stated that BCAE needs resources and not closure.
 - c. Some of these commenters referred to the closure of Andrew Jackson High School in 1994 as an example of how closure doesn’t work, since BCAE is one of the replacement schools for Andrew Jackson High School.
 - d. One commenter stated that, as BCAE phases out, it will not get resources and cited Jamaica High School as an example.
 - e. One commenter said that phase-out will have a negative impact on all the other schools on the campus.
 - f. One commenter stated that her son was doing well in school and is now failing classes since he found out the school was closing.
 - g. Multiple commenters, including Bernie Lopez, representing The Council of Supervisors and Administrators (“CSA”), stated that there are no criteria for school closure, and that schools proposed for phase-out do not fit any pattern.
 - h. Some of these commenters, including Janelle Hyde representing the UFT, stated that the first proposal to phase-out BCAE had a negative impact on BCAE’s reputation and was a factor in the decline in enrollment at BCAE.
7. Multiple commenters cited numerous leadership changes over the past five years.
8. Multiple commenters expressed a lack of supports provided to BCAE over the years, asking how BCAE has been supported since the last time the community met to discuss the possibility of phasing-out the school.
9. Multiple commenters expressed support for the vocational component of BCAE.
 - a. One commenter asked in what ways a new vocational school would perform better than BCAE.

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

The DOE received no written and/or oral comments through its dedicated phone line and e-mail for this proposal.

The DOE received a comment which does not directly relate to the proposal. This comment is summarized below.

10. A commenter stated that her daughter did not get matched to any school on her High School application.

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



- Comments 1(b), 2(d), 6(b), and 8 express concerns regarding the supports that were provided to BCAE and express the belief that added resources, and not phase-out, is the appropriate course of action. Comments 2(a) 4 (a), and 6(h) refer specifically to the impact the previous phase-out proposal had on BCAE and the supports that were offered at that time. Comments 4(b) and 5(a) contend that the current principal should be given more time and resources to make improvements at BCAE.

All schools receive support and assistance from their superintendent and their CFN, 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.

While the DOE recognizes that BCAE staff members have worked hard to improve the school, even with support, the school has not produced adequate outcomes for students. To help the school's efforts to improve performance, the DOE has offered numerous supports including:

Leadership Support:

- Coaching the principal in the use of classroom observations and feedback to enhance teacher effectiveness.
- Working with the principal to assess areas in need of improvement in the school and supporting the implementation of a strategic action plan to address these concerns.
- Assisting school leadership in the development of instructional plans and goals for the school year, in support of the school's Comprehensive Education Plan.

Instructional Support:

- Providing coaching and professional development for teachers on strategies to strengthen instruction and improve academic outcomes for special education students.
- Participating in classroom walkthroughs to provide targeted feedback for teachers on ways to improve classroom instruction and increase student engagement.
- Coaching teachers in the development of lesson plans, curriculum maps and rubrics aligned to Citywide instructional expectations.
- Facilitating the school's participation in a program that provides on online resources and technology to help teachers differentiate instruction and improve literacy outcomes for students.

Operational Support:

- Training school staff in student data tracking systems to ensure efficient and effective monitoring of student attendance, and providing guidance on strategies to increase student attendance.



- Assisting the school in the development of a school safety plan and discipline code, and coaching school staff in best practices for reducing the number of safety incidents and suspensions.
- Advising school staff on budgeting, staffing, teacher recruitment and building management.

Student Support:

- Coaching the school in the use of evidence-based guidance and counseling strategies to build the school's capacity to offer social and emotional support to students.
- Providing professional development for school staff on topics in youth development, including crisis-management, bullying, and violence prevention, in order to foster awareness and improve the school's culture and learning environment.

BCAE has received individualized support plans, as well as centralized services that the DOE provides to all schools—yet despite this extensive assistance, the school has failed to meet the needs of its students and families. These supports have been provided to BCAE since the DOE proposed to phase-out BCAE in the fall of 2009.

In regards to comments about giving the principal more time to make improvements at BCAE, the DOE initiated a comprehensive review of BCAE with the goal of determining what intensive supports and interventions would best benefit the BCAE 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.

The DOE recognizes that BCAE is a valued member of the community, and is supported by many. After completing that review, though, the DOE believes that only the most serious intervention – the gradual phase-out and eventual closure of BCAE – will address the school's declining performance and longstanding struggles and allow for new school options to develop in building Q490 that will better serve future students and the broader community. Of course, struggling schools must be given a real shot to improve. But if the school continues to fail after receiving additional support, we must make the incredibly difficult decision to replace the failing school with a new option.

We cannot stand by and allow schools to keep failing our students when we know we can—and we must—do better.

- Comments 2(b) and 7 express concerns about the change in leadership at BCAE.

While the DOE acknowledges that the school underwent changes in the leadership, BCAE was provided the aforementioned comprehensive, school-specific supports by the DOE. Despite this extensive assistance, it is apparent that BCAE has not succeeded in developing the proper



infrastructure to meet the needs of its students and families. Leadership, while very important, is still only one component of a school. The school culture and conditions have not enabled increased student achievement. It is our belief that phasing out this school and bringing in higher quality schools will provide better options for the community and families in the future.

- Comment 3(e) concerns the fact that the large high needs population at BCAE has an impact on the performance of the school.

The overall Progress Report grade is designed to reflect each school's contribution to student achievement, no matter where each child begins his or her journey to career and college readiness. The methods are designed to be demographically neutral so that the final score for each school has as little correlation as possible with incoming student characteristics such as poverty, ethnicity, disabilities, and English learner status. To achieve this, the Progress Report emphasizes year-to-year progress, compares schools mostly to peers matched based on incoming student characteristics, and awards additional credit based on exemplary progress with high-need student groups. Each school's performance is compared to the performance of schools in its peer group, which is comprised of New York City public schools with a student population most like the school's population, according to the peer index. The peer index is used to sort schools on the basis of students' academic and demographic background, and the formula to calculate a school's peer index includes the percentage of students with disabilities, the average 8th grade English and Math proficiency scores of incoming students, the percentage of students with self-contained placements, and the percentage of overage students. For high schools, each school has up to 40 peer schools, up to 20 schools with peer index immediately above it and up to 20 with peer index immediately below it. Thus, BCAE is grouped in its peer group with other New York City public schools with similar student academic and demographic background.

Poor performance report grades thus indicate that a school is not serving its students well, both objectively and by comparison to other schools serving similar students. Moreover, the new schools proposed to open are anticipated to serve student populations similar to the phasing out school.

Further, in New York City, high school admission is based on a Citywide choice process, with students ranking up to 12 high school programs in order of preference. High school students with IEPs are admitted in the same manner as general education students. ELL students are admitted to high schools in the same manner as their non-ELL peers. Many schools Citywide serve high proportions of high-need or underserved populations and produce positive academic outcomes.

- Comments 1(a), 3(d), 5(b), and 6(a) concern the policy of school closure, and Comment 6(c) refers specifically to the closure of Andrew Jackson High School.

The central goal of the Children First reforms is simple: to create a system of great schools. Every child in New York City deserves the best possible education. This starts with a great school – led by a dedicated leader with a vision for student success.



To ensure that as many students as possible have access to the best possible education, under this Administration, New York City has replaced 142 of our lowest-performing schools with better options and opened 576 new schools: 427 district schools and 149 public charter schools.

As a result, we have created more high-quality choices for families. Graduation rates at new schools are higher than the schools they replaced. Here are a few examples:

- *Manhattan:* The new schools located on the Seward Park Campus in lower Manhattan had a graduation rate of 71.1% in 2011, compared to Seward Park High School's graduation rate in 2002 of 36.4% (Seward Park HS completed its phase-out in 2006).
- *Manhattan:* The new schools located on the Park West Campus in Manhattan had a graduation rate of 72.2% in 2011, compared to Park West High School's graduation rate in 2002 of 31.0% (Park West HS completed its phase-out in 2006).
- *Brooklyn:* In 2011, the schools on the Van Arsdale campus in Brooklyn had a graduation rate of 86.7%—about 40 points higher than the former Harry Van Arsdale High School's graduation rate of only 44.9% in 2002 (Van Arsdale HS completed its phase-out in 2007).
- *Brooklyn:* The Erasmus Hall High School graduated only 40.3% of student in 2002. The new schools on the Erasmus campus are getting tremendous results, graduating 71.4% of students in 2011. (Erasmus Hall HS complete its phase-out in 2006.)
- *Queens:* The new schools located on the Springfield Gardens Campus in Queens had a graduation rate of 68.8% in 2011, compared to Springfield Gardens High School's graduation rate in 2002 of 41.3% (Springfield Gardens HS completed its phase-out in 2007).
- *Bronx:* The new schools located on the Evander Childs Campus in the Bronx had a graduation rate of 72.6% in 2011, compared to Evander Childs High School's graduation rate in 2002 of 30.7% (Evander Childs HS completed its phase-out in 2008).

Ten years ago when the Mayor charged us with developing a system of great schools we knew it was a big goal to deliver on and would require bold action on the part of all of us.

We count on each of our schools to provide a high-quality education to its students—and we hold all schools to the same high standard. If a school is not getting the job done for its students, we are compelled to take serious action to ensure its students do not fall even further behind.

In a June 2010, MDRC, an independent research group, 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.



New York City was ahead of the curve in complying with President Obama's call to close or turnaround the lowest 5% of schools nationwide and provide better options to families. We simply cannot stand by and allow schools to keep failing our kids when we know we can—and we must—do better. New York City's new schools strategy has helped us to deliver on the core promise we make to NYC families to provide *all* students with an excellent education.

Our new schools are overwhelmingly getting the job done for students, and when they are not, and a school is struggling, we follow the same process to phase out and replace that school.

- Comment 6(g) concerns the criteria for identifying struggling schools.

In a concerted effort to ensure that all students have access to high-quality school programs, the DOE annually reviews the performance of all schools citywide. This process identifies schools that are having the most trouble serving their students. Using a wide range of data and on-the-ground information, we identify our most struggling schools for intensive support or intervention.

First, we compile a preliminary set of schools that meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Received a grade of D, F, or a third consecutive C or worse on the 2011-12 Progress Report; and/or
- Received a rating on the most recent Quality Review of Developing or Underdeveloped; and/or
- Identified as Priority (bottom 5% in the state) by the New York State Education Department; and/or
- Received a recommendation on their 2011-12 Joint Intervention Team review for significant change in organizational structure or phase out/closure.

Next, we apply additional criteria to determine which schools are most in need of support or intervention. We remove from consideration schools that meet any of the following criteria:

- Elementary and middle schools that have a higher English Language Arts and Math average proficiency than their district average or the city average (whichever is lower). The city average for 2011-12 is 53.5% proficient; and/or
- High Schools that have a higher graduation rate than the citywide graduation rate. The citywide rate for 2010-11* is 65.5%; and/or
- Schools that received an A or B on the 2011-12 Progress Report; and/or
- Schools that earned a Well Developed score on a 2010-11 or 2011-12 Quality Review; and/or
- Schools receiving a Progress Report Grade for the first time in 2011-12.

**Note: 2011-12 citywide graduation rate is not available yet.*

Schools that are removed from consideration for the most intensive support or intervention will receive differentiated support from their network team, but are not considered for phase-out.

We identify the remaining schools as struggling schools. These schools will undergo strategic action planning. These plans will identify concrete action steps, benchmarks, and year-end goals aimed at immediately improving student achievement. This plan will outline the specific support the network will provide to the school to address the most urgent areas of need, including:

- Leadership coaching;



- Professional development on instructional strategies for struggling students;
- Identifying grants aimed at specific needs of the school;
- Introducing new programs;
- Supporting the development of a smaller learning environment; and
- Possible leadership change.

Some of the struggling schools were also further investigated for more serious interventions that may include phase out/truncation and replacement. When considering whether a struggling school should be investigated as a candidate for more serious intervention – phase-out/closure/truncation – we consider a few key data points:

- Student performance trends over time;
- Demand/enrollment trends over time;
- Interventions already underway (e.g. SIG model);
- Talent data;
- School culture / environment;
- District needs / priorities; and
- School safety data.

In addition to our investigation, we also had conversations with school staff, parents, students, communities, and networks to get a holistic sense of what is happening at the school and what supports or interventions would most likely improve student outcomes. In our early engagement meetings at these schools, we had conversations with constituents about what is working and what is not working before making a decision about the supports or interventions that can best support student outcomes.

At the end of this multi-step process, our analysis and engagement directed us to a set of schools that quantitative and qualitative indicators show do not have the capacity to significantly improve. Deciding what course of action can best support the students and community of a struggling school is not easy, but we are compelled to act based on our commitment to ensuring that every student has access to high-quality schools.

No single factor determines whether a school will phase out or not. Deciding to phase out a school is the toughest decision we make. But it is the right thing to do for the students of New York City.

- Comments 2(c, e) , 6(d, f), 9, and 9a concern the impact on students attending BCAE as well as the successful programs at BCAE, and concern the resources that BCAE would be given if the proposal to phase out the school is approved. Comment 6(e) concerns the impact of this proposal on the Campus Magnet Campus.

BCAE will continue offering student athletics and other extra-curricular program options, but the number and range of programs offered may gradually diminish due to declining student enrollment as the school phases out. It is difficult to predict precisely how changes to the above offerings might be implemented, as decisions would rest with school administrators and would be made based on student interests and available resources. In terms of the CTE component at



BCAE, some BCAE students are currently enrolled in the Entrepreneurship and Virtual Enterprise program, which is not state-approved. Students enrolled in this program that is phasing out will be supported as they progress toward graduation at BCAE, but they will not graduate with a CTE endorsement.

Further, as part of the replacement strategy for the proposed phase-out of LGCS, the DOE is proposing to co-locate a new school, 29Q243, in building Q490 beginning in the 2013-2014 school year. 29Q243 will offer new CTE programming with a Career Pathway in Health Sciences, and the Office of Postsecondary Readiness (“OPSR”) will support the leadership of 29Q243 to gain state approval for this program. Under the National Academy Foundation, which has a four year career-based curriculum, 29Q243 may also explore creating a new career cluster theme of medical services. A medical services themed CTE program may help 29Q243 to diversify the Campus Magnet Campus. However, also as stated above, students will only graduate from 29Q243 with a CTE endorsement if the programs are approved by the time they graduate.

While we know that phasing out and replacing schools is the right decision for these communities, we take seriously our obligation to provide high-quality support to students in schools that are phasing out.

Supports for students in phase-out schools have evolved over several years as we have learned what differentiated support is needed to support these schools and students.

If phase out proposals are approved, schools will 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.

In September 2011, 26 schools began phasing out. These schools have received additional funding and specialized network support. Middle schools and high schools that began phasing out in September 2011 have been supported by the Transition Support Network.

In September 2012, 17 additional schools began phasing out. All schools undergoing the process of phasing out are now supported by the Transition Support Network. Five schools that were approved for truncation continue to be supported by their networks.

While we do not know exactly what the supports will look like for the 22 proposed phase-outs and 2 proposed truncations that would be implemented beginning in September 2013 if approved, we do know that we will continue to establish differentiated and deliberate support to those schools and students.

These supports should help to continue a positive trend we have seen in phasing out schools. Historically, as high schools have phased out, their four-year graduation rates have risen.



In response to comment 6(e), there are currently hundreds of schools in buildings across the City that are co-located. 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 to ensure equitable allocation of classroom, resource and administrative space. While the DOE acknowledges and commends the co-located schools in Q490 for their positive relationship, the DOE does not anticipate that the proposed phase-out and eventual closure of BCAE and LGCS will impact admissions, current or future student enrollment, or instructional programming at Humanities & Arts or MAST. All schools will continue to receive targeted supports from their ’CFN’s in the areas of leadership, instruction, operations and student support. Additionally, the proposed opening and co-location of 29Q243 in Q490 is part of the DOE’s central goal to create new school options that will better serve future students in the Campus Magnet Educational Campus and the community at large.

- Comments 3(a, b, and c) specifically pertain to the data for credit accumulation, graduation rates, and the measure of college and career readiness for BCAE as compared to other schools.

BCAE did receive a B grade for College and Career Readiness. However, BCAE has a history of low performance, including an overall D grade on the 2009-2010 Progress Report and an overall C grade on the 2010-2011 Progress Report. BCAE has struggled for years, and the school’s performance during the 2011-2012 school year further demonstrates that the school lacks capacity to improve quickly to better support student needs. Graduation rates have remained below 58% for the last four years. BCAE’s four-year graduation rate (including August graduates) was 47% in 2012—well below the most recent Citywide average of 65.5% (Citywide average is based on the 2011 New York State reported graduation results for NYCDOE students.) The DOE also considered BCAE’s six-year graduation rate (including August graduates) which was 68% in 2012—below the most recent Citywide average of 70.9% First year credit accumulation is a key predictor of student success because students who fall behind early in high school often have trouble getting back on track to graduate. In 2011-2012, only 63% of first-year students at BCAE earned at least 10 credits with at least 6 of those credits earned across 3 of the 4 core subject areas. This rate of credit accumulation puts BCAE in the lowest 11% of schools Citywide.

- Comment 10 does not directly relate to the proposal and does not require a response.

Changes Made to the Proposal

No changes have been made to this proposal.