

Public Comment Analysis

Date: February 29, 2012

Topic: The Proposed Co-location of Brooklyn Success Academy Charter School 4 (84KTBD) with Existing School J.H.S. 050 John D. Wells (14K050) in Building K050 Beginning in 2012-2013

Date of Panel Vote: March 1, 2012

Summary of Proposal

The New York City Department of Education (“DOE”) is proposing to site Brooklyn Success Academy Charter School 4 (84KTBD, “Success Academy – Williamsburg”), a new public charter school that will serve students in kindergarten through fourth grade in Building K050 (“K050”), located at 183 South 3rd Street in Community School District 14 beginning in 2012-2013. Success Academy – Williamsburg would be co-located in K050 with existing middle school J.H.S. 050 John D. Wells (14K050, “J.H.S. 50”), which serves students in grades six through eight. J.H.S. 50 admits students in sixth grade through the District 14 Middle School Choice application process and maintains a Screened: Academic program in the Humanities. A “co-location” means that two or more school organizations are located in the same building and may share large, common spaces like the auditoriums, gymnasiums and cafeterias.

Currently, in addition to J.H.S. 50, K050 also houses a high school, Academy for Young Writers (14K404). However, the Panel for Educational Policy (“PEP”) has approved a proposal to re-site Academy for Young Writers to Building K422 (“K422”) in District 19 beginning in the 2012-2013 school year. Therefore, Academy for Young Writers will no longer be housed in K050 starting in the 2012-2013 school year and is not expected to be impacted by this proposal. Also, the Office of Adult and Continuing Education (“OACE”) holds evening classes at K050 on Monday and Wednesday evenings, and K050 houses a community-based organization (“CBO”), El Puente, which offers after school programs at J.H.S. 50.

According to the 2010-2011 Enrollment Capacity Utilization Report (the “Blue Book”), K050 has the capacity to serve 1,232 students. Currently, the building serves 822 students, yielding a building utilization rate of 67%. If this proposal is approved, in 2012-2013, the first year of the proposed co-location, Success Academy – Williamsburg will serve approximately 170-196 students in kindergarten and first grade. Success Academy – Williamsburg will then add one grade each year until serves approximately 525-625 students in kindergarten through fourth grade in 2015-2016. At that time, K050 is projected to serve approximately 870-1,000 students enrolled in J.H.S. 50 and Success Academy – Williamsburg, yielding an estimated building utilization rate of 71-81%. Thus, K050 has sufficient space to accommodate the proposed co-location.

Success Charter Network (“SCN”), a charter management organization (“CMO”) that operates nine public charter schools in New York City, has been approved by its charter authorizer, the

State University of New York (“SUNY”) Charter Schools Institute, to open three new public charter schools in Brooklyn, including Success Academy – Williamsburg, for the 2012-2013 school year. Success Academy - Williamsburg has been approved by SUNY Charter Schools Institute to serve up to 689 students in kindergarten through fifth grade. However, the DOE has informed SCN that K050 can accommodate only the school’s kindergarten through fourth grade students based on the space available in the building. The DOE will consider all long term options to accommodate the anticipated growth of Success Academy - Williamsburg, which may include re-siting some of its grades to a different location. Any proposal to re-site or co-locate Success Academy – Williamsburg in another building would be posted in another EIS subject to a vote by the PEP.

The DOE believes in SCN’s record of success and supports the permanent placement of this charter school operated by SCN in District 14 in order to continue providing educational opportunities for students and families. SCN strives to provide rigorous and well-rounded instruction in communities throughout New York City. Each of the four SCN elementary schools that received a Progress Report for the 2010-2011 school year received an overall grade of A.

The Educational Impact Statement (“EIS”) describing this proposal is available in the main office of J.H.S. 50 and on the DOE’s website at:

<http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/leadership/PEP/publicnotice/2011-2012/Mar12012PEP.htm>.

Summary of Comments Received at the Joint Public Hearing

Two joint public hearings were held regarding this proposal at K050. The first hearing was held on January 17, 2012. The second hearing was held on February 16, 2012. At both hearings, interested parties had an opportunity to provide input on the proposal. Approximately 400 members of the public attended the first hearing, and approximately 40 people spoke. Approximately 470 members of the public attended the second hearing, and approximately 58 people spoke. Present at the first meeting were City councilwoman Diana Reyna, a representative of Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez, District 14 Community Education Council (“CEC”) President Tesa Wilson, J.H.S. 50 Principal Denise Jamison, Executive Director of the Office of Portfolio Management Paymon Rouhanifard as well as Elizabeth Haskins and Carrie Marlin, Ariel Guerrero, Nicholas Marini, Bert Wyman and Etzer Botes from the DOE. Present at the second meeting were City councilwoman Diana Reyna, a representative of State Senator Martin Dilan, a representative of Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez, J.H.S. 50 Principal Denise Jamison, District 14 Community Superintendent James Quail, Citywide Council on Special Education member Ellen McHugh, Executive Director of the Office of Portfolio Management Paymon Rouhanifard as well as Gregg Bethel, Carrie Marlin, Kim Wong, Jaelyn Leffel, Debra Schwartzman and Ariel Guerrero from the DOE. Representatives from CEC 14 were invited to participate in the hearing, but declined to attend.

The following comments and remarks were made at the joint public hearing on January 17, 2012:

1. A commenter stated that:

- a. She is not against charter schools or quality educational options, but is against a proposal that will not allow the community and its leadership to participate in the decision making process.
 - b. The DOE should not only consider the needs of students who are entering the school system, but should also consider those already in the system.
 - c. District 14 needs more quality middle schools.
2. A commenter stated that:
 - a. The DOE says that local elementary schools are under-enrolled, but opening a new kindergarten through fourth grade elementary school will continue to reduce enrollment at local elementary schools.
 - b. The community has been asking for more quality middle schools in the district, but the DOE is not listening.
3. A commenter stated that:
 - a. The community has asked for more quality middle and high school seats, but the DOE has turned a deaf ear.
 - b. The DOE should strengthen the schools and programs that already exist in District 14, not bring in new programs.
 - c. District 14 knows what it needs to educate its children and it does not need the DOE to tell them what they need.
4. A commenter stated that:
 - a. One of the notices stated that over 26% of students in K050 have Individualized Education Programs (“IEPs”). It is rare that schools are as welcoming to students with disabilities as J.H.S. 50 seems to be. Success Academy serves fewer than 3% of students with IEPs.
 - b. She is against charter schools and co-location.
 - c. The DOE promises that if capital expenditures in excess of \$5,000 are made to a DOE building as a result of co-location, similar funds will be made available to DOE schools for capital upgrades. However, the DOE does not make these funds readily available.
 - d. The projected growth of Success Academy – Williamsburg will force students with disabilities out of J.H.S. 50.
 - e. The DOE is ignoring the opinion of the Williamsburg community.
5. A commenter stated that:

- a. Students with disabilities are barely mentioned in the EIS; she described the EIS as a building statement, not a statement of educational impact.
 - b. The EIS does not state: 1) how the charter school would recruit students with disabilities; or 2) that children with disabilities should receive more square footage per student for related services.
6. A commenter stated that the teachers at J.H.S. 50 are not in favor of a charter school being co-located at K050.
7. A commenter stated that:
 - a. Community Board 1 passed a resolution urging rejection of this proposal because the community does not need another elementary school.
 - b. Community Board 1 wants a plan that has been developed with community input.
8. A commenter made the following statements and asked the following questions:
 - a. The Borough President's office has not heard anything about this co-location.
 - b. Why are advertisements for Success Academy – Williamsburg only being posted in the Northside? Why is Success Academy – Williamsburg not recruiting from the Southside?
 - c. Why are no advertisements for Success Academy – Williamsburg being displayed in Spanish?
 - d. The Borough President is concerned about who this school will serve. Will there be a preference for local children?
 - e. How will children get to the school?
 - f. Approximately 30% of students at J.H.S. 50 are English Language Learner (“ELL”) students. How will Success Academy – Williamsburg serve this population?
 - g. It is vital that the DOE develops plans like this one in conjunction with the community, not in opposition to the community.
9. A commenter stated that when he was a student at J.H.S. 50 he had to dodge bullets and run from house to house to and from school. He applauds that the DOE is looking to improve J.H.S. 50, but instead of bringing in a new school, the DOE should work to strengthen what currently exists at J.H.S. 50.
10. A commenter stated that:

- a. Elected officials and community leaders all want the same thing - the rejection of this proposal.
- b. He read a story in the New York Times about a boy who was encouraged to leave a Success Academy charter school after being enrolled for 12 days. According to the story, the boy is now excelling at a district public school.
- c. Enrollment of ELL students at Success Academy charter schools ranges from 2% to 4%. But the Southside of Williamsburg has many ELL students.
- d. The DOE should do what Success Academy fails to do, which is serve the whole community.

11. A commenter stated that:

- a. It is outrageous that the DOE has excluded the leadership of the community of the Southside of Williamsburg from the decision-making process.
- b. She is not against all charter schools, but is against Eva Moskowitz's charter schools.

12. City councilmember Diana Reyna stated that:

- a. She rejects the current proposal.
- b. The process has polarized the community.
- c. She has met with the DOE encouraging the DOE to present District 14 with a comprehensive plan for improving all schools.
- d. District 14 schools have been exploited. District 14 leads the city in hosting the highest number of charter school co-locations.
- e. Schools do not underperform or become under-enrolled overnight.
- f. The DOE has failed to recognize the need for more quality middle schools.
- g. The DOE has unilaterally decided to put four elementary schools in a one-mile block.
- h. The voices of parents have been ignored.
- i. The decision regarding this proposal has already been made.
- j. Success Academy – Williamsburg will perpetuate social inequality in a community that has struggled for decades.

13. A representative of Congresswoman Velazquez stated that:

- a. Our community will fight the Success Academy corporation.

- b. We need quality education for all children, not only those lucky enough to get selected through a lottery.
- c. Success Academy serves only a small percentage of minority and disadvantaged children. The ones that are left behind are the ones we are fighting for today.
- d. There are already four elementary schools within walking distance of K050. The community needs quality middle schools.
- e. The DOE should invest in existing schools.
- f. The community has been excluded. The DOE thinks our community does not value education. The DOE needs to issue another request for proposals for a new school at K050.
- g. The DOE should work with the community to develop a new, different plan ensuring that every child has a fair education.
- h. The congresswoman will not stand for separate but equal schools.
- i. The marketing strategy of Success Academy – Williamsburg has targeted the Northside of Williamsburg, pitting one community of parents against another. If the DOE does not examine the outreach efforts of Success Academy in excluding certain populations, Congress will.
- j. The Congresswoman urges the DOE to reexamine this proposal.

14. A commenter stated that:

- a. The community says “no” to Success Academy, and he has collected over 1,000 signatures to give to SUNY or the DOE.
- b. The commenter asked whether SUNY has ever rejected a proposal after the PEP has voted on it.
- c. The DOE treats the community with disrespect.

15. A commenter stated that the DOE should not allow a private charter to come in to K050 with money from private equity funds that goes to line private pockets.

16. A commenter stated that she lives in the Northside and Success Academy has been recruiting from condo buildings, and told people that they cannot put their children in local public schools. But she has a daughter at P.S. 84, and P.S. 84 has plenty of room for more children.

17. A commenter stated that:

- a. The DOE has shamefully abdicated their responsibility. Students have been deprived for decades. Now the DOE is creating a crisis to bring in their solution: corporate charter schools.

- b. The DOE is privatizing public schools, which are the foundation of democracy, and Success Academy has the intention of displacing the vulnerable Williamsburg community.

18. A commenter stated that:

- a. Williamsburg has always been and still is an immigrant community.
- b. Success Academy wants to “dismember” our community.
- c. Success Academy has not engaged community parents and leaders.
- d. District 14 needs dual language middle school programs.

19. A commenter stated that:

- a. Every church and school is saying the same thing: we do not want outsiders coming in, but we want to build our own school.
- b. We will demonstrate at the DOE, go on hunger strikes and go to jail in opposition to this proposal.

20. A commenter stated that on behalf of P.S. 19, Success Academy has nothing for the school community.

21. A commenter stated that the DOE should work to strengthen existing schools, rather than co-locate a new school at K050.

22. A commenter stated:

- a. The DOE should tell Eva Moskowitz to open a charter school in her own neighborhood.
- b. District 14 will not allow J.H.S. 50 to be taken over by a charter school.

23. A commenter stated that he grew up in the community and the community is not going down without a fight.

24. A commenter stated that:

- a. District 14 does not need another elementary school, but rather, the District wants to be a partner in the community to improve middle schools.
- b. District 14 has enough charter schools, and the DOE should help existing schools.

25. A commenter stated that the Puerto Rican community knows that Success Academy – Williamsburg will not be for them.

26. A commenter stated that the community wants to work with the DOE, but the DOE does not want to work with the community.

27. A commenter stated that:
 - a. Eva Moskowitz is not at the hearing to listen to community concerns.
 - b. She is a teacher at Academy for Young Writers, and that school is being pushed out of K050 because Eva Moskowitz wants the building.
 - c. The community does not want Success Academy.
28. A commenter stated that the DOE should stop telling parents they know what is best and should stop planning without community input.
29. A commenter stated that if the DOE is not listening, the community should occupy Williamsburg, the schools, and the DOE.
30. A commenter stated that there is a lot of misinformation regarding Success Academy.
31. A commenter stated that J.H.S. 50 is fine, has been around forever and does not need a charter school.
32. A commenter stated that the community will occupy the schools and will not allow this co-location proposal to go forward.
33. A commenter stated that community members do not trust Success Academy, and the DOE should work to build respect and trust with the community.
34. A commenter described the New York State Education Department as “pathetic”, because it allows Eva Moskowitz to make money and kick out students with special needs, ELLs, and others.
35. A commenter stated that:
 - a. There is a law that says siblings have the first right to enroll in charter schools, so there will no room for other children.
 - b. We need to fight because they want to take over our community.
36. A commenter stated that:
 - a. Parents need new middle school options, not more elementary schools.
 - b. Her daughter attends a school that shares space with a charter school and she knows they use tax money to build a school model that excludes children who are difficult to teach.
37. A commenter stated that:
 - a. Success Academy engages in discrimination and racism and pushes Latino students like him out.
 - b. This proposal is taxation without representation and genocide.

38. A commenter stated that:

- a. Her two children attend P.S. 132 and she opposes Success Academy.
- b. It is shameful that no one from the PEP is present at the hearing.
- c. Success Academy claims they have 1,000 signatures in favor of the proposed co-location of Success Academy – Bed Stuy at K059, but the signatures are not from our community, they are from paid consultants.
- d. Success Academy is just interested in making a profit.
- e. The DOE should listen to the community.

39. A commenter stated that:

- a. He wants the best education for his kids, delivered from people inside the community, not from people outside of the community.
- b. It is a shame that Success Academy wants to come to Williamsburg. Tell Eva Moskowitz to go somewhere else because the community does not want her.

40. A commenter stated that Success Academy does not accept bilingual students.

The following comments and remarks were made at the joint public hearing on February 16th, 2012:

41. A commenter stated that:

- a. She opposes the EIS because she does not think it contains a statement of educational impact.
- b. CEC 14 has decided not to participate in the second Joint Public Hearing and she supports their protest because the process of providing an analysis of public commentary to the PEP the night before the PEP votes is no way to consider the various comments from the audience.

42. City councilmember Diana Reyna stated that:

- a. She and the CEC do not support this co-location proposal.
- b. The community has been asking for reform in the schools but the DOE has not listened.
- c. The SUNY Charter Schools Institute was not created to force charter schools into communities.
- d. Any failure assumed by our students is a failure of the DOE. The DOE has to be held accountable for neglecting and abandoning our community.
- e. The DOE has pitted community against community.

- f. The DOE has shown it has not been capable of providing the quality education the community has been requesting for decades.
- g. This proposal will mean further neglect of our children because high performing public schools will be competing for high performing students, resulting in continuing under enrollment at public schools.
- h. The DOE is unwilling to cooperate with the community.
- i. We need to reform J.H.S. 50 and continue what we started at P.S. 84 – pursue a dual language program.
- j. She does not support any school that advertises six months in advance in certain neighborhoods but not other neighborhoods.
- k. Every school in District 14 has 50% ELLs and students with special needs but Success Academy’s enrollment does not exceed 14% ELLs.

43. A representative of State Senator Martin Dilan stated that:

- a. The Senator is 100% against co-location of schools.
- b. The only way to fix our schools is to work with the people who are in the schools, not replace them with someone who is making a lot of money.
- c. The Senator will work with legislative leaders in the community to continue to fight against schools like Success Academy.

44. A representative of Congresswoman Nydia Velazquez stated that:

- a. The DOE has divided parents, children and neighborhoods by initiating a “chaotic crisis” with “divisive and disenfranchising” co-locations and phase-outs.
- b. Success Academy should respect the emotions and the community of Williamsburg.
- c. No one sought community input on the proposal to co-locate Success Academy at K050 and no one provided the community with information about Success Academy. She is sure there was outreach in other communities, but not in the Southside.
- d. She is against separate but equal schools and the community wants the right to pick the schools that are worthy of being in the community.
- e. District 14 needs middle schools and dual language programs.
- f. There are already four elementary schools in close proximity to K050.
- g. The DOE needs to work with all children, not just those that win the lottery or those that are the “cream of the crop.”

- h. The DOE should work with the Southside Coalition to create a comprehensive, holistic, and culturally sensitive dual-language middle school at J.H.S. 50.

45. A commenter stated that:

- a. With over 1,000 signatures, Greenpoint, the Northside, and the Southside, are in opposition to this school co-locating here.
- b. Success Academy is not recruiting from the Southside, they are not serving ELLs and they are not serving the whole community.
- c. District 14 needs more high quality middle schools, not additional elementary schools.
- d. We will not stop until Success Academy is stopped.

46. A commenter shared his memories of attending J.H.S. 50 and stated his opposition to this proposal.

47. A commenter stated that the DOE should invest in district public schools, not district charter schools.

48. A commenter stated that Eva Moskowitz should take her school to her backyard and stop invading his space.

49. A commenter stated that:

- a. Success Academy's recruitment tactics are underhanded, sneaky and unethical.
- b. Success Academy has done zero community outreach, although they have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on marketing and advertising and this money should be spent on her children's school's art program.
- c. Success Academy has been founded by a hedge fund and is run by a group of hedge funds.
- d. The DOE violated her privacy rights by giving her children's names to Success Academy for recruitment purposes.

50. A commenter stated that:

- a. Her son was kicked out of Harlem Success Academy after 12 days. Now her son is thriving in a gifted and talented program at a non-charter public school.
- b. Charter schools force themselves into communities and kick out children who do not get good test scores.

51. A commenter made the following statements and asked the following question:

- a. She has been at J.H.S. 50 for three years and she does not want Success Academy to take over her school.
- b. The DOE should improve schools instead of making new schools.
- c. Why wasn't Success Academy at the first Joint Public Hearing?
- d. Success Academy should not co-locate with a school that offers bilingual and special education classes.

52. A commenter read a resolution passed unanimously by Community Board 1, summarized below.

53. A commenter stated that:

- a. Harlem parents that want Success Academy should stay in Harlem because Brooklyn does not want Success Academy.
- b. She is a former charter school parent and charter schools abuse children.
- c. Next year Eva Moskowitz will try to come into District 13, but Districts 13, 14 and 15 are against Success Academy.

54. A commenter stated that:

- a. She represents a group of public school parents from Williamsburg and Greenpoint called Williamsburg and Greenpoint Parents for Our Public Schools, or WAGPOPS, and WAGPOPS opposes Success Academy.
- b. There is room at Brooklyn Success Academy 1 for parents who want that choice, and there is also room at P.S. 31, P.S. 84, P.S. 32, and three other charter schools.

55. A commenter stated that:

- a. If Success Academy is approved, it will be the "Failure Academy" because it is not natural to the community.
- b. It is wrong to think that what worked in Harlem can be imposed upon Williamsburg.
- c. Parents who have registered their children for Success Academy – Williamsburg are uninformed.
- d. Her daughter is at P.S. 84 now and she wants to send her daughter to J.H.S.. 50 in five years because it has the same qualities as P.S. 84, including a dual language program, diversity, creativity and a unified parent body.

56. A commenter from the neighborhood stated that she does not want the DOE to tell her what the community needs. She wants the DOE to listen to what the community says it needs, which is not a charter school.

57. A commenter stated that the DOE tries to co-locate charter schools even when the community opposes co-locations.
58. A commenter stated that during his three years at J.H.S. 50 he met great people – parents, staff and others – and success is already at J.H.S. 50, so his message is ‘no’ to Success Academy.
59. A commenter stated that:
- a. She traveled from Harlem to the Joint Public Hearing to support Success Academy.
 - b. The proximity of four elementary schools is not a reason to oppose this proposal because parents can never have too many school options.
60. A commenter stated that:
- a. She is appalled that her four-year-old son received glossy advertisements but the Latino community did not receive similar advertisements.
 - b. Success Academy has held secret meetings to recruit white people from high-rise condominiums in Williamsburg.
61. A commenter stated that District 14 has the right to self-determination and says no to co-location and phase-out.
62. A commenter stated that she lives in the Southside of Williamsburg and supports Success Academy.
63. A commenter stated that she is African American and her husband is Spanish, and her daughter attends Success Academy and is succeeding.
64. A commenter stated that she was originally opposed to the co-location of Success Academy but statistics show that J.H.S. 50 is a failing school and Success Academy provides quality education.
65. A commenter stated that he lives on the Southside of Williamsburg and supports this proposal because he wants a high achieving option for his children.
66. A commenter stated that:
- a. Outsiders who do not know the community, do not live in the community and have no say in the community have created an energy that is at odds with who the community is and what the community believes.
 - b. The DOE does not care about children or the success of the community; they systematically defend charter schools while draining funds out of public schools.
67. A commenter stated that:

- a. Success Academy charters are a failed policy and are the educational equivalent of fast food: uninspired and bad for you.
 - b. The proposal is not about educating our children, but is only about Success Academy making money.
 - c. The community wants to be listened to and is unified in opposition to Success Academy charters.
68. A commenter asked the audience at the hearing to raise their hand if they supported Success Academy and observed that no one raised their hand.
69. A commenter stated that students in District 14 have a good education and good teachers and do not want Success Academy.
70. A commenter stated that the DOE has systematically taken away money from public schools, resulting in displacement of the community's residents.
71. A commenter stated that her child goes to Success Academy and if parents in District 14 do not want to enroll in Success Academy they do not need to.
72. A commenter stated that:
- a. His daughter attends a Success Academy and he supports Success because the staff cares about all children, including those who have special needs and ELLs.
 - b. Parents are very involved in Success Academy schools
73. A commenter stated that she supports parent choice, and her child has had six years of success at Success Academy.
74. A commenter stated that her two daughters attend Harlem Success Academy 2 and the comments at the hearing are not accurate.
75. A commenter stated that she graduated from J.H.S. 50, gained admission to a specialized high school, and was accepted to every college and university she applied to but the programs that lead to her success are no longer supported. The NYC public school system works and needs additional support but not charter schools.
76. A commenter stated that co-locating Success Academy with J.H.S. 50 will not be tolerated and will not happen.
77. A commenter stated that she grew up in the community, has two children at P.S. 84 and that parents who send their children to Success Academy will learn that the school is not successful.
78. A commenter stated that parents have to choose what is best for their children and she has chosen P.S. 84 for her child.

79. A commenter stated that when her daughter attended her zoned school she was bullied every day and nobody helped her, but now she attends Success Academy and is treated well and reads at a second grade level.
80. A commenter stated that she does not dislike Success Academy, but she feels like Success Academy ambushed and is not working with the community.
81. A parent at Success Academy stated that he supports the school's college preparatory mission.
82. A commenter stated that this proposal is reminiscent of colonialism. The DOE should support J.H.S. 50, and Success Academy should get their own school.
83. A commenter stated that she is a graduate of P.S. 84 and J.H.S. 50, and she wants to know what success comes from impairing a public school that educates kids from the Southside.
84. A commenter said "Bloom's rules dooms schools."
85. A commenter stated that:
- a. At the hearing on January 17th only one Williamsburg community member supported the proposal; the rest of the community opposed it.
 - b. Nobody from the PEP is at the hearing.
 - c. District 14 parents already have choice and they do not want Success Academy.
86. A commenter stated that:
- a. The DOE wants to close schools, regardless of whether they are good or bad, to increase space for for-profit corporations. Mayor Bloomberg represents a small class of people with money and power who will cut school budgets and lay off school aides.
87. A commenter stated that:
- a. Eva Moskowitz was in the lobby but did not have the respect to enter the auditorium to greet [City councilwoman] Diana Reyna or [El Puente staff] Luis Garden Acosta or Frances Lucerna.
 - b. Success Academy has not recruited people of color from Williamsburg. The Williamsburg community will not accept displacement and marginalization.
88. A commenter stated that:
- a. These decisions are dividing communities and forcing children to watch resentment and hostility at the behest of Eva Moskowitz .

- b. No matter what the DOE does to destroy schools, including budget cuts, test prep, replacing curriculum and increasing class sizes, parents love and support public schools.
 - c. The DOE's and Mayor Bloomberg's policies have failed. The number of children needing remediation after graduation is increasing. El Puente is the only city school that is succeeding and it should be replicated.
89. A commenter stated that white, black and Latino parents, a Congresswoman, a City Councilwoman, a State Senator, grandparents, young people and community leaders have all come together to oppose this proposal.
90. A parent at Harlem Success Academy stated that her daughter has received a quality education, and parents from Success are not against the Southside community.
91. A parent at Success Academy stated that the negative comments about Success Academy made at the hearing were false, and parents in Williamsburg should be given the choice to enroll at Success Academy.
92. A commenter stated that last year demand for charter school seats far outstripped the supply of charter school options, as measured by the ratio of total applications to total seats.
93. A commenter supports Success Academy.
94. A commenter stated that the DOE should change the system for better instead of closing schools or opening charter schools.
95. A commenter stated that:
- a. She wants a school that is "our" success school, not an additional school.
 - b. The people who support this proposal are not from Williamsburg. The Williamsburg community opposes the proposal.
96. A commenter stated that:
- a. His five year old sister at Harlem Success Academy is already trying to learn to read.
 - b. He needs a college preparatory education like Harlem Success Academy's to achieve his goals.
97. A commenter stated that if Success Academy opens in Williamsburg, it will be an additional option for families and nobody would force kids to go to Success.
98. City councilmember Steve Levin stated that:
- a. He does not oppose charter schools or co-location, but is concerned that Success Network will come in despite staunch community opposition.

- b. Success Charter Network has not listened to the community.
- c. District 14 has been a strong community school district for many years, and many people worked to improve schools in this district.
- d. Success Charter Network bombard the community with paid-for advertisements, but is not establishing relationships with community institutions, individuals, and parents which are necessary to establish a fine educational institution.
- e. This proposal will compromise P.S. 84's ability to succeed.
- f. He opposes this proposal.

In addition to collecting feedback at the Joint Public Hearing referenced above, the DOE solicited feedback on this proposal via email, telephone and an internet feedback form.

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

99. The DOE received 26 emails or phone calls in support of this proposal.

100. A commenter wrote that:

- a. We do not want Eva Moskowitz and her Success Academies in our schools. She segregates and destroys schools communities. She does not serve the neediest populations as NYC public schools do. She pushes out and/or does not accept children with special needs and ELLs.
- b. Charter schools are not a choice. Lotteries are a gamble.
- c. Eva Moskowitz solicited our families under false pretenses – she claims she is targeting the neediest children, but she is targeting those who are gentrifying the neighborhood. Success charters are not about the best education for all of our children; they are about real estate and profit for Eva.
- d. District 14 does not need another elementary school.
- e. J.H.S. 50 needs resources to make it into a viable, attractive, strong Junior High School. It does not need Success Academy encroaching on its building, trying to bring in children from other neighborhoods, and not reaching out to the surrounding neighborhood.

101. A commenter wrote that:

- a. My neighbors and I vehemently oppose Success Academy coming to Williamsburg. Their advertising campaign included illegal direct mail sent to my 7-year-old child. They are racist because J.H.S. 50 is in the Latino section of Williamsburg, but they are only targeting white people. Stop this illegal and unwanted action by Eva Moskowitz, her lying husband, Eric Grannis, and the Success Academy.

102. Twenty-three emails were received stating we do not support the proposal.

103. A parent with a child in a public school that is co-located with a charter school wrote that:

- a. I oppose this co-location. I have been bombarded with glossy color brochures about Success, trying to entice me away from my zoned school.
- b. Co-location and the charter system are unfair. Let them get their own buildings, and support local schools.

104. A commenter wrote that:

- a. The community has spoken out vigorously against the co-location of Success Academy at K050.
- b. The Southside community expressed its wishes for the school seats it needs, but was given this instead.
- c. I strongly oppose Success Academy's co-location at J.H.S. 50.

105. A commenter wrote that:

- a. My family does not support the proposal.
- b. Success Academy should find their own space and pay for it themselves. They spend millions on advertising but only get charged \$1 as a "non-profit."
- c. The DOE should open new schools modeled after programs that work and have thousands of applications, like Hunter, Stuyvesant, Anderson, and Nest, and should meet the needs of the thousands of kindergartners who are wait-listed each year.
- d. The DOE should adequately fund public education for all and support existing schools.

106. A commenter wrote that:

- a. My son is in kindergarten at P.S. 84, and I do not support allowing Success Academy to co-locate in J.H.S. 50, or anywhere else in District 14.
- b. Our public schools serve the neighborhood well and are thriving, particularly P.S. 84.
- c. Funding and support for existing public schools should not be taken away by allowing an unnecessary and unwanted charter to co-locate here.

107. A commenter wrote that:

- a. My child attends a public primary school in District 14, and I do not support the proposal.

- b. Public schools be equitably funded and supported, rather than phased out, closed, and replaced by corporate-backed charter schools with no accountability to our community.

108. A commenter wrote: my child is in kindergarten at P.S. 110 in Greenpoint, Brooklyn. I oppose this proposal, the co-location on Berry at South 3rd in 2012, and a co-location of Citizens of the World at PS 110 for 2013.

109. A commenter wrote: Success Academy Charters belong in their own buildings.

110. A commenter submitted an op-ed, originally written for the New York Post, on behalf of Williamsburg and Greenpoint Parents for Our Public Schools (WAGPOPS), opposing the proposal because the existing schools in District 14 meet the community's educational needs, and the community does not need charter schools.

111. A commenter wrote: I am a 10 year old who lives in Greenpoint. I don't want Success Academy in my district. We need middle schools not more elementary schools. I like my neighborhood school.

112. A commenter wrote that:

- a. Success Academy does not belong anywhere in District 14, and our family does not want it here.
- b. We have an amazing and very committed community, and are committed to continuing to improve public schools that are already a part of our community.

113. A commenter wrote: This community does not need another elementary school. We need support for our middle and high schools and we want community input. Say no to Success Academy.

114. A commenter wrote: I oppose Success Academy Charter School in Williamsburg. It will not meet the needs of our community, and will take more necessary resources away from our public schools.

115. A commenter wrote that:

- a. This charter company has been plastering the Bedford Avenue subway stop with expensive advertisements. Their goal is to draw wealthier kids on the Northside at the expense of poorer kids on the Southside.
- b. We have good public elementary schools in this district, and we do not need a charter.
- c. Success Charters are specifically targeting economically upscale neighborhoods. Charters should help underserved areas.
- d. Success Charter wants to develop an attractive "brand" that they can then market as being the most viable way of educating children.

- e. Public schools should be backed by the public and benefit all children, not backed and promoted by hedge funds and real estate tycoons, benefiting only some children.

116. A commenter left a voicemail stating that she hopes a charter school is not coming to P.S. 84. She is working with the principals and teachers to create a good school and wants the school to remain the same.

117. A commenter left a voicemail stating that she does not want charter schools here; she loves her local public schools and wants to keep them public.

118. A commenter left a voicemail stating that he is strongly against co-location of Eva Moskowitz charter schools in District 14.

119. A commenter left a voicemail stating that she opposes the proposal because Success Academy will draw students away from already underutilized schools. She opposes Mayoral control and taking money from public schools and giving it to Eva Moskowitz and her cronies.

120. The DOE received a written petition, with 191 signatures, demanding:

- a. That the DOE reject the proposal; and,
- b. The DOE engage the community and the Southside Community Schools Coalition (SCSC) in a collaborative process to determine the future of the J.H.S. 50 building.

121. The DOE received 67 signed petitions stating:

- a. The DOE's proposal to allow the co-location without community direction is unethical and immoral and will eventually eliminate the Latino community from its longtime home of Los Sures.
- b. Eva Moskowitz's corporation has never met with any Southside Community organization or any recognizable Southside leader to assess the needs of our community. Instead, she has only campaigned in the Northside, polarizing Southside Latinos and Northside newcomers.
- c. We are not stating that policy makers are consciously racist, but as Judge Emily Jane Goodman declared: "It is well established that race neutral policies violate the Fair Housing Act if racial segregation is perpetuated or if a minority group or groups are adversely impacted."
- d. The impact of Eva Moskowitz's school would be to undermine and destabilize the Southside's Latino Community and J.H.S. 50 in favor of the newcomer/non-Latino community.
- e. We do not need another elementary school because our elementary schools are underutilized. We need a quality middle school.

122. The DOE received a resolution, passed unanimously by Community Board 1, opposing the proposal because:
- a. Four elementary schools exist within a few blocks of J.H.S. 50;
 - b. J.H.S. 50 has a higher ELL population and a higher IEP population than the citywide average and could use additional resources;
 - c. The district needs more quality middle/junior high school options;
 - d. The DOE suggested the need for improvements to J.H.S. 50 but never presented any improvement plan;
 - e. The DOE did not consult with community partners and organizations prior to this proposal;
 - f. Co-locating a K-4 school with a junior high school of 6-8 grades presents age conflicts and space utilization issues;
 - g. The DOE and community partners should create a plan to improve J.H.S. 50.
123. A commenter wrote that her son attends P.S. 84 and what the community really needs is a quality middle school option. She stated that she heard that P.S. 84 has applied to expand to serve grades five through eight but has been denied twice.
124. A commenter wrote that his son attends P.S. 84 and that a charter school sharing space at P.S. 84 would deplete the school's resources and be devastating to the school.
125. A commenter wrote that her child attends P.S. 84 and that the community has not asked for Success "or any other corporate charter chain" to be "wedged into" DOE facilities. The commenter characterized the proposal as unfair, underhanded, appalling and unethical.
126. A commenter wrote that she is the parent of a child at P.S. 110 and that the threat of putting a charter school in our building and our district makes her extremely upset because her effort to improve her school will be diluted, the community will be divided and the school will be crushed and progress will stop.
127. A commenter wrote that they do not support the proposal and that the DOE should strengthen existing public schools, similar to recent improvements at P.S. 84.
128. A commenter asked why, with low enrollment in elementary schools, does the DOE propose to open a new elementary school? The commenter characterized the proposal as a "total affront to the existing community and a waste of space especially since an existing school is being evicted."
129. The DOE received 100 letters, drafted by the Southside Community Schools Coalition and signed individually, addressed to the Mayor, the SUNY Board of Trustees and the PEP, stating that:

- a. Signatories oppose the proposal.
- b. The proposal will not address the real educational needs of the community. District 14 has several elementary schools within walking distance of K050, as well as an innovative dual language program at P.S. 84.
- c. The proposal would interfere with the development of JHS 50.
- d. The DOE has refused community input and has neglected the District's neediest schools.
- e. The community has watched school struggle under the "failed leadership of Mayoral control".
- f. The community has "fought bad decisions before and will not allow the DOE to make bad decisions [on behalf of District 14] again".
- g. Signatories have worked for thirty years with community leaders to improve schools and demands to be participate in decision making processes that affect the education of children.

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

Comments 59(a, b), 62, 63, 64, 65, 71, 72 (a, b), 73, 74, 79, 81, 90, 91, 92, 93, 96, 97 and 99 are in favor of the proposal and do not require a response.

Comments 18(a), 30, 78, 84, 86 (a, b), 88(b, c), 98(c), 106(b), 115(d, e), 116, 121(d) and 129(e) are not directly related to the proposal and do not require a response.

Comments 1(a), 3(c), 4(e), 7(b), 8(a, g), 11(a), 12(b, g-i), 13(f, g), 14(b, c), 18(c), 26, 27(a, c), 28, 29, 33, 38(e), 41(b), 42(b, c, h), 43(b), 44(c, d, h), 50(a), 56, 57, 61, 67(c), 80, 98(a, d), 120(b), 122(f) and 129(d, f, g) pertain to the process of engaging the community regarding the proposed co-location of Success Academy – Williamsburg at K050, including engagement with community based organizations and elected officials.

The DOE is committed to engaging with the community, included its elected representatives, for all proposals requiring a significant change in school utilization, as detailed in Chancellor's Regulation A-190. This includes making an analysis of public commentary publicly available to the PEP no later than 24 hours prior to the PEP voting on a proposal.

The decision to implement a proposal is not made until the PEP votes on the proposal. Once the DOE has proposed and the PEP has approved an appropriate site for a new school, SUNY makes an independent determination regarding the appropriateness of the facility that the DOE has selected, and it is accurate that SUNY has not rejected a proposal that the PEP has approved. However, the PEP carefully reviews each proposal before making a decision regarding a significant change in the utilization of a building. The PEP's vote for this proposal will take place on March 1, 2012. Pursuant to Chancellor's Regulation A-190, the proposal was published and made available to all impacted families, schools, and communities via the DOE's website. Furthermore, two joint public hearings were held in regards to this proposal to provide a brief summary of the proposal and to provide an opportunity for community input in the decision over whether the proposal should be enacted.

In September 2011, the DOE met with CEC 14 to discuss underutilized buildings in the district and early planning for portfolio interventions, including the charter school pipeline.

Additionally, since that date, the DOE has met with representatives of the District 14 community, including elected officials and other community leaders, regarding this and other proposals.

The DOE believes in Success Charter Network's record of success and is confident that Success Academy – Williamsburg will provide a benefit to the District 14 community.

Comments 4(a), 5(a, b), 8(b-d, f), 10(b, c), 13(c, i), 16, 25, 34, 35(a), 37(a), 40, 42(j, k), 44(g), 45(b), 49(b, d), 50(b), 60(a, b), 87(b), 98(b), 100(a, c), 101(a), 103(a), 115(a, c), and 121(b) relate to student recruitment and retention at Success Academy – Williamsburg, including outreach by Success Charter Network, advertising and marketing for the new school and the enrollment policies for students who are ELL students and/or students with disabilities who require mandated services.

While the DOE cannot comment on SCN's paid advertising strategy, the DOE notes charter schools are prohibited from denying admission to students on the basis of such variables as academic achievement, language proficiency, disability and race. Charter schools, including those operated by Success Charter Network, must enroll students through a blind lottery process. Thus, there will be no preference given for students living in one section of District 14 as opposed to another section of District 14. The lottery will be open to all age-appropriate students throughout New York City.

Comment 8(c) states that there are no advertisements for Success Academy – Williamsburg in Spanish.

The EIS for this proposal has been posted and is available in Spanish.

As noted in the EIS, the DOE has been advised that Success Charter Network plans to seek authorization from its charter authorizer to change the lottery for Success Academy – Williamsburg to provide preferences for: (1) returning students; (2) siblings of current or accepted students; (3) ELL students; and (4) applicants who reside within District 14CSD. If this authorization is sought and approved, Success Academy – Williamsburg will set aside, in the first lottery pull, a percentage of seats for ELL students that is comparable to the average ELL percentage at traditional public elementary schools within the City. The assertion in comment 42(j) that every school in District 14 has 50% ELLs is inaccurate. Indeed, as noted in the EIS, J.H.S. 50 has 23% ELLs. Because Success Academy – Williamsburg will have no returning students or siblings of current or accepted students in 2012-2013, Success Academy – Williamsburg will in effect provide first and second preference to ELL students and students who reside within District 14. Therefore, the DOE is confident that Success Academy –

Williamsburg will ultimately serve both ELL students and students who live in all areas of District 14.

Comments 2(a), 4(d), 42(g), 55(d), 98(e), 106(c), 107(b), 119 and 121(e) pertain to the impact of co-locating Success Academy – Williamsburg at K050 on enrollment and budgets at other District 14 schools, including J.H.S. 50.

With respect to enrollment at other District 14 elementary schools, the DOE acknowledges that opening a new school may impact enrollment at other schools, but it is difficult to discern in advance the details of any impact.

With respect to school budgeting, the DOE notes that in New York State, Fair Student Funding “follows the child” whether a student is enrolled in a charter or non-charter public school. The formula has been determined by the state legislature and is overseen by the New York State Education Department. The DOE does not control this formula and the funding formula for Success Academy – Williamsburg is not affected the approval or rejection of this proposal. All schools in New York City, including charter schools, may choose to raise additional funds to purchase resources they feel would benefit their students.

Comments 3(b), 9, 10(d), 13(e), 21, 24(b), 47, 49(b), 51(b), 75(b), 82, 83, 94, 100(e), 122(c), 127 and 128 assert that the DOE should work to strengthen existing schools or programs instead of co-locating Success Academy – Williamsburg (or other charter schools).

The DOE is committed to providing a portfolio of high quality school options to students and families. Part of this strategy involves opening new public schools – both charter and non-charter – each year. The process of opening new schools does not preclude the DOE from continuing to support other, existing schools and programs. On the contrary, the DOE will continue to work with existing public schools in District 14 to support and strengthen these options for District 14 students and families.

While more than one quarter (26%) of the total elementary school seats in District 14 are in schools that received an overall 2011-2012 Progress Report score of “A”. However, only 8% of *available* elementary seats in District 14 (defined as the difference between an organization’s target capacity and current enrollment according to the 2010-2011 Enrollment Capacity Utilization Report), are in schools that received an overall 2011-2012 Progress Report score of “A”. The DOE believes in SCN’s record of success and supports the permanent placement Success Academy – Williamsburg in District 14 in order to continue providing educational opportunities for students and families. SCN strives to provide rigorous and well-rounded instruction in communities throughout New York City. Each of the four SCN elementary schools that received a Progress Report for the 2010-2011 school year received an overall grade of A.¹ If this proposal is approved, Success Academy - Williamsburg will add approximately 525-625 additional kindergarten through fourth grade seats in District 14.

¹ For information on school Progress Reports, visit: <http://schools.nyc.gov/Accountability/tools/report/default.htm>

Comments 1(b, c), 2(b), 3(a), 7(a), 12(f, g), 13(d), 18(d), 24(a), 36(a), 42(i), 44(e, f), 45(c), 100(d), 104(b), 105(c), 110, 115(b), 121(f), 122(b, d, e), 128 and 129(b) note that there are four elementary schools in close geographic proximity to K050 and/or assert that District 14 does not need a new elementary school, but needs additional high quality middle or high school options and additional programs for students who are ELLs and have special needs.

The DOE concurs that District 14 has needs beyond the need for new, high quality elementary school options, including the need for additional high-quality middle and high school seats and high-quality services for ELL students and students with special needs. However, the DOE notes that while excess elementary school seats currently exist in District 14, 42% are in schools that earned a Progress Report score of “C” or below in 2011-2012. These data indicate that the need for high quality elementary school seats remains strong.

This proposal in no way precludes the DOE from future actions designed to respond to other educational demands of District 14. Further, the DOE is confident that J.H.S. 50 (and Success Academy – Williamsburg) will continue to meet the needs of the students currently enrolled in the building, including ELL student and students with special needs, within the space allocation of the Citywide Instructional Footprint (the “Footprint”).

Comments 4(b), 6, 10(a), 11(b), 12(a, d), 13(a, b, h, j), 14(a), 15, 19(a-c), 20, 22(a, b), 23, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35(b), 36(b), 37(b), 38(a, c, d), 39(b), 42(a), 43(a, c), 45(a, d), 46, 48, 49(a, c), 51(a), 53(a-c), 54(a-b), 55(a, c), 57, 58, 61, 67(a, b), 68, 69, 70, 76, 77, 85(a, c), 88(a), 89, 98(f), 100(a, b), 101(b), 102, 103(b), 104(a, c), 105(a-d), 106(a), 107(a), 108, 109, 111, 112(a, b), 113, 114, 117, 118, 120(a), 122(h), 128 and 129(a) express general opposition to this proposal, charter schools and co-locations generally, Success Charter Network or the founder of Success Charter Network specifically.

As noted above, the DOE is committed to providing a portfolio of high quality school options to students and families. The DOE believes in SCN’s record of success and will continue to partner with high quality charter school operators in an effort to continue providing new options for students and families. The DOE believes that all children in public schools, including public charter schools, should have access to the physical space and resources necessary to provide educational programming pursuant to the Footprint, and will continue to provide public charter schools with access to DOE facilities when it is appropriate and beneficial to the community.

Any future proposal for opening and/or co-locating a charter school in District 14 would begin with community engagement to discuss the community’s needs, and would be described in separate EIS and require separate approval from the PEP.

Further, the DOE notes that District 14 does not host the highest number of charter schools that are co-located with DOE schools in public facilities. Districts 5, 7 and 17 each have higher numbers of charter school co-locations than District 14.

Comment 4(c) pertains to capital upgrades to DOE facilities that may occur as a result of the co-location of charter schools.

The DOE works judiciously to address the capital needs of all schools in a timely manner.

Comment 8(e) concerns transportation.

Transportation will be provided according to Chancellor’s Regulation A-801:
<http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/21A1B11A-886B-4F74-9546-E875EE82A14C/40303/A801.pdf>.

There will be no change to existing transportation practices at J.H.S. 50.

Comments 12(j), 17(b), 18(b) and 121(a, d) assert that this proposal will perpetuate trends of gentrification, community displacement, and/or social inequality in the Williamsburg community.

The DOE’s intention in proposing to co-locate Success Academy – Williamsburg at K050 is to continue providing high quality school options for students in District 14. The DOE has no intention of displacing community members, creating or perpetuating social inequality or contributing to gentrification and does not believe that this proposal will create those conditions.

Comments 12(c, e), 17(a), 42(d, f), 66(b) and 75(a), assert that the DOE has failed students by failing to adequately plan for or support existing schools and by allowing schools to become low-performing or under-enrolled.

As of spring 2010, all NYC public schools receive their primary support from a team of about 15 staff members called a Children First Network (“CFN”). Each network team provides expert support, technical assistance, and quality control for a group of approximately 25 schools: they offer training and coaching for principals and teachers, share instructional resources to meet each school’s needs, and help schools across the network collaborate with each other. Network teams also help schools:

- recruit and hire teachers,
- spend their budgets effectively,
- conduct all daily operations,
- use data and technology, and
- cultivate partnerships with community-based organizations and cultural institutions.

In addition, networks help schools deliver effective services to students with disabilities and ELLs. Because the same team supports each school in all of these different areas, principals can feel confident that every decision will be made strategically, with the school’s instructional goals in mind.

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 provide struggling schools with leadership, operational, instructional, and student supports that can help turn a struggling school around.

Struggling schools will have a targeted action plan developed by their network. 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
- Staff and/or leadership changes.

For further information on CFN Network, please visit:
<http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/schools/support/default.htm>.

Comment 27(b) relates to the planned move of Academy for Young Writers to District 19.

On February 9, 2012, the PEP approved the proposed re-siting, grade expansion, and co-location for Young Writers (14K404) with a new secondary school (19K422) and a District 75 program (75KTBD) at building K422, beginning in the 2012-2013 school year.

The re-siting, grade expansion, and co-location of Young Writers in K422 addresses the needs of the Academy for Young Writers community and the Brooklyn and District 19 community. The proposed re-siting will allow Academy for Young Writers to expand to serve middle school students in addition to students in grades nine through twelve in a newly constructed facility. Moreover, more students are currently enrolled in Academy for Young Writers from District 19 than from any other District. Thus, the re-siting of Academy for Young Writers will shorten the travel time for many students at the school.

Comment 38(b), 51(c), 85(b) and 87(a) relate to the absence of Success Academy representatives and/or PEP members at the Joint Public Hearing(s).

The DOE notes that while Success Academy representatives were invited to the Joint Public Hearing held on February 29, 2012, they are not mandated to attend. PEP members are not mandated to attend Joint Public Hearings. PEP members will have the opportunity to review this public comment analysis prior to voting on the proposal.

Comments 39(a), 55(b), 66(a) and 95(a, b) express dissatisfaction with educational options developed by people “outside” of the community.

The DOE appreciates all feedback from the community regarding a proposal. When the Educational Impact Statement and Building Utilization Plan are issued, they are made available to the staff, faculty and parents at all impacted schools, and on the DOE's Web site, and in each school's respective main office. In addition, the DOE dedicates a proposal-specific website and voicemail to collect feedback on this proposal. Furthermore, all schools' staff, faculty and parent communities are invited to the Joint Public Hearing to solicit further feedback.

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, that J.H.S. 50, the District 14 community, and Success Academy—Williamsburg will be able to create productive and collaborative partnerships.

As previously noted, the DOE's intention in proposing to co-locate Success Academy – Williamsburg at K050 is to continue providing high quality school options for students in District 14. The DOE has no intention of making community members feel as though educational options are brought into the district from the 'outside.' To that end, given the finite number of buildings available in New York City, the DOE attempts to use all of its school buildings as efficiently as possible. Co-location is therefore very common in New York City schools – with 33% of all DOE buildings housing more than one school organization – as there are not sufficient school buildings to allow each school organization to operate in its own building. SCN currently manages a total of nine charter schools in Brooklyn, Manhattan, and the Bronx. All four of the SCN schools that received a Progress Report in 2010-2011 earned an overall score of A. The DOE believes in SCN's record of success and supports the permanent placement of this SCN charter school in District 14 in order to continue providing educational opportunities for students and families.

Comment 41(a) pertains to the Educational Impact Statement (EIS) relating to this proposal.

The EIS is a comprehensive document which lays out the educational impact of the proposal to site Success Academy – Williamsburg in K050 on J.H.S. 50 and other current and future students in District 14. The EIS includes information on the proposed impact of the proposal on the school itself, the building, and the community at large.

Comments 42(e) and 44(a, b) assert that this proposal has cause emotional strife and pitted community against community.

As previously stated, the DOE recognizes that people in the community may have strong feelings against this proposal. Regardless, the DOE believes that, if this proposal is approved, that J.H.S. 50, the District 15 community, and Success Academy—Williamsburg will be able to create productive and collaborative partnerships. In proposing to co-locate Success Academy – Williamsburg at K050, the DOE intends to continue providing high quality school options for students in District 14.

Comment 51(d) asks why Success Academy should take over an existing school.

K050 is currently underutilized. This means that the space in the building is not being used as efficiently as possible and could be used to create new educational opportunities for families. The DOE supports parent choice and strives to ensure that all families have access to high-quality schools that meet their children's needs.

As previously stated, 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. While Success Academy—Williamsburg and J.H.S. 050 will share common spaces like auditoriums, gymnasiums, and cafeterias, each school is allocated particular classrooms and spaces for its own students' use. This proposal is not intended to pit the schools in K050 against each other. The DOE is confident that all school leaders in K050 will be able to create a collaborative and mutually respectful environment for all students, staff, and faculty members in the building.

Comment 52 relate to the resolution of Community Board 1 and is responded to above.

Comment 122 (g) and 129 (c) pertains to the impact of this co-location on J.H.S. 050, including common spaces that will be shared at K050 if this co-location proposal is approved.

There are currently hundreds of schools in buildings across the City that are co-located; some of these co-locations involve multiple DOE schools while others involve DOE and public charter schools sharing space. In all cases, the Instructional Footprint is applied to both DOE and public charter schools to ensure equitable allocation of classroom, resource and administrative space.

The Citywide Instructional Footprint (the "Footprint") is the guide used to allocate space to all schools based on the number of class sections they program 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. At the middle school and high school levels, the Footprint assumes every classroom is programmed during every period of the school day except one lunch period. The full text of the Instructional Footprint is available at http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/ronlyres/78D715EA-EC50-4AD1-82D1-1CAC544F5D30/0/DOEFOOTPRINTSConsolidatedVersion2011_FINAL.pdf. If this proposal is approved, space will continue to be allocated to schools pursuant to the Footprint.

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 DOE schools. In all cases, the DOE seeks to provide high quality education and allow parents/students to choose where to attend.

The Building Utilization Plan ("BUP") details the number of class sections each school is expected to program each year and allocates the number of classrooms accordingly. 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 BUP demonstrates that there is sufficient space in the building to accommodate the proposed co-location.

For further information, please refer to the BUP here:

<http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/leadership/PEP/publicnotice/2011-2012/Mar12012Proposals.htm>.

Comments 123, 124, 125 and 126 pertain to the potential impact of this proposal on other schools, namely P.S. 84 and P.S. 110.

The DOE notes that this proposal is anticipated to have no impact on space allocation at schools other than J.H.S. 050. With regard to 14K084's application to expand to serve grades six through eight, the DOE notes that P.S. 84 was denied an application to expand in 2009-2010 and in the 2011-2012 school year.

Changes Made to the Proposal

In response to public feedback, the following changes to the proposal were made:

- No changes have been made.