



Date: January 26, 2010

Topic: The Proposed Phase-out and Eventual Closure of Christopher Columbus High School and Co-location of Knowledge and Power Preparatory Academy International High School with Existing Schools in School Building X415

Date of Panel Vote: January 26, 2010

Summary of Proposal

Beginning in the 2010-2011 school year, Christopher Columbus High School (11X415, “Columbus”), an existing school serving students in grades 9-12, will be phased out of operation. Columbus is housed in building X415, (“X415”), located at 925 Astor Avenue, the Bronx.

In the 2010-2011 school year, Columbus will begin phasing out one grade per year until the school closes in June 2013. Columbus will not accept new grade 9 students for the 2010-2011 school year, and grade 9 will be eliminated. Grade 10 will be eliminated in 2011-2012; and grade 11 will be eliminated in 2012-2013. Christopher Columbus will close in June 2013.

The phase-out and eventual closure of both Global Enterprise¹ and Christopher Columbus will create available space in X415 to house Knowledge and Power Preparatory Academy International High School (10X374, “KAPPA”), an existing DOE school. KAPPA is a high-performing high school currently located in District 10 in the Bronx that must move from its current location in order to grow to its full grade scale of 9-12. KAPPA currently serves grades 9-11 and will serve grades 9-12 in 2010-2011. KAPPA will be located in K415 with Columbus and Global Enterprise High School until their phase-outs are complete, Collegiate Institute for Math and Science, Astor Collegiate, Pelham Preparatory, and a District 75 program – 75X010. This proposal addresses the need to provide higher quality high school options throughout the City.

¹ The proposal to phase-out and eventually close Global Enterprise High School, which is also housed in school building X415, is the subject of a separate educational impact statement and will be voted on by the Panel at its January 26, 2010 meeting.

The Educational Impact Statement on this proposal was posted on the New York City Department of Education's (hereinafter referred to as "DOE") Web site on December 11, 2009. An amended Educational Impact Statement was posted on the DOE's Web site on January 8, 2010.

Summary of Comments Received at the Joint Public Hearing

A joint public hearing regarding this proposal was held at school building X415 on January 7, 2010. The hearing was open to the public, and all interested parties had an opportunity to comment on the proposals. Eight hundred and two individuals attended the hearing, and 62 individuals spoke against the proposal to phase-out Columbus. Speakers opposed the proposal for the following reasons: (1) the teachers have worked hard to help students succeed; (2) the students come to high school unprepared, which negatively affected Columbus's Progress Report grades; (3) the school community is caring and nurturing to current students and alumni; and (4) general opposition to charter schools in New York City public school buildings.

Summary of Issues Raised in Written and Oral Comments and Significant Alternatives Suggested

One written comment regarding this proposal has been received. Dr. Janet L. Shideler of Excelsior College opposes the proposal based on the work of Christine Rowland and Seth Mactas to serve English Language Learner students and the Columbus administration and faculty's perseverance in spite of difficulties.

In addition to the above comments, some individuals and one organization, Class Size Matters ("CSM"), submitted written comments objecting to all of the phase-outs proposed by the DOE. Although the comments did not address any one phase-out proposal in particular, but instead addressed all proposals generally, the DOE has incorporated these comments into the public comment analysis for each phase-out proposal, including Jamaica. In opposing the DOE's proposal to phase-out and eventually close these schools, these commenters cited the following reasons: (1) the Educational Impact Statements for the proposals cite incomplete or inaccurate graduation rates and do not state the schools' five-year graduation rates as used by the New York State Education Department; (2) the DOE did not use a rational formula and failed to follow its own accountability standards in proposing these phase-outs; (3) the schools the DOE has proposed for phase-out have significantly high numbers of minority and high-risk students, including special education students, incoming ninth-grade students with low scores upon admission, and homeless students, who will not be accepted or accommodated at the new small schools that replace the phasing out schools; (4) the Educational Impact Statements do not address where students at the phasing out school who are behind in credits will attend in the future; (5) the Educational Impact Statements fail to analyze the impact of the phase-outs on overcrowding of other schools and use figures from the DOE's Blue Book, which does not use a formula that is aligned with state-mandated class size goals; (6) closing large, zoned high schools will force many students to travel further from their homes; (7) large high schools provide more choices in electives for students and can address a broader range of students; (8) the Educational Impact Statements do not address the financial impact of the placements of teachers from the phasing-out schools into the Absent Teacher Reserve (ATR) or the expense of funding the new schools; (9) the phasing out schools are being punished for setting high academic and safety

standards; (10) the phase-outs will impair recruitment of teachers into schools serving high-needs students; and (11) there is no evidence that the DOE has made an attempt to improve conditions at the schools the DOE has proposed to phase-out.

Finally, CSM calls for a moratorium on school closings until the City's Independent Budget Office can prepare a report on the effects such closings. As an alternative, CSM suggests that rather than phase-out these schools, the DOE should: (1) implement smaller class sizes at the schools; (2) restore the superintendent role and cooperation between schools; (3) provide more resources and expert help for the schools; (4) develop better curricula for at-risk students; (5) provide more support to large, comprehensive high schools; (6) launch an independent investigation of test score inflation, credit recovery and cheating, and reform the accountability system so as to not encourage these practices; and (7) implement new approaches to discipline.

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

The DOE has chosen not to revise its proposal to phase-out Columbus. Columbus received a D on its 2008-2009 Progress Report. While the school was deemed "Proficient" on its 2008-2009 Quality Review, the report cited a number of serious concerns, such as lack of rigor and differentiation in instruction, that suggest the school is ill-equipped to quickly turn around to better support student needs.

Columbus serves a relatively high-need student population, including large numbers of English language learner students. Given those demographics, a six-year graduation horizon might be a more reasonable standard to apply to evaluate the school. Even here, however, the school only achieved a 54 percent graduation rate in 2008-2009, well below the citywide average. The nearby New World High School, which serves English language learners almost exclusively, achieved an 80 percent four-year graduation rate. Experience demonstrates that schools like New World that provide targeted support to high-need students can achieve remarkable success in helping those students make progress.

Furthermore, demand for seats at Columbus High School is low. Enrollment has declined from 3,500 students to 1,500 students over the past decade. In part, this is because the DOE phased down total school enrollment as one component of its efforts to improve outcomes at the school. However, that is not the sole factor contributing to the school's declining population. Columbus is a zoned high school, but only 11 percent of students zoned for the school attend it. Last year, only 165 students out of 80,000 ranked Columbus first on their high school admissions application, which was among the lowest in the City, particularly relative to the school's size.

Columbus has a four year graduation rate of 40%. One commenter cites the State Education Department's recent adoption of five-year graduation rates as a reason for opposition to the phase-out proposals. However, the policy cited by the commenter was only recently adopted by the Regents and the state continues to use the four-year graduation rate in their accountability standards as well.

Some commenters have suggested that the DOE has not used a rational formula and has not followed its accountability criteria in deciding which schools should be phased out. Under the DOE's accountability framework, schools that receive an overall grade of D or F on the Progress Report are subject to school improvement measures. If no significant progress is made over time, a leadership change (subject to contractual obligations), restructuring, or closure is possible. The same is true for schools receiving a C for three years in a row and for any school that the Chancellor has determined lacks the necessary capacity to improve student performance, regardless of the school's Progress Report grades and Quality Review scores.

It is also important to understand that the Department of Education weighs numerous factors when evaluating schools as candidates for closure. Although Progress Report grades and Quality Review scores contribute significantly to the decision-making process, they are not the only considerations. The Department of Education takes into account many other sources of information as well, including school performance trends, enrollment data, demand data, and evaluations by superintendents and school support staff who work closely with the school and can evaluate its capacity to make significant improvements within a short time span.

The Quality Review evaluates how well schools are organized to improve student learning. The Quality Review measures educator and administrator actions, which are "inputs." It does not measure results, or "outputs," and though it reflects some factors in school success, those are but one set of factors. If administrator actions improve while student progress does not, we still must try to change the outcome. Schools are rated on a four-point scale, with "Well Developed" representing the top category of performance.

But school turnaround is difficult, takes time, and does not always succeed. A score of "Well Developed" might give us confidence that the school has the capacity to rapidly make significant improvements, while a "Proficient" school may only be capable of making incremental gains insufficient to quickly reverse a longstanding history of failure.

Proficient schools possess strengths and weaknesses. In evaluating the Quality Review reports from schools considered for closure, we looked closely at the reviewer's assessment of those strengths and weaknesses to see how they might impact the school's capacity to achieve a dramatic turnaround. For example, at many of the schools proposed for closure, evaluators found that instruction lacked rigor or was not sufficiently differentiated to meet individual student needs—both very serious concerns.

Many of the schools we proposed for closure received "Proficient" ratings on their Quality Reviews, and that is good news for current students who will remain enrolled in the school as it phases out. We expect phase-out schools to continue supporting their students and, in fact, outcomes at phase-out schools have historically improved with each successive year. That said, the Department's comprehensive review of the 19 schools proposed for closure found that none of those schools was equipped to make the dramatic progress needed to quickly transform into truly successful schools where all students can thrive.

Some commenters have asserted that the DOE has targeted schools with high numbers of minority students and at-risk students, including special education students, incoming ninth graders with low test scores, and homeless students. In support of this claim, commenters state

that the schools subject to phase-out serve a significantly higher number of at-risk students than schools with similarly low grades that are not slated for closure. They also claim that these students will be displaced as a result of the school phase-outs because the new small replacement schools will not accept or accommodate such students. New schools that have been opened by the DOE serve all students.

The new small schools that have been created over the last six years do accept English Language Learners and Special Education students and are serving them at a higher rate than schools citywide, with better outcomes. On average the new schools have a graduation rate of 75% and are serving some of the hardest to serve students. Here are some facts:

- The vast majority of new schools have unscreened admissions policies.
- During the 2008-2009 school year, ninth-grade enrollment at new schools included 14.2 percent special education students and 13.6 percent English language learners, compared to 12.8 percent special education students and 10.3 percent English language learners citywide.
- When looking across a school's entire population, they also serve more special education students and ELL students than the citywide average. In 2008-2009, new schools served an average of 12.3 percent special education students and 12.6 percent English language learners compared with 11.6 percent and 10.8 percent, respectively, citywide.
- Looking at Collaborative team teaching and self-contained classes—considered the highest-need special education students—new schools continue to serve a larger population than schools citywide with 8.1 percent of their students requiring those services compared to 7.4 percent citywide in 2008-2009.
- Similarly, new small schools serve a higher proportion of low-income students, black and Hispanic students, and students performing below grade-level expectations upon ninth-grade enrollment when compared against citywide averages.

Current students at the schools proposed for phase-out who are behind in credits, including current Columbus students, will not be displaced as a result of the phase-out proposals. The Department of Education is committed to supporting schools as they phase-out. All students enrolled in the phase-out schools will continue to be served, including homeless students, English language learners and special education students. The DOE will assist phase-out schools in developing individual plans for each student to ensure that they continue to accumulate credits and will be able to graduate before or at the point the school is slated for complete phase-out. Any students who are unable to accumulate the requisite number of credits within the three year timeline will be placed in other schools or programs that meet their needs and where they will continue to work towards earning a diploma.

The DOE does not anticipate that the phase-out of schools will result in overcrowding at other schools throughout the city. With the phase-out and eventual closure of these schools, including Columbus, the DOE has also proposed the phase-in of several new small schools. The building in which Columbus is housed will not be closed and citywide we will be replacing each seat that is lost. For next year there will be sufficient seats. To the extent CSM asserts that the DOE has not adhered to state-mandated class size goals in planning school phase-outs and new replacement schools, the DOE disagrees. Through a combination of new facilities, the

adjustment of enrollment projections and the opening of new schools, we will serve all students who otherwise would have attended a school proposed for closure. The centralized High School Admissions Process allows us to do two things: (1) ensure that students have access to high quality options and (2) ensure that we plan for all schools appropriately.

It is important to be clear that the DOE values choice. Many of the overcrowded schools are zoned schools that offer additional programs for students outside of the zone. We constantly struggle to balance demand for zoned and choice programs in a school. Currently students are not choosing to attend these schools and they are not at full capacity. By phasing out these underperforming and low demand schools and putting in new options, we will draw students back to the campus and ultimately reduce overcrowding in other areas.

Commenters have further stated that closing large, zoned high schools will force many students to travel further from their homes. In the High School Application Process allows students to rank up to 12 high school choices. Given the over 400 high school options available to students, they will only have to travel further from their homes if there is a high school option that they wish to attend. Additionally, some commenters have stated that large high schools provide more choices in electives for students and can address a broader range of students than the small schools that will replace them. Small schools currently offer AP and College Now Courses in addition to other electives depending on the particular school and student demand. Schools on a campus can also collaborate to offer electives to students across the various schools on the campus.

Some commenters also state that schools are being punished for setting high academic and safety standards. The DOE is not using phase-out proposals to punish schools. The schools proposed for phase-out have not exhibited evidence of helping students to achieve high standards. In fact, the schools proposed for phase-out have a long history of underperformance.

In opposing all of the DOE's phase-out proposals, one commenter argues that no school should be phased out and closed due to the potentially impaired recruitment of teachers into schools serving high needs students, the costs associated with starting new replacement schools, and the expense of placing teachers in the absent teacher reserve pool. There is, however, no evidence that school closures cause teachers to avoid working at schools that serve high needs students. In fact, over the last seven years, the DOE has raised teacher preparation to a point where 100 percent of teachers are certified, as compared to a low of 83 percent before, with the gap existing in high-poverty schools. Second, while there are costs associated with the opening of new schools and with teachers put into excess, the greater cost is that of the thousands of students who have passed through the schools proposed for closure without graduating or developing proficiency. Cost can only be considered in the context of what is earned in return. In these cases, too few students have earned the education we owe them, and the costs are born by not just the DOE, but those children, their families, and society at-large.

Finally, members of the public commenting on this proposal have assert that there is no evidence that the DOE attempted to improve the conditions at any of the schools it has proposed to close and suggests steps the DOE should take to improve these schools. Columbus has worked closely with a School Support Organization and network team selected by the principal and School Leadership Team. The SSO works with the principal and other school staff members

to provide support on a broad set of issues, including curriculum and instruction, human resources, professional development, budgets, and legal issues, among others. These SSOs work closely with the schools to ensure that inquiry teams are working at each school and using data to drive instruction. Network Leaders and Achievement Coaches spend time on a weekly basis in the schools. In addition the Superintendents and School Achievement Facilitators also provide support to schools and Principals. All City schools benefit from these supports and most City schools have made steady progress under this Administration. In the case of Columbus the school received support in the form of facilitated PD for new teachers regarding Inquiry Team process and identification of target student population; professional development with the Assistant Principals involving goal-setting for each student in their core subjects; coaching sessions regarding reading and writing best instructional practice; and assistance in implementing a credit recovery project. The UFT chapter chair has been leading inquiry teams and has led focused work on ELLs. The DOE also introduced Small Learning Communities into the school, which provided additional funding through a federal grant as well as instructional support from the DOE's Office of Postsecondary Pathways and Planning.

Because there is little evidence to suggest that continued school improvement measures will result in improved outcomes for students, the DOE has chosen not to accept the alternatives proposed. The proposal will be presented to the Panel for Educational Policy as currently posted.

A copy of the educational impact statement for this proposal can be obtained at http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/F0043783-8608-433C-855E-99228622A268/75268/11X415ChristopherColumbus_AmendedEIS_1810_Final1.pdf.

**Prepared by
Department of Education**