CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

----X

April 28, 2010 Start: 1:08 pm Recess: 4:33 pm

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

B E F O R E:

ROBERT JACKSON Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Council Member Charles Barron Council Member Fernando Cabrera Council Member Margaret S. Chin Council Member Daniel Dromm Council Member Lewis A. Fidler Council Member Helen D. Foster Council Member Daniel R. Garodnick Council Member David G. Greenfield Council Member Vincent M. Ignizio Council Member G. Oliver Koppell Council Member Karen Koslowitz Council Member Jessica S. Lappin Council Member Stephen T. Levin Council Member Deborah L. Rose Council Member Eric A. Ulrich Council Member James Vacca Council Member Albert Vann Council Member Mark S. Weprin

Robert Jackson Opening Statement Chairperson Committee on Education

Nicole Gutierrez
Ellis Preparatory Academy
Intern
Committee on Education

Louis Ramon Diaz
Ellis Preparatory Academy
Intern
Committee on Education

Anthony Irozello Principal School in Daniel Dromm's District

Kathleen Grimm
Deputy Chancellor
Division of Infrastructure and Portfolio Planning
Department of Education

Jeff Shear Chief of Staff Division of Infrastructure and Portfolio Planning Department of Education

Elizabeth Bergin Senior Director Capital Planning School Construction Authority

Testimony presented for the record Council of Supervisors and Administrators In support of Intro 155

Testimony presented for the record Advocates for Children In support of Transformation Zone

Testimony presented for the record Lenore Brown In support of Resolutions 156 and 157 and Intro 155

Testimony presented for the record Victoria Valencia In support of Resolutions 156 and 157

Testimony presented for the record
Cynthia Williams
Parent Leader
New York City Coalition for Education Justice
Mother of six children who attend public school
In support of Resolutions 156 and 157

Testimony presented for the record Julia Boyd Parent from Boys and Girls High School, Brooklyn In support of Transformation Zone

Testimony presented for the record Shareen Carrington PA President Maxwell High School In support of Transformation Zone

Testimony presented for the record Kenneth Moore PA President Robison High School In support of Transformation Zone

Testimony presented for the record Latoya Anthony PA Member Sheep's Head Bay High school, Brooklyn In support of Resolutions 156 and 157

Testimony presented for the record
Esperanza Vasquez
Parent
New Settlement Department
Coalition for Educational Justice
In support of Resolutions 156 and 157

George Sweeting
Deputy Director
New York City Independent Budget Office

Sarita Subramanian Education Capital Analyst New York City Independent Budget Office

Eric McGill
Education Policy Analyst
Representing
Scott Stronger
President
Borough of Manhattan

Leonie Haimson Executive Director Class Size Matters

Emily Horowitz
Professor of Sociology
St. Francis College
Chairperson
Task force on Overcrowding
Subcommittee to Reform the Blue Book
Manhattan Borough President's Office

David Bloomfield
Professor of Education
CUNY Graduate Center
Educational Leadership Program
Brooklyn College
Former President
Citywide Council on High Schools

Lenore Brown
Cypress Hill Resident
Member
Cypress Hill Advocate for Education
New York Coalition for Educational Justice

Doug Israel
Director
Research and Policy
Center for Arts Education

Rev. Joade Daur-Cardasis
Pastor of Episcopal Parish
Bronx, New York
Representing
Bishop Mark Sisk
Bishop Catherine Roskam
Diocese of New York, Episcopal

Helen Rosenthal Former Chairperson Community Board 7 Manhattan

Shino Tanikawa Parent of two children in public school Member Community Education Council District 2

Elliot Skip Roseboro Coalition for Educational Justice

Ann Kjellberg Public School Parent Advocacy Committee

Aysha Schaumberg Counsel Committee on Education

Jan Atwell
Policy Analyst
Committee on Education

Joan Pavone Committee on Education Regina Peredo Ryan Finance Policy Analyst Committee on Education

Shirley Limongee Communications Committee on Education

Nathan Toth Assistant Director Capital Division New York City Council

Joanna Garcia Chairman Jackson's Staff

Beth Shuler Chairman Jackson's Staff

Sara Margrave Chairman Jackson's Staff

[Gavel banging]

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Well good
afternoon everyone and welcome to the Education
Committee's hearing on Intro number 155 and
Resolution number 156 and Resolution number 157.
Let me introduce my colleagues that are present
this afternoon. From my left to my right,
colleague from Queens, Karen Koslowitz; my
colleague from the Bronx, Fernando Cabrera; and
our colleagues from Queens, Council Member Eric
Ulrich from Queens; and my colleague to my right
from Staten Island is Vincent Ignizio. Is there
anyone in back? You know, there's 51 of us. You
have to try to remember all 50gee whiz, that's a
tough task. And welcome to today's Education
Committee hearing.

Intro number 155 is a bill I sponsored that would amend the City Charter of New York to require the Chancellor to submit to the City Council by November 1st of each year, an annual report on enrollment, capacity and school utilization data for the prior school year, to be utilized for the current and future 5-year Capital Plan. Currently the Department of Education

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

produces an enrollment capacity and utilization report also known as the Blue Book. And if you don't know what it looks like, it looks like this. It's a pretty thick book and it's white but it has blue writing on it. [Chuckling].

The Blue Book is a crucial tool for capital planning as it is supposed to show the physical capacity of school buildings and whether schools are overcrowded or underutilized. the current Blue Book is seriously flawed and doesn't accurate reflect real conditions in most schools especially when it comes to overcrowding. To find out if this was true, in 2008 I commissioned a survey of school principals conducted by Professor Emily Horowitz of St. Francis College and Leonie Haimson of Class Size More than one-third of all principles in Matters. the City of New York responded to the survey. those who responded, half of principles at the schools that the Department of Education reported as underutilized said their schools were actually overcrowded.

School overcrowding is a serious problem in New York City schools and a very

2.0

important issue to me. Over the past two years

Manhattan Borough President Scott Stringer issued

three reports on overcrowded schools in Manhattan.

And the Comptroller of the City of New York

released a report on school overcrowding citywide.

Spring is here and newspapers are once again filled with stories of long

Kindergarten wait list and of students across the City who can't find a seat in their neighborhood school. This is totally unacceptable. Add to this the increasing competition for scarce space due to creation of new schools and collocation of charter schools inside existing district school buildings and the result is guess what, we're facing a real school facilities crisis.

The current Blue Book makes the situation worse because it doesn't show the true level of overcrowding. For one thing, overcrowded schools that have had to convert specialized spaces such as science labs, libraries, music rooms, art rooms, dance studios, etcetera, into regular classrooms so that their official capacity in the Blue Book increased as a result of that.

In addition New York City schools are required by

2.0

State law to reduce class size for all grades, K to 12. The current Blue Book methodology only reflects the reduced class size targets for grades K to 3, not for grades 4 to 12.

Thus it distorts the notion of how much space is actually available in the schools that are under State mandate to reduce class size. Something's wrong here. And that's why we need a true book to replace the Blue Book. A book that tells the truth about how much space is or is not available in our schools. For that reason we're proposing Intro number 155 to fix the problem with the current Blue Book.

In addition to the Blue Book bill we'll be hearing testimony today on Resolutions number 156 and 157 both of which I sponsored.

Resolution number 156 would call on the New York

City Department of Education to implement models of expanding learning time based on the New York

City Coalition for Educational Justice, commonly known as CEJ, their campaign for redesign and expansion of school day and year and a strategy to assist low performing schools improve student performance.

whatsoever.

Many educators and policy makers believe that students need more time than the average 6 hours a day, 180 days school year to master the 21st Century skills such as critical thinking and teamwork as well as core academics in order to compete in our global economy. Hundreds of initiatives to extend learning time have been launched across the nation. With some linked to increased student achievement. And some models of expanded learning time entail additional costs

The generation schools model expands learning time by up to 30% for all students without increasing teacher work time.

Instead teachers work on staggered schedules to extend the day so that there is no added cost.

It's time for New York City to try to expand learning time as one strategy to help improve struggling schools.

that can vary widely from a few hundred dollars to

more than \$1,000 per student each year, while

other models do not require any expenditures

Resolution number 157 would call on the New York City Department of Education to

establish a School Transformation Zone and based on the model proposed by the New York City
Coalition for Educational Justice to improve low performing schools and prevent school closings.
Right now the Department of Education's only strategy for dealing with low performing schools seems to be shut them down. Close them up. And replace them with charter schools.

Now I know the Department of
Education may disagree with me but I haven't heard
anything yet as to the detailed plans that they
have made, but since the Mayor gained control of
the City school system in 2002 the Department of
Education has closed 91 schools and many of them
large high schools and replaced them with new
small schools or charters. And as you know the
Mayor said in Washington DC that he plans on
closing 10% of the lowest performing schools over
the next 4 years and that adds to about 150
schools.

So I believe as do many others that closing schools should not be the last resort.

And it should only be used after other efforts have been made to help struggling schools. Last

month on March 2nd, this Committee held an oversight hearing on the Department of Education's proposed school closings. And at that hearing my colleagues and I asked the Department of Education what steps they took to helps struggling schools before closing them down.

I specifically asked the Department of Education to show me any written action plans they had developed to help turn around these schools. In response the Department of Education sent us copies of the school's own comprehensive education plans for every school, every school leadership team that is required to comply every year to show how much their plan to use the funds allocated to the schools.

So in essence we asked to tell us what you've done in each school to turn this school around before you decided to close it. And what they did is they sent us all of the CEPs, the Comprehensive Education Plans that was established by the school leadership teams and said here.

Here is it. A CEP is not what you specifically have done to turn around schools. That's not an action plan. That is not an action plan.

2.0

2.3

	A Comprehensive Education Plan is					
	what you plan on achieving. But as to an action					
	plan, tell me how much more additional money					
you're putting in, tell me how much more						
	additional help you're giving it, tell me what					
	have you done in collaboration with parents to say					
	specifically what your benchmarks are going to be					
	to turn this school around. And whether or not					
	that's one year, two years, three years or					
	whatever. That was not done.					

But I thought that I was very clear: an action plan, not a CEP. If I wanted a CEP, I would have asked for a Comprehensive Educational Plan for each school.

Critics argue school closures

displace many of the students most at risk

including special education students and English

language learners who may drop out as a result.

There is evidence of collateral damage created by

closing large high schools. In a report issued by

the Center for New York City Affairs, which found

that as the lowest achieving large high schools

were closed, large schools were closed; thousands

of students particularly new immigrants and

2.0

children receiving special education services were diverted to remaining large schools. The graduation rate and attendance rates at these schools then declined and some became failing schools that were subsequently closed. You hear what I'm coming from? There seems to be a spiral effect here.

So there is a domino effect, some people may call it, from school closings leading to surrounding schools becoming overcrowded with greater concentrations of high need students, then being targeted for closure themselves. To halt this vicious cycle it took a lawsuit by a coalition including UFT, the NAACP, the Alliance for Quality Education, Manhattan Borough President Scott Stringer, State elected officials, parents and City Council Members including myself to stop the Department of Education from closing the latest round of 19 schools.

A number of parents and advocates such as the New York City Coalition for Education

Justice have called on the Department of Education to fix these low performing schools rather than close them down. CEJ has proposed a comprehensive

improvement strategy, development of a School
Transformation Zone that will give all struggling
schools the opportunity to join the zone and turn
themselves around before being subject to closure.
One of the required elements for the zoned schools
would be to add more instructional time to the
school day and year. A similar model formerly
called The Chancellor's District was created in
the New York City by former school Chancellor Rudy
Crew in 1996 to improve low performing schools.

Schools in the Chancellor's

District received additional resources and assistance that included smaller class sizes, extended learning time, after school programs with tutoring, and enrichment activities, intensive professional development, and extensive instructional support. Although the Chancellor's District was ended in 2003 by the Bloomberg Administration a 2004 evaluation by the Institute for Education and Social Policy at NYU, New York University, found that the Chancellor's District significantly improved the reading outcomes of students in those schools in three years of focused effort.

2	After leaving New York City Rudy
3	Crew because Superintendent of Miami schools and
4	established a similar School Improvement Zone in
5	Miami which succeeded in dramatically raising
6	student achievements in Miami's lowest performing
7	schools. In fact Miami's School Improvement Zone
8	was named one of the top 50 programs of the 2008
9	Innovations in America Government Award
10	Competition. Obviously it's time to reinstitute
11	this successful initiative here in New York City,
12	its birthplace by creating a School Transformation
13	Zone for struggling schools. [Applauding]
14	[Audience applauding]
15	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Sometimes
16	when no one applauds you have to applaud yourself.
17	[Audience laughing]
18	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: My colleagues
19	and I are eager to hear from the Department of
20	Education, their views on Intro number 155 as well
21	as to get feedback on Intro 155, Resolution 156,
22	Resolution 157 from DOE if they wish and other
23	interested witnesses.
24	Everyone who wishes to testify
25	today must fill out a witness slip with is located

2.0

at the desk at the Sergeant of Arms to my left, to your right, in the front of the chambers. Please indicate on the witness slip whether you are here to testify in favor or in opposition of Intro 155, Resolution 156 or Resolution 157.

I want to point out however that we will not be voting on any of these items today as this is just the first hearing on all three. We will allow as many as possible to testify.

Testimony will be limited to three minutes per person and now I'd like to introduce additional colleagues that have arrived.

In front to my left is Council

Member Lew Fidler of Brooklyn; Danny Dromm next to
him of Queens; over here in front of me Oliver

Koppell of the Bronx; along with our brand new
colleague from where? The great Borough of

Brooklyn, David Greenfield, the newest kid on the
block, David welcome to the Education Committee.

You're welcome. And of course Dan Garodnick our
colleague from Manhattan. David you missed
earlier when I was like hesitate on announcing
some of my colleagues because I said there's 51 of
us and I don't have the list in front of me and I

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Okay with

25

2.0

that I want to thank all my colleagues for your
indulgence in reading my opening statement. I had
a lot to say. And now we're going to turn to the
Department of Education and I believe we have
several individuals, Kathleen Grimm, our Deputy
Chancellor for Infrastructure, Portfolio and
Planning at the Department of Education. We have
Jeff Shear, the Chief of Staff of Division of
Infrastructure and Portfolio Planning and
Elizabeth Bergin, a Senior Director of Capital
Planning, SCA. So welcome the three of you. And
along with your staff and whoever wants to go
first you may beintroduce yourself and you may
begin your testimony.

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR KATHLEEN GRIMM:

Thank you very much Chair Jackson and members of the Education Committee. As stated, my name is Kathleen Grimm. I am Deputy Chancellor of the Department and with me is my Chief of Staff, Jeff Shear and Elizabeth Bergin who is our Senior Director at the SCA for Capital Planning.

We are pleased to be here today to discuss the proposed Intro number 155. The New York City public school system as you know

educates more than 1 million students in over

1,600 schools. We are the largest single school

district in the United States and our public

schools collectively enroll more children than the

population of 8 states. Constructing and

maintaining school buildings to serve so many

students is an enormous undertaking particularly

in a city where the real estate market is

notoriously competitive.

Despite these challenges the Mayor has made the expansion and improvement of our school infrastructure a priority. And with this Council's help this Administration has made unprecedented progress in building the overall capacity of our school system. As you all know the 5-year Capital Plan from 2005 to 20009 included construction of 55,000 new public school seats. We are now in the 1st year of the 2010-2014 plan which will add an additional 30,000 seats to our system.

Over the course of these 2 plans,
the Administration will have added more than
85,000 new seats to our system and I think that's
something that we should all feel enormously proud

about. And certainly your collaboration has been instrumental in that progress. You supported our efforts to get our Capital Plans fully funded.

You directed hundreds of millions of dollars towards improving school buildings in your districts and you contributed ideas that have enhanced our capital planning. So we value your continued attention to building our system-wide school capacity.

But while we appreciate the intentions behind this bill, we do not believe that it will enhance our capital planning efforts and it imposes enormous new reporting burdens on our principals.

Just talking about the so-called Blue Book and our capital planning efforts. Each fall the Department publishes its enrollment capacity and utilization report, known fondly by all of us as the Blue Book. In the interest of transparency and to support community engagement in our capital planning efforts this very detailed report is released both in print and on our website where it is readily accessible to parents, educators,

community leaders and elected officials.

We also actually release three

versions of this report. One provides information

by building showing the capacity and utilization

of each school housed in a given building. The

second version is school-based and consolidates

all relevant data for each school operating

multiple sites into a single listing. And the

third version organizes all of this information by

City Council District so each of you have a

succinct listing of all your schools.

The Blue Book identifies the maximum physical capacity of all public school buildings. And then it compares that capacity against audited enrollment levels which are not finalized until January, to calculate an annual utilization rate for every City school. Now of course conditions in our buildings are hardly static so we update our inventory of space and utilization rates every single year.

As part of this process school principals complete what is called an Annual Facilities Survey where principals share the latest information regarding the size, function

2.0

2 and use of each room in their school buildings.

And in the case of shared campuses how rooms are allocated among the different schools.

The School Construction Authority then devotes a considerable amount of time and attention to analyzing and auditing these data including conducting some random site visits to selective schools to audit the data. As a result the most current Blue Book always presents data from the previous school year.

This information is vital because the first step in identifying new capacity needs in the City, whether we are talking about construction of new buildings or creating annexes and additions is assessing these utilization rates in our existing facilities. In this way we can be confident that we are using our existing building efficiently before devoting capital funding to new construction projects.

The Blue Book provides a very clear and effective framework for the Department to evaluate facility usage consistently across schools. We have developed standard formulas to calculate school capacity based on the grade

2.0

levels served within each building. And over the past few years with considerable input from Council Members, advocates and other community leaders, we made several significant enhancements to those formulas.

Firstly, in addition to what we cal the historical capacity and utilization rate, our traditional method for calculating school capacity; we introduce something called the target rate which reflects aspirational goals for maximum classroom capacity. We also lowered target capacity levels in grade 4 to 12 to reflect our goals of reducing average class size. This target calculation can be adjusted as goals change while the historical rate allows us to make consistent comparisons year over year.

Another important change recently introduced is that we now break out data to indicate the capacity of dedicated pre-Kindergarten classrooms and required cluster classrooms in elementary schools. It is important to understand that these formulas err on the side of being conservative in terms of assumed facility usage.

2.0

For example in our middle and high

schools we assume that our standard classrooms are

used for 7 out of 8 periods a day and that our

specialty rooms are used only 5 out of 8 periods.

Now we know in many cases school leaders are able

to use those classrooms much more effectively.

And the Department provides extensive support to

principals to help them make strategic programming and staffing choices that optimize use of their available resources. But again for planning purposes we are using this more conservative formula.

schools and buildings understandably garner much attention but these realities make it clear that the utilization statistic alone does not fully capture the space situation in any given building nor does it account for shifting demographics and future enrollment trends which might impact facility needs in a community going forward. For those reasons the Blue Book is merely one element of the Department's comprehensive capital planning process.

In developing capacity

recommendations for our 5-year Capital Plan, our analysis draws on existing capacity, coupled with capacity that is under construction. Capital planning also requires an assessment of emerging needs. The School Construction Authority employs to demographic firms to help develop 5 and 10-year enrollment projections. These projections incorporate data on birth rates, the census, historical enrollment trends, and retention rates.

housing starts and rezoning efforts.

Incorporating this broad range of data allows us to monitor shifts in enrollment on an ongoing basis so we can make timely adjustments where there is a sustained increase or decline in need.

We then overlay information on

We also engage in a very robust public review process with Community Education Councils, certainly the City Council and other elected officials and community groups. We amend our Capital Plan annually based on these conversations and the latest data which allows us to catch emerging needs quickly so we can make needed changes in a timely way. This November, for example, we added 5,000 seats to our current

5-year plan to reflect what we saw as a shifting enrollment projection.

Our capital planning is an evolving process. But we do believe it has effectively guided our capital planning over the last past several years. Your input has also enhanced our efforts to meet the needs of students and their families. For example, several Council Members urged us to revise capital planning to reflect needs at the neighborhood level rather than the District level. We adopted that recommendation for elementary and middle schools and it has helped us better address pockets of overcrowding within Districts where overall enrollment has been declining.

The effectiveness of our capital planning process is most clearly manifest in the 85,000 new seats that we will be bringing online through these two consecutive Capital Plans. When construction funded under the current plan is completed, 8% of City students will be enrolled in classrooms or buildings that did not exist in 2005 at the beginning of the first plan. That unprecedented growth occurring even in these tough

times provides clear evidence that our capital planning process is making a real difference for students and families across the City.

I'd like to spend a few minutes talking about some of the logistical challenges that we see in the proposed legislation. Because of the success we have seen in terms of these additional seats, we must question the value of imposing additional reporting requirements on the Department and more importantly on our principals.

While we appreciate the intentions behind the proposed legislation and share your goals certainly of continuing to improve the capital planning process, the logistical challenges of implementing the proposal as written are enormous. The proposed legislation would require us to report historical changes in room usage for the past 15 years. Yes, the last 15 years. Many of our principals have not served in their current buildings for 15 years and even those who have done so might not recall various changes in room utilization over that entire period.

Moreover such anecdotal

2.0

recorrections even when available would not
provide a legitimate basis for reporting. As a
result we would have to dig into archival records
to obtain original building plans and any
subsequently construction plans where they exist.
These records may or may not have room usage
information. Additionally some classroom
conversions actually do not require physical
modifications so no construction records would
exist in those cases, making full compliance with
the proposed legislation a logistical
impossibility

Moreover unlike today's Blue Book we would not be able to produce a report that allowed for fair and consistent comparisons between schools because the quality and the availability of building records would vary across the entire City. Compiling and researching building records also would be time consuming and labor intensive. And I can't stress this enough, particularly for our principals from whom we gather this information. It is worth noting that principals already devote considerable time to meeting Federal, State and City reporting

2.0

requirements and our Annual Facilities Survey is a particularly time consuming and complex survey as it is.

And while these reports provide
vital information the time and labor involved
necessarily comes at the expense of visiting
classrooms, working with teachers or meeting with
students and their families. Consequently the
Department is working very hard to streamline
reporting requirements so that our educators can
focus on instructional priorities.

In a universe where budgets are strained and educators are already stretched thing we ask you to join us in this effort by exercising caution in adding to the extensive reporting demands our principals already face. In the case of this bill the Department believes that the value of the information when weighed against the time and labor required to obtain it simply isn't worth it.

We know that our existing data collection and capital planning protocols have produced unprecedented school construction. And we also know that there are many reasons for

2.0

converting classrooms in buildings from one purpose to another that have nothing to do with crowding or capacity considerations. For example many school buildings undergo major renovations.

A former high school might be used to house an elementary school or we may convert a large school into a campus housing multiple smaller schools.

Major renovations generate classroom conversions but these take place as the facility is substantially enhanced.

In other cases classrooms are repurposed because of changing instructional models or because student demand for once popular courses such as home economics or typing has waned. The net effect of these conversions benefits students but under this legislation the changes might appear as a loss of capacity.

Likewise the proposed legislation fails to account for the creation of new cluster or specialty rooms within a school building even when those rooms are specifically created to replace other spaces converted away from those purposes. It doesn't account for specialized classrooms in newly constructed buildings some of

which are purposefully designed to house schools with distinctive themes or programs. And it is unclear how the proposal would account for the value of capacity in auditoriums, cafeterias and other spaces that are not included in our existing calculations. Simply put, much of the new information principals would spend time gathering would not be effective in terms of enhancing the capital planning process itself.

So in conclusion I want to reiterate to all of you that we share your goal of building capacity in our system. And with your continued support we have made unprecedented progress in improving and expanding public school facilities. This September, this September we will open 25 brand new school buildings with over 17,000 new seats. Over the course of the 2 5-year Capital Plans we are funding construction of 85,000 new seats across the five Boroughs.

We understand your desire to have additional facilities information to build on those achievements but as we continually strive to improve our capital planning we must balance this desire with a realistic sense of what information

2.0

2.3

is easily accessible and useful. We simply cannot
distract principals from their primary
responsibilities as instructional leaders to
compile information that we don't think we need.

Additionally as the Council is aware, State law requires the preparation of the Capital Plan by the Chancellor specifies its elements and establishes the process for its approval. We have concerns that this bill might be preempted by State law to the extent that it seeks to modify the elements of the plan or related requirements. We will of course leave that to the lawyers.

I hope you consider these concerns carefully as you evaluate the merits of this bill. We would be glad to meet with you to discuss these issues further and to identify alternative strategies to enhance information gathering and sharing around facility issues that would minimize the burden on our educators or avoid jurisdictional questions.

I want to thank you again for having us here today and we are happy to take your questions and respond to any other information you

		-	_	_, ,	
,	might	ask	tor	Thank	$\nabla \cap \Pi$

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Well thank

you Deputy Chancellor Grimm. We've been at this

for about nine years, you and I. And while I

respect you a lot for who you are I don't always

agree with you, you know that.

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Yes I do know that but I think working together we have accomplished a great deal Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: That's true.

Let me introduce additional colleagues. Charles

Barron who joined us from Brooklyn; Jimmy Vacca of

the Bronx; and Al Vann of Brooklyn coming in; and

also Jessica Lappin of Manhattan. And next to me
he said and me: Mark Weprin of Queens, thank you

Mark.

COUNCIL MEMBER WEPRIN: You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: I'm going to turn to my colleagues first for questions and then I'll come back to myself. Our colleague Fernando Cabrera of the Bronx.

COUNCIL MEMBER CABRERA: Thank you so much Mr. Chairman. I want to take really a

moment to thank you for introducing this vital bill because it's been my experience so far, even as a new member, that often we don't get accurate information. We get misguided information regarding what's really taking place in the DOE and school. A perfect example of that is what I just heard in the testimony being related to the fact—insinuating the principal that this will be a burden to principals.

And in speaking to principals in my District, they're very eager to report and we see here written testimony from the CSA Union in full support of this bill. So we see an obvious contradiction or perception how the DOE sees and perceives their principals and what they're really going through. I mean we have 550 principals who in a survey just done a couple of years ago stated that the class sizes were too large while the Board of Ed is reporting they're underutilized.

So there's an obvious--so it leads me to my first question. Why does not the DOE use State mandated class size targets for grades 4 to 12? If it is mandated by the State, I would like to know why the DOE is not following the State

2.0

2.3

2 mandated class size targets.

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Well the class size targets are targets that we have put in place in conjunction with the State and we are working toward them. We do not use those targets in the capital planning process because the capital planning process measures the capacity of every individual classroom, the maximum capacity of each individual classroom.

The targets for the citywide class size are averages across the system. So we're not talking about exactly the same thing.

COUNCIL MEMBER CABRERA: Well I'm looking at the report that was provided to us by the Legislative Director and I basically took it word for word but let me just proceed here forward and I tend to trust our Legislative Director a lot more here.

In terms of how many--I'm just curious as to how many school trailers do we have at the present moment?

[Pause]

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: 363.

COUNCIL MEMBER CABRERA: And how

from other hearings you consider charter schools,

25

2	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:and the
3	capacity. It's just a formula. It is one way to
4	look at it. If youif you find that difficult we
5	can look at that formula and see if we might want
6	to change it.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER CABRERA:
8	Definitely. Thank you Mr. Chairman, my time is
9	up. Maybe another Council Member could pick up my
LO	line of questioning.
11	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Well let me
12	let's pick up on that. So.
13	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Um-hum.
L4	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: What I was
L5	trying to understand in listening to the question
L6	and the response, hum, charter schools that are
L7	collocated in a public school is not configured
18	into the number of students using the utilization
19	and capacity and the number of students in the
20	building?
21	MS. BERGIN: No, that's not
22	correct
23	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: [Interposing]
24	What are we hearing. I mean I
25	MS. BERGIN: [Interposing] In the

That is

22

2.3

24

25

[Interposing] CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: But doesn't that go against what the State has required you to do as far as what you submitted to the State of New York? I mean they came back and

2.0

2.3

that match up? 28 is not 24. So please help me
out here, maybe I don't understand. And let me
ask my question. Does any colleague understand if
24 equals 28? No and I'm not trying to be funny.
I'm very serious about that. Does anyonedoes 24
equal 28? Give me \$28 and I'll give you \$24 right
now

So I'm sorry. I guess I've got to make a little fun of it because if not I'll just get a little annoyed. So Deputy Chancellor, let me hear from you. How does it align? Please help me out.

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Fun is better than annoyance.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Yes I agree [chuckling].

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Because there--we're actually looking at two different things. What we're looking at in the Capital Plan is setting a target for the maximum capacity in a classroom. And so in the Capital Plan for K to 3, our maximum is 20 for K to 3 and for 4 to 12 it is 28 as you mentioned. That's how we build the classrooms. On a separate path we really have our

2 C4E [phonetic] arrangement with the State where we have targeted certain class size that we want to qet to.

and in 4 to 12, 24. That's the average. That's the target we aspire to across the entire City. So what we have to make sure that in any given school we're giving principals enough flexibility to manage their programming because frankly they're not going to have 24 students in every single class. So I'm not going to be--especially in a high school.

You're going to have larger classes and smaller classes depending on what the subject is. So we are working toward the average C4E targets in our class sizes. But in the Capital Plan we are building classrooms that will give principals flexibility to reach those targets.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Deputy

Chancellor I'm still trying to follow you and I guess I'm in a haze because if in fact you're saying you're going to build schools with the capacity of 28 but you're giving the principals flexibility why aren't you building schools

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

_	COMMITTIES ON EDUCATION
2	knowing that your target is 23 or 24 students
3	depending on who you ask.
4	But quite frankly I don't see how
5	down the road that the number of students in 4
б	through 12 is going to be 24 when you are
7	building, supposedly schools that canthat is

going to have 28 per classroom. In essence you're

going to need more classrooms in order to go with

the target of 23 or 24. You're going to need more

11 classrooms than targeting 28 students per class.

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Well I don't know how much detail you want to go into right here--

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: [Interposing] Well in general do you agree that you're going to need more classrooms? If in fact your real goal is to follow what the State is saying, 23 in 4 to 8, you're going to need more classrooms than building for 28 students per classroom.

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: As you know we also disagree on what class size reduction means.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Okay but that's a different story though--

25

2	Then working with principals across all schools we
3	are working toward C4E targets of 20 and 24 which
4	principals may achieve in different ways. A push-
5	in teacher for example, which is something which I
6	think we disagree on.
7	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Well I'm
8	telling you, it's amazing to me because I quite
9	frankly as someone that has been involved as a
10	parent activist since 1980 and been on this
11	Education Committee for 9 years, your answer is
12	not clear to me. Let me just say that.
13	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: I
14	understand that.
15	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: It's not
16	clear.
17	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: I would
18	also point out that on average our utilization of
19	buildings is under 100%.
20	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: And Deputy
21	Chancellor, you know, you, as I said, you and I,
22	we've been together 9 years. And, you know, you
23	put forward, you the Department of Education, the

Chancellor and the Mayor, put forward a 5-year

Capital Plan that said that there would be no

2.0

2.3

additional seats in Districts 6, 5, 4 and District 1 because the need would not be there when all of these Districts as per Scott Stringer's report are mandating that they're overcrowded.

They're fighting for space in

District 3, in District 6 and other Districts all

around the City. And you put forward a 5-year

plan that says that no additional seats are

needed. That's absurd, Deputy Chancellor, I'm

sorry. You were wrong. And DOE was wrong. And

you cannot prove me wrong because go ask the

parents in District 3 where I attended a press

conference 2 weeks ago.

There were not only parents from 1 school; there were parents from many schools. I told you in District 6, you had parents at 153, the Hamilton High School. You've got 3 schools in IS 218 and you're telling me, no additional seats are necessary in District 6 over the next 5 years. I can't believe it.

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: As you know, we--capital construction is just one aspect of how we address these utilization and capacity issues. We do review--we do issue an annual

2.0

2.3

amendment. We go through this process every year
so that we make sure we are examI do remind you
last November we added 5,000 seats to this plan.
But right now, based on that last amendment we
don't see needs in the Districts where we did not
add seats.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Because I think that the Department of Education says okay there's a seat here, there's an empty seat here, there's an empty seat here, there's an empty seat here. And so as a result of that you don't need any additional seats.

That's kind of--I'm telling you

Deputy Chancellor, you know, you know I appreciate

you but I don't know who's feeding you what Kool
Aid that you truly believe that we don't need

seats in District 3 and District 6. It's

absolutely dumfounded if you ask me. And I tell

you quite frankly if I was the Mayor, many of you

would not have your jobs. But let me just move

on.

[Applause]

24 SERGEANT AT ARMS: Settle down.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Let me move

2.0

2.3

С	on before I get annoyed and I don't want to get
t	too annoyed. Vincent Ignizio from Staten Island.
Η	He's not here? Let's go to the next member, Danny
D	Dromm from Queens.

very much Chair Jackson. I too am very concerned about your facts and figures and your numbers.

And I know from personal experience having taught in District 24 for 25 years that space utilization, class size was very, very difficult to deal with and control and really never got any better and in fact always got worse. And I represent that District now in the City Council including District 30 as well.

And I am very concerned about the utilization of space. When you talk in your facts and figures and your numbers about the size, function and use of all rooms, does this include what the room was originally intended for? If you pull books from a library shelf, take all the shelves out and put kids in there how does the fact that the school no longer has a library come up in terms of space utilization?

MS. BERGIN: Well first there is no

2.0

2.3

2	capacity	assigned	to	any	room	that	is	designated
3	as a libı	rarv.						

4 COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: By capacity 5 you mean?

MS. BERGIN: Counted towards the number of seats in the building. We do request when the principals complete their Annual Facilities Survey that if a room such as an auditorium or a library or a gymnasium has been converted to classroom space that they report it as its original intended use. So therefore there would be no general education capacity associated with that. So--

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: But if the school loses a gym or loses a library, there's no way, just by looking at the information that you've provided us with to say that in fact now this school does not have those facilities available for those students.

MS. BERGIN: If they have converted say a gymnasium to a classroom, we ask that they identify it as a gym so that when we're calculating the capacity we won't calculate it as a classroom capacity, same for a library.

1	COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION 55
2	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: But
3	MS. BERGIN: [Interposing] So the
4	point
5	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM:
6	[Interposing] But where does it show up in terms
7	of statistics and numbers that they no longer have
8	that gym or that library?
9	MS. BERGIN: It won't show up on
10	the Annual Facilities Survey.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: And that's
12	what I think is the heart of what it is that we're
13	trying to get at. Because we
14	MS. BERGIN: [Interposing] But the
15	fact thatthe fact that they're reporting it as a
16	library would mean that we are not counting that
17	toward capacity. So the point
18	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM:
19	[Interposing] No.
20	MS. BERGIN:of the survey is so
21	that when we calculate capacity we don't assume a
22	capacity for a room that was a library
23	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM:
24	[Interposing] Are you saying that they're still
25	reporting it as a library and not a classroom?

2	MS. BERGIN: We request that they
3	do so that we don't calculate the capacityroom
4	use calculatecapacity for that.
5	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: What
6	we're saying is that if a school has converted a
7	library and has children in it that they let us
8	know that because then when we create the school
9	utilization, we want to exclude that use and we
10	want to say what is the utiliwhat does this
11	school need in terms of capacity because we don't
12	want to count that library as a classroom. And we
13	do not count it as a classroom.
14	So we would, in a school that was
15	overcrowded, see an increase in the utilization
16	rate.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: And if
18	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:
19	[Interposing] Now if the school was very
20	overcrowded it would go over 100
21	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM:
22	[Interposing] Capacity.
23	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:and
24	then it would be on our radar screen as an
25	overcrowded school.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Would it show

up as a specialty room or some other room or would

24

25

this--22

23

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:

24 [Interposing] Yes some of it I--

25 COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: --that goes

2	on. And testing that goes on in hallways as well
3	because there's not enough room to bring a child
4	to a room with some privacy. And so whereas some
5	of the nuts, the figures showyes okay the child
6	has a seat, other factors are not taken into it.
7	And I think that's at the heart of what it is that
8	we're trying to get to. And in some ways help the
9	Department of Education
10	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:
11	[Interposing] Um-hum.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM:deal with
13	these issues that we can get a feel for what's
14	required in the future. Anyway, the other thing
15	is like is space utilization included in quality
16	reviews? And I'm asking that as a teacher because
17	and I think you would agree, unless you tell me
18	otherwise, that space utilization
19	MS. BERGIN: [Interposing]
20	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM:
21	overcrowding affects instruction. So is that
22	taken into account when you do quality reviews?
23	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Well a
24	quality reviewer, if he or she felt that there was
25	something in the space utilization having an

2	impact on the plan, the instructional plan and the
3	instructional efforts they should certainly
4	include it.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Well Deputy
6	Chancellor, when I've gone through quality reviews
7	they've told me that they are not allowed to put
8	that information into report. And I really wish
9	that you would look into that
LO	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:
11	[Interposing] I will. I will look at that.
L2	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM:because I
L3	think that's another way that we can get a handle
L4	on this.
L5	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Um-hum.
L6	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: And they
L7	said well space utilization, class size, really
18	has no impact on these reports. Is my time up Mr.
L9	Chairman?
20	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: You can ask
21	another question if you want to.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Trailers.
23	And I heard Council Member Cabrera talk about
24	that. Is there any type of a life expectancy on
25	those? Is, you know, 'cause to be honest with you

2.0

the trailers that I've been in, in some of the schools in my District, they're warped. The ceilings are warped, the walls are warped, the sheetrock in them is warped. The toilet paper rolls can't even be attached to the wall of them because they're so warped that the screws fall out. So what is the life expectancy of a trailer and what type of decision needs to be made to replace them?

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: We don't like trailers. TCUs, we don't like them either. We would love to be rid of all of them. As a practical matter, while that is an aspirational goal we have, we still do have them, close to 400 of them. We have fortunately decreased rather significantly the number of children in them.

We don't have any stated life expectancy or life term but as Liz said earlier we are inspecting them, again, if you are finding some place with a leak or any kind of situation like that you let us know, we'll go right out and inspect them. Because we do want to make sure that what those that are in use are in proper condition for the children.

2	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: And one
3	final? How many classes right now are over the
4	20, 28 class size limits that you're talking about
5	throughout the school system? In other words if
6	we're aiming at a 20 for early childhood 1 to 3
7	grade and a 28 for the upper grades, how many,
8	right now, are over those limits?
9	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Well we
10	have our class size averages which are published
11	as you know in the Mayor's Management Report. And
12	they range, I am looking at the list from
13	Kindergarten through 8 th grade, they range from
14	Kindergarten at 20.8 toor 21.9, I'm sorry, up to
15	8 th grade where we have I think the largest number
16	and that's 27.7.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: And just a
18	final statement. I would love to see those
19	figures by District so that we can identify the
20	Districts that have the most need. Because I
21	think what happens in this is that some areas of
22	the City pull those numbers down and it's not an
23	accurate reflection
24	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:

[Interposing] Yes, fair enough.

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: [Chuckling] Thank you.

certainly keep her.

the system. And if I were the Mayor I would

22

2.3

24

25

2.0

see where we had gaps or where we needed to do things. I think if you look at this, some of your objections deal with the difficulty of compiling the first report.

But once the thing is done, each year it's not going to change that much. It's for most places going to be the same with respect to the number of classrooms, the number of libraries that are there or where there and aren't here anymore. The number of cluster rooms that are there and weren't there anymore. All of that information is going to be the same. So the first year it will be a little tough to do this.

So I would urge Mr. Chairman that the staff, get together with the staff of the Deputy Chancellor. Because I think that the Blue Book is a useful tool but it could be more useful and I think the suggestion of the bill is to make it more useful. And I really think that can be done.

And the other thing is that I think that there does have to be some refinement of the Blue Book because it comes up with strange numbers in some o four schools. Our middle school/high

school 141 is said to be underutilized. And I just--you know, I've gone there. I've looked at it. I've discussed it with the principal and it's not over capacity but it's at capacity. It's not underutilized. And that's just--doesn't make sense. So I think there has to be some study of that.

But I think the more information we can have, and look just because we have targets doesn't mean we can always meet them. I mean we have converted too many rooms that were science labs or art rooms or music rooms to other uses.

And it's good to know where we should look to reverse that trend. And I think that's the point of the bill.

I really don't have a question, it's just a suggestion that I make. I think that the bill is reasonable. It certainly can be worked on if there's something in the bill that's difficult to accomplish. But I really think we should move ahead Mr. Chairman. And if, I mean I think the Department could well work with us to put something together that would be useful for us and indeed useful for them.

2	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Well thank
3	you Council Member Koppell our colleague. I
4	totally agree with you. And so I hope that the
5	Department of Education will not listen to me but
6	listen to you.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER KOPPELL:
8	[Chuckling]
9	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: [Chuckling].
LO	All right. Let's turn to our other colleague, go
11	back to Vincent Ignizio from Staten Island.
L2	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Thank you
L3	Mr. Chairman. And I apologize for having to step
L4	out. I have a brief question. At what point does
L5	the DOE, the SCA or any rendition of the two say
L6	okay we're going to try a temporary fix. We're
L7	going to being in transportables. Is there like a
L8	number? When and why do you bring in
19	transportables and do you bring in transportables
20	in advance of a larger addition perhaps, you know,
21	how doeswalk me through that system of how you
22	grant transportables for any given school?
23	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: We try
24	not to bring them in at all.
25	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Okazz

2	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: But Liz
3	do you want to talk about some situations which I
4	think we articulated in the last plan where we
5	would not necessarily need to bring them in but to
6	continue to utilize TCUs during a lot of
7	construction.
8	MS. BERGIN: Under the last plan we
9	did install TCUs in several [skip in audio] in the
LO	current plan we are anticipating not installing
11	TCUs. So we are really
L2	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO:
L3	[Interposing] Do we own the ones that we currently
L4	have? Like if you're
L5	MS. BERGIN: [Interposing] Yes we
L6	do.
L7	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Okay.
L8	MS. BERGIN: Yes we do. So we are
L9	reallywe're trying not to expand that universe
20	of TCUs.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Okay.
22	MS. BERGIN: And actually just
23	shrink them. We have several projects [skip in
24	audio] remove TCUs and create
25	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Addition.

will open up the level of who we can bring in from
other Districts or other areas outside the zone?
How does that work?
DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Are you
talking about high schools?
COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: High
schools, yeah. Sorry.
DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Because
many of our high schools are no longer zoned.
COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Okay.
DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: And so
all children, all young people I should say, in $8^{\rm th}$
grade, go through the annual process of listing
the 12 high schools that they would most like to
go to. And we go through an intricate matching
program. And what happens is any child in a zoned
high school area has a right to go to that school.
COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Okay. So
and finally what criterion or what criteria do you
utilize with regards to bussing because as you
know I'm a huge advocate of the school in the
Charleston area of my Distinct. I have PS 1, PS
3, PS 56 and PS 6 all over 100% capacity, all in

various stages. One is at 164%.

2	We thought ahead many years ago and
3	we set aside 10 acres for a school in the
4	Charleston site. We havewe had seats for it but
5	I was told by Capital Planning and Portfolio that
6	well it would require a lot of bussing. And
7	that's why we won't put a school there despite the
8	needs of capacity throughout that area. So is
9	that a new criteria? How do wenow are we saying
LO	because it will require bussing we don't build
11	schools in an area that's overcrowded?
12	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: No. No.
L3	Our capital planning decisions are made solely on
L4	need, influenced often by available of space
L5	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO:
L6	[Interposing] Right.
L7	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:but
L8	never by bussing.
L9	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Well I'm
20	just telling you the situation which I encountered
21	is that I have a piece of land that was set aside,
22	over 10 acres for a school, in an area where every
23	school in the area around it is overcrowded. And
24	I was told well we can't build a school there

because it would require too much bussing.

2	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: I will
3	review that and I will get back to you on that
4	because that's not the criteria that we use.
5	Criterion.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Okay. Mr.
7	Chairman if I will, can Iif I can solicit your
8	support and help on this matter, I've been
9	fighting this battle for many years and just to
10	reiterate to the Committee and to those at large
11	we have a piece of property that was purposefully
12	set aside for a school, land bank for a school,
13	when they did the development project.
14	Every school around it is
15	overcrowded right now. We received 400 seats in
16	this Capital Plan for that area. I asked for it
17	to be placed here and was told it can't happen,
18	you know, it's not enough walk-ups; it would be,
19	you know, excessive in terms of the
20	transportation. I didn't know that to be a
21	criterion of siting. I was told that it wasn't.
22	So now I go back and ask where is the issue with
23	regards to this
24	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:
25	[Interposing] Okay.

schools that I visited in my District, even the whole idea of lunch period because you have all these schools collocating together, the kids are having lunch at 10:30. And the principals are telling me that they've got to tell the students to take a snack because they have—they'll get hungry before the school is over. And so we see more and more of those situations that our schools are overcrowded and there's not enough space.

And then also when we look at having science lab. I mean that is a must for all the schools. And then also having classrooms available for arts programs and other recreational, music program. And that, a lot of those are being used as regular classrooms.

So when you do the walk, to go and survey a school, to see if it's really has room or not to accommodate another school, a lot of time the real picture is not being shown. So how do you go about in terms of really meeting the needs of all of our schools and really looking at the long term view of really helping to reduce class in our public schools?

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Okay.

2 | Well I think you've asked me several questions.

Let me do my best to try to respond to you. First of all even by placing several schools in one school building, several school organizations, we

are using the original capacity of the school.

Now not all of our buildings have the best cafeterias in the world.

I mean there was a day when schools were built really without kitchens and without significant cafeterias. And we are still using those buildings. So the question about the hours, and I do know it exists across the City in many places, we need to work with the building councils, with the principals in the schools to see what we can do about programming. And frankly the picture probably will never be perfect but that doesn't mean we should stop trying.

With science labs, I think, stop me if I say something wrong here, but I think between the last Capital Plan and this plan all high schools now have a science lab and we are on our way to assure that all middle schools will have a science lab. Remember we became very concerned about that when we crafted the last plan because

2.0

2.3

we had all the new Regent's requirements coming
in. And we said how can we ask kids to take
science exam if they don't have science labs. So
we've made a lot of effort in those areas. Was
there something else?

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Well in the science labs, I've seen the difference between a real science lab and just a room with maybe a sink and not a full science lab.

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Um-hum.

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: So how are you working towards making sure that they have a real full equipped science lab for the high school?

MR. JEFF SHEAR: Well I think for...
any specifics; we'll need to work together with
you on any specific schools. But in general the
middle school labs are considered to be
demonstration labs and those are the rooms that
have the sink and the table at the front of the
room. And that is aligned with the instructional
curriculum for middle school grades. And the high
school science labs are the ones that have the
separate tables for the students to do work at and

2.0

2.3

2 experiments and so forth.

So that is the distinction that we make. And what we have done and are doing is we're spending close to half a billion dollars, over \$400 million in ensuring that every middle school and high school building has the appropriate labs and the schools have access to it.

Again if you're aware of a situation where there is a lab and there isn't access for whatever reason, we're happy to work with you on that.

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: But is that funding coming out of DOE?

MR. SHEAR: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: And so you're not asking Council Members because that's what the schools are asking us. To help. But it should be coming out of a DOE budget to...

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Yes it should although we always happily accept any funds you want to send our way. You know, if a school is asking you for money, we probably should sit down and talk about it because either we have

16

17

18

19

2.3

24

money in the plan to do it and so that's good and
we just need to make sure that the principal knows
it or perhaps the principal wants something a
little richer than what we can afford and then
it's up to you to kind of see if you want to fund
that.

8 COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: No but I
9 would love to sit down with you--

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:

11 [Interposing] Okay.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: --and make

13 sure that the budget is coming up from DOE--

14 DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:

15 [Interposing] Of course.

commitment to science lab in every middle school and high school then we need to get--

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:

20 [Interposing] Absolutely.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: --get that in 22 the schools.

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: We should talk about that.

25 COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Thank you.

2	But my other question was the class size. That
3	there are, you know, targets that we want
4	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:
5	[Interposing] Um-hum.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN:meet and
7	right now, we're not meeting those targets for
8	reducing our class size.
9	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: We're
10	working very, very hard at that. The numberswe
11	did go over the numbers, the current, actual
12	averages throughout the City. They are going up.
13	We are not happy about that. But we are living in
14	very difficult times. And of course we are very
15	concerned about the State 'cause we are very
16	dependent on the State money. And we're waiting
17	to see what's going to happen.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: All right.
19	Thank you.
20	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Deputy
21	Chancellor, I think in response to Council Member
22	Chin's question as far as you responded about
23	science labs
24	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:
25	[Interposing] Um-hum.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: [Interposing]

25

			-	
You're	anina	+ ~	7000 170	that
I IOU LE	GOTIIG	LU	TEPOTAE	ullat.

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Yes.

4 CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Okay. That's

5 good. I want to turn to questions that we--about

6 class size goals, if you don't mind.

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Um-hum.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Were you able to meet the following average class size goals set forth in the 5-year class size reduction plan? If not, why not? So for example, for Fiscal Year '08, 1, grades K to 8 was 20.5 I'm sorry, K to 3 was 20.5. Grades K to 4--4 to 8 was 24.3, and grades 9 to 12 was 23.9.

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Um-hum.

And for grades 9 to 12, the '08

Question is whether or not for Fiscal '08 were you able to meet those class size reduction plan, reduction goals according to your plan. And of course then my question is for the next fiscal year which is Fiscal Year '09, grades K to 3 went down from '08 from 20.5, the plan was 20.1. And grades 4 to 8 in '08 it was supposed to go down from 24.3 to 23.3, in essence 1 full student.

2	plan was 23.9; it was supposed to go down to 23.2.
3	So I ask you if you can give some details as to
4	did you meet your 5-year class size reduction plan
5	for '08 in grades K to 3, 4 to 8, and 9 to 12.
6	And did you reach it for Fiscal
7	Year '09 in grades K to 3, 4 to 8, and 9 to 12 as
8	per the numbers from your 5-year plan?
9	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Okay.
10	We're in litigation on this. I'm going to be a
11	little careful. But I have numbers here for
12	School Year '10. And those numbers are published
13	by grade.
14	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: School year
15	'10, you mean beginning September '09?
16	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Yes.
17	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: To June
18	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:
19	[Interposing] No this year.
20	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: I'm sorry,
21	whenone second. I've got to back up here. You
22	said for School Year '10.
23	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Yes.
24	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: School Year
25	'10 began when, September

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: This

year. And that is regrettable. So we are not

24

25

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: None of us would be.

24

25

1	COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION 87
2	Okay.
3	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: So
4	Kindergarten is 21.9.
5	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Okay.
6	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Grade 1
7	is 22.2.
8	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Okay.
9	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Grade 2
10	is 22.2.
11	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Same as Grade
12	1. Right?
13	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Yes.
14	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Okay go
15	ahead.
16	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Grade 3
17	is 22.5.
18	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Okay.
19	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Grade 4
20	is 24.4.
21	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: 24.4
22	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Grade 5
23	is 24.9.
24	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: 24.9.
25	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Grade 6

1	COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION 88
2	is 26.
3	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: 26.
4	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: And Grade
5	7 is 26.9.
6	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: 26.9.
7	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: And Grade
8	8 is 27.7. These are the averages in the City.
9	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: And do you
10	have other stats as far as the high schools?
11	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: I do not
12	have the high schools with me. I'll have to get
13	that for you.
14	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Can you
15	provide, if you don't mind Deputy Chancellor, the
16	remaining grade, 9 through 12
17	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:
18	[Interposing] Certainly.
19	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: And also in
20	my question I had asked you for Fiscal Year '08,
21	you know, those grades and Fiscal '09. Now your
22	numbers are based on what? The registers of
23	October 31 st
24	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:
25	[Interposing] Yes.

2	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON:I'm talking
3	about the old ones, not the current ones you just
4	gave me. I'm talking about '08 and '09.
5	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: You have
6	the '08 and '09 before you. I do not have them
7	before me.
8	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: No, no. I
9	don't have them in front of me. I'm sorry
LO	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:
11	[Interposing] Oh.
L2	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON:I had asked
L3	you whether you, the Department of Education, had
L4	met the goals that you said that you were going to
15	meet. So you have those numbers in your shop
L6	somewhere I guess.
L7	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:
18	Certainly.
19	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Okay. My
20	question is, is that based on the October $31^{\rm st}$,
21	registers, the '08 and '09, or is it based on
22	what?
23	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: The '08-
24	'09 numbers would have been based on the October
25	'08 register.

25 [Interposing] Um-hum.

2.0

2.3

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON:49%, said
that their class sizes were too large to provide a
quality education and that the utilization rate as
reported in the Blue Book was inaccurate. How
did, if at all, the Department of Education
respond to this and what, if any, corrective
action was taken?

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: I think we did issue some kind of formal response. Do you remember? This was a while back. Anyway, as I recall, we, of course, had some concerns about the scientific nature of this survey. Certainly I think almost all of our principals would like more space and would that we could give it to them.

But I don't think we can really accept the findings of that study because I don't think we felt it was really grounded.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Okay. Well then I guess my question is, you know, in your conclusion that you can't accept the findings of this study because it was not maybe grounded, did the Department of Education request to meet with Emily Horowitz and Leonie Haimson to discuss this in detail in order to say, hey, well how did you

methodology and this is what we disagree with from a, I mean from a real point of view.

Not to just say that we disagree with their methodology. We have our own way of calculating. Especially when principals, that's one thing and I agree with you, everybody wants more space. But one thing is wanting more space and another thing is principals clearly stating that the Blue Book was inaccurate. That's a different story. So--

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:

[Interposing] Um-hum.

respond to the first part of my question was whether or not any one in your Department requested to sit down with them to discuss this in order to determine their methodology and whether or not the conclusion that you just gave that you don't accept it as being accurate has any, in fact, basis for truth.

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: To the best of my knowledge no one did. I'd certainly be happy to sit with them if they would like. Nor

2.0

2.3

2	did they reach out to us before they undertook
3	their study to try to determine what the best
4	method might be. Having said that though, the
5	Blue Book is based totally on data collected
6	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: [Interposing]
7	From the principals.
8	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:from
9	the principals.
10	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: I know. And
11	that's why I'm asking you
12	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:

[Interposing] So.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: --when the principals--and I heard you and I've heard you say that many times over. But when 55% of them say that the information is inaccurate, if I'm in charge, something's wrong here because if I'm saying to the Oversight Committee on Education, I'm saying to everyone else, that the principals, the Blue Book is based on information I get from the principals and then in an independent survey or analysis with documentation, 55--50% of the principals are saying that the information contained in that book is inaccurate, something's

representative?

1	COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION 94
2	wrong here. And I would think that you would want
3	to find out, to get to the bottom of it.
4	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Well one
5	thing we do is we take the data submitted to us
6	from the principals and we do audits. We do
7	random audits. We go out
8	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: [Interposing]
9	I remember you said that before.
10	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:and we
11	check. Obviously the reason we ask the principals
12	to do it is we don't have the wherewithal to go
13	out and actually survey every single school. And
14	it's the principal who really is the most
15	knowledgeable about how her school is being used.
16	But we do audit on a random basis so we have some
17	confidence that the numbers are correct.
18	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Well are the
19	principals the most knowledgeable individual that-
20	-or, you know, because the principals they go
21	around by themselves or they go around with a
22	parent leader. Do they go around with the
23	custodian? Do they go around with the UFT

25 DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: That's up

23

24

25

2	that the Blue Book and reported that some of these
3	
3	little rooms that was being used, they were so
4	small, they were being used, when I walked by one
5	of the rooms, a student was in there rehearsing
6	with a tutor as far as a musical instrument. And
7	that had been used in the utilization and capacity
8	of the school building which was should not have
9	happened. So.
10	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: I will
11	let Liz answer this. It sounds like it's a
12	building that we wouldn't have even counted.
13	MS. BERGIN: No. Any rooms that
14	are less than 240 square feet we wouldn't count in
15	the capacity calculation. So for us it doesn't
16	exist. And if the school
17	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: [Interposing]
18	Well
19	MS. BERGIN:uses it they can use
20	to use it but it wouldn't add to the capacity of
21	the building. And in many cases they do use

smaller, smaller rooms for pull out sessions or

things but they are not counted in our capacity.

you say that earlier... I forgot your name again.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Well I heard

2.0

MS. BERGIN: It's Liz.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Liz, I heard you say that earlier And I wrote it down. That any room larger than 240 square feet--smaller than 240 square feet isn't counted as a room and not counted--

MS. BERGIN: [Interposing] For capacity at all.

.0 CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: --for

12 MS. BERGIN: No.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: So well something's wrong here. And for, in my opinion, for you to allow a report to come out that I sanctioned and helped fund by Class Size Matters and Emily Horowitz and not formally determine where did you get this from, this information is wrong, and to issue a formal statement with some facts and information 'cause maybe now I'm going to ask them is I'm going to try to get--I'm going to ask them, I want--give me some lists of some specific schools where the information is wrong. And I'm going to send it to you.

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Fine.

1	COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION 98
2	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Because quite
3	frankly
4	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Well look
5	at it.
6	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Let me just
7	say this to you.
8	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Sure.
9	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Who do I
10	believe? I believe them. And, you know, you may
11	not like that but based on everything that I know,
12	I believe them
13	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:
14	[Interposing] I
15	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON:because I
16	say that based on certain information from a
17	historical perspective. When the 2004-2009 5-year
18	Capital Plan, I was told by the Department of
19	Education, maybe even by you specifically or your
20	representatives, that District 6 would not be
21	overcrowded. That District 6 all of the cluster
22	rooms would be put back as they were.
23	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Um-hum.
24	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: All of the
25	transportable would be gone. And that the class

2	size reduction of K to 3 at that time you were
3	only talking about K to 3 at that time, would be
4	in place. Well all the transportables are not
5	gone. And the Kindergarten classes are not 20 or
6	below. And people are fighting for space up
7	there, even though from 2002 to now they say that
8	the number of students in District 6 has
9	decreased
10	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:
11	[Interposing] Yes.
12	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON:from
13	27,000, 28,000 to 21,500. You know. It's not
14	what DOE said would happen. So
15	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:
16	[Interposing] I
17	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON:in essence
18	I did not believe it then and I don't believe it
19	now.
20	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: I take no
21	umbrage at your not believing me. I'm only
22	interested in the facts. So let's sit down. You
23	pick a few of those schools
24	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: [Interposing]
25	Okay.

1	COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION 100
2	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:and
3	we'll sit down and we'll go through it. And one
4	of us will be right.
5	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Well that's
6	good. I know you agree with the fact that all of
7	the transportable are not gone in District 6.
8	Right?
9	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Yes I do.
10	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: And I know
11	you agree with the fact that all of the K to 3
12	grades in District 6 are not 20 or below.
13	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Yes I do.
14	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Okay
15	[chuckling]. Okay.
16	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: How much
17	we agree on
18	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: [Interposing]
19	[Laughing]. Let me go to the next question then.
20	But I am going to follow up with that
21	specifically
22	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:
0.0	[Total and Cook The Land Cook The Lines

[Interposing] Good, I look forward to that. 23

24 CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: --I'm going 25 to get it to you Deputy Chancellor.

2.0

2	DEPUTY	CHANCELLOR	GRIMM:	Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Why doesn't the Blue Book report on the number of cluster rooms in buildings that house middle schools? Or do they?

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: [Off mic]
They don't have them do they, it's just middle
schools?

MS. BERGIN: The cluster room

functionality was really developed for elementary
schools because generally they—the students in
elementary schools don't travel between classes.

For high schools we developed a different—for
middle schools and high schools we developed a
different model which was the determination of a
classroom being a general classroom or a specialty
classroom. And then assigning a program
utilization for that whether it's 7 periods out of
the day for general classrooms or whether we were
working with 5 out of 8 periods a day for
specials. So the cluster nomenclature really is
unique to the elementary school level.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Is that K to

6? Or whatever--

2.0

2.3

2	have any numbers as to how many schools,
3	elementary, middle and high schools lack gyms,
4	libraries or science labs?

5 DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: We 6 certainly do not have it with us--

7 CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: [Interposing]
8 Okay.

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: --I
certainly think most of those data we can provide
you. I would like to say a few things. First of
all every schools is, you know, built with a
library. And so it is rare that a library is
converted. And if a principal wants to do it we
really work very closely with him to try to
discourage that. I've already said that with
regard to science labs we've undertaken a lot of
work and made a major commitment to make sure
schools have science labs.

Not all schools have gyms. I mean, you know, even in the last plan in our efforts to build seats, we leased buildings and we went into unusual spaces and we weren't able to build that tremendous footprint that everybody thinks of as a school with a big cafeteria and a big auditorium.

2	But we have tried to be as resourceful as we can
3	in terms of wellness rooms or fitness rooms so
4	that all children have an opportunity.
5	But let us get the data. It's not-
6	-we do not have everything in every school. We
7	know that. But we're happy to share that with
8	you. Because Deputy Chancellor, you know, while I
9	appreciate that you get us this information I
10	think that yesterday, this question was shared
11	with your staff and I don't know if it was 3:00
12	o'clock in the afternoon, 4:00 or 5:00 o'clock but
13	quite frankly we did share the question.
14	So I mean we didn't think that
15	considering that this would be a difficult
16	question to answer knowing that the DOE and SCA
17	you keepyou should know this information. You
18	should have it in some sort of database in order
19	to determine, you know, how many schools are
20	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:
21	[Interposing] Um-hum.
22	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON:lacking
23	gymnasiums and what have you.
24	[Pause]

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Yes. I

2.0

2.3

2	apologize and we will provide it to you as soon as
3	we can.
4	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Deputy
5	Chancellor would the Department of Education
6	[off mic] I'm sorry. Let me turn to my colleague
7	Danny Dromm from Queens. Council Member Dromm.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Thank you

Chair Jackson again. I just want to follow up a little bit on what you were saying also in terms of the numbers of the rooms that are not being used for their original purpose like gyms, cluster rooms, libraries, etcetera.

In your count or your assessment of that can you also include utilization of those gyms? Because here's a problem that I've seen occur.

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Um-hum.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Schools have a gym but only half of the classes in the school can use that gym because there's just so many other classes that they can't all possibly use that. There's only so many periods in a week. Is there a way that you could measure that so that whereas there's a gym, not every student in the

in terms of getting an accurate count of the

25

1	\cap	Q
_	v	ン

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: On another

25

1	COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION 11
2	issue in terms of enrollment, is it true that
3	enrollment rose by about 14,000 this year
4	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:
5	[Interposing] Yes.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM:and we
7	have been told in the past that it wouldn't exceed
8	that number until 2016. So the numbers seem to be
9	off there. Do you have a reason or explanation
10	for that?
11	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Well a
12	couple of things happened last year and this is
13	the reason why we do this amendment every year
14	because projections are projections. And we want
15	to make sure we're monitoring it. It's one of the
16	reasons we added 5,000 seats, you know, because we
17	saw some changes. But you may have more exact
18	number than I but a large piece of that 14,000 was
19	because of a change in policy in terms of 5-year
20	olds coming into the public school system instead
21	of staying with ACS.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Was it even
23	3,000 though?
24	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Do you

remember what that was? 3,000 or 4,000, yes.

involved in doing our projections now. And we're

those numbers to be so critical, crucial to the

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: I just find

going to see what this year looks like.

22

23

24

25

2	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: In Queens as
3	well where they were going to put in a school for
4	458 seats, yet the housing complex was going to
5	house 5,500 new families. And let's just say
6	hypothetically that even if the elementary school
7	could absorb the number of childrenI don't think
8	that's even possible with just 458 seats,
9	approximately, there was no provision made in
LO	terms of where those children would go for junior
L1	high or high school.
L2	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Um-hum.
L3	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: So
L4	eventually they would all be pushed into either
L5	Flushing High School or surrounding junior high.
L6	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Um-hum.
L7	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: In those
18	schools and I think we also need to take into
L9	account these developments that are going up
20	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:
21	[Interposing] We do. Absolutely.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM:and how do
23	you account for that?
24	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: We do.
25	We take our demographic studies and then we

2	overlayI mean we work with several City agencies
3	in terms of housing starts and projections that
4	City Planning is making. We're constantly
5	factoring that in. And frankly we have
6	conversations with people such as the Council
7	Members who are sometimes really close to what's
8	happening in terms of communities and we factor
9	that in too.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: And now in
11	terms of Kindergarten enrollment for next year.
12	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Um-hum.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: I hear that
14	it's about up 15% thanor, excuse me, that 15%
15	are on a waiting list at this point. Is that
16	true?
17	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: We have a
18	waiting list. We have a waiting list every year

waiting list. We have a waiting list every year actually that at least since we've been monitoring it centrally. And we are working on that list.

We have identified the areas where the lists exist; District 3 for example is certainly one of them. We're opening a new school in that District. And we anticipate that every child will have a seat come September. What we're trying

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Have you got those data?

24

25

2	MR. SHEAR: Well I've got… I only
3	have some of the data. I guess first I would say,
4	acknowledge as the Deputy Chancellor has that yes
5	there are wait lists citywide. This is as of
6	April 15 th ; the zone number of children on wait
7	lists for their zoned elementary school is
8	slightly less than 1,500. So that we have 60,000,
9	65,000 Kindergartners so it's a much smaller
10	percentage than 15%.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: However in
12	that number that you're talking about it's for
13	their zone school.
14	MR. SHEAR: Um-hum.
14 15	MR. SHEAR: Um-hum. COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: You're not
15	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: You're not
15 16	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: You're not taking into account children who are bussed to
15 16 17	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: You're not taking into account children who are bussed to schools in another area of the District?
15 16 17 18	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: You're not taking into account children who are bussed to schools in another area of the District? MR. SHEAR: If they are bussed away
15 16 17 18 19	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: You're not taking into account children who are bussed to schools in another area of the District? MR. SHEAR: If they are bussed away from their zoned school, we are taking that into
15 16 17 18 19 20	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: You're not taking into account children who are bussed to schools in another area of the District? MR. SHEAR: If they are bussed away from their zoned school, we are taking that into account.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: You're not taking into account children who are bussed to schools in another area of the District? MR. SHEAR: If they are bussed away from their zoned school, we are taking that into account. COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: That's part
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: You're not taking into account children who are bussed to schools in another area of the District? MR. SHEAR: If they are bussed away from their zoned school, we are taking that into account. COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: That's part of the number that you have there?

It--

2.0

2.3

2	MR.	SHEAR:

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM:

[Interposing] They're not counted as accommodated in other words. Children who get bussed to another?

MR. SHEAR: We are going through a process and the first step of the process is to have parents register or pre-register their children at their locally zoned school. And we have just done the first iteration to see how many of those can be accommodated at this school. And we've created wait lists totaling slightly less than 1,500 children.

So at this point we are not making alternate offers. We are in the process of seeing whether those schools can accept more children or in the case, for example, in District 3 as the Deputy Chancellor mentioned, we're opening a new school there, PS 452, and that new school has not yet made offers. And we also will be making offers for gifted and talented slots that are available. So we are—

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM:

[Interposing] And those gifted and talented go to

_	COMMITTIES ON EDUCATION 110
2	a Beacon school or an enrichment program? So
3	they're pulled out of the pool of regular
4	students.
5	MR. SHEAR: If the parents accept
6	that offer.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Um-hum.
8	MR. SHEAR: Then they would go to
9	another school or program and that would free up a
10	seat. So we're still in the middle of the process
11	though as of now it's slightly less than 1,500
12	where we're not bussing students to another zone.
13	And some of the crowding is in traditionally
14	crowded schools. And some of it represents new
15	schools. It's a mix of both. I think it's
16	heavily in the places that were crowded last year.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Is there any
18	way we could get those schools where that
19	overcrowding has occurred and the numbers are
20	going up and they have to be put on the waiting
21	list? We're just very curious to know why it
22	continues to occur in certain Districts in certain
23	schools.

I mean Chairman Jackson spoke about schools in his District. It's continuing to occur

2	in schools in my District despite having built
3	this new school, 280. And I think we're trying to
4	get to the bottom of why this continues to happen.
5	I mean I know people continue to move in but we
6	need to get more on top of that.
7	And I guess finally talking about
8	building new schools if I may; I understand that
9	some charter schools are being built in Harlem and
10	in Red Hook. I think District 15. And those are
11	areas that traditionally are under enrolled. Why
12	are you building charter schools in Districts that
13	are under enrolled when we need regular schools in
14	Districts that are overcrowded?
15	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Well I
16	believe in both of those situations thewe are
17	partnering with the charter school. And the
18	charter school has selected the area.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: And what do
20	you mean by partnering?
21	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: There are
22	funds in the Capital Plan that we dedicate to
23	these partnerships.

COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: So it's City capital dollars being used to build the physical

25

[Interposing] And create some competition for our public schools.

2	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: And this
3	goes back to a question that I asked the last time
4	when you were here I believe. If you are so
5	interested in this model of private dollars being
6	used in conjunction with City dollars, why isn't
7	that model followed for the regular public school
8	system?
9	Why can't you get a corporation to
LO	help build the public school? Let's take the
11	Willets Point development, in other words, and
12	when we're talking about development, we can talk
L3	about making sure that the developer is using
L4	private dollars to build more than just one
L5	elementary school.
L6	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Of
L7	course. I'm being informed that they are building
18	that school for us.
L9	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: I'm sorry?
20	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: They are
21	building that school for us.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Which one?
23	In Willets Point?
24	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Yes.
25	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Yes, one.

2	An elementary, no I think it's K to 8 was the
3	final resolve on that. But nevertheless it's just
4	not enough seats in that particular school to
5	service 5,500 families. And this is where we keep
6	falling short. Part
7	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:
8	[Interposing] I think that
9	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM:of that
10	was worked out but still it's not enough to meet
11	what I think is going to be the demand.
12	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Okay.
13	Well as I said we will be reviewing this with you
14	ever single year in terms of the demand. I think
15	it's a great step forward to get somebody to build
16	a school for us. And if you find any other
17	corporations who want to, send them my way because
18	we'll make a deal with them. [Chuckling].
19	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: Thank you.
20	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Thank
21	you.
22	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Thank you.
23	Lastly let me ask you, we have heard that in many
24	schools there is insufficient space for special
25	education services, considering the number of

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

actual children in the school requiring such
services. If you can explain how is this captured
and in what current formula.

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Mini

6 buildings?

7 CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: No, not mini.

We've heard in many schools--

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:

[Interposing] Oh many. Sorry.

MS. BERGIN: The Blue Book captures the information on the room use surveys for the specific either District special education rooms or the D 75, the citywide program. For the D 75 program, depending on how--what program is in those rooms, we calculate the capacity according to that, to the program we have. So if it's a 12 to 1 to 1, we would calculate the capacity accordingly. If it's a District special ed program, I believe the capacity is 12 although that is specified in the [skip in audio] though we do calculate specific capacities for the rooms that are [skip in audio] either for the citywide special education or the District special education.

2	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: What if I,
3	what if I or somebody else told you that students
4	with special needs are receiving services in
5	hallways and in closets in some schools even
6	though the school may be listed as being
7	underutilized in the Blue Book. Would that be
8	acceptable to you, the Department of Education?
9	MS. BERGIN: We would certainly
10	like to hear [skip in audio] and look into it.
11	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Okay. We'll
12	we're going to get you the citations.
13	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Good.
14	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Because we've
15	been told that some students are receiving
16	services in hallways and in closets where the
17	school may be listed as being underutilized. So
18	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:
19	[Interposing] Please share it with us because I
20	mean that isand as Liz says, we certainly want
21	to look at it. We would want to talk to the
22	principals and see what the programming situation
23	is there.
24	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: So let me
25	where shouldI mean just, let me branch off of

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

2	that: special, children with special needs, where							
3	should they be receiving their services? Should							
4	it be in a classroom? Whether or not it's the 12							
5	it be in a classroom? Whether or not it's the 12 to 1 or what have you. It should not be in a closet. We would agree with that? It should not be in a hallway? DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: I certainly agree with it in the way you're							
6	closet. We would agree with that? It should not							
7	be in a hallway?							
8	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: I							
9	certainly agree with it in the way you're							
10	presenting it							
11	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: [Interposing]							
12	Right.							
13	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM:I mean							
14	what is a closet. If we're talking about a very							
15	small space that is adequate for one therapist and							
16	one child, it might be okay, I don't know. If							

one child, it might be okay, I don't know. somebody is in a stairwell, no, that's not okay. So we would like to hear where people think this is happening and we'll look at it.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: So if it was in like a nice sized closet that was--and that at a certain point in time was converted to sort of like a specialty or tutor room where one on one or maybe two on two could happen, that would be appropriate then.

you know the message that that's delivering to our There's no air in there. There's no window in there. You can barely fit a table in That is just unacceptable and I'm sorry. there. I'm beginning to get angry too.

21

22

2.3

24

25

DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Well as I said to the Chair, when someone says is it okay to

2	have a child getting services in a closet, I have						
3	to respond no. But I want to see the situations.						
4	If it's a room that's been adequatelya small						
5	room that's been adequately converted, I'm okay.						
6	But I want to see the room.						
7	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM: But I'm						
8	telling you they're closets.						
9	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: I want						
10	COUNCIL MEMBER DROMM:						
11	[Interposing] With no window. It's where they						
12	stored tools. Okay. I'm telling you that this is						
13	happening in many of the schools in my District.						
14	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Okay. I						
15	urge you to share with the Chair these places and						
16	we will commit to you that we will take a look at						
17	them.						
18	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Mr.						
19	Chairman.						
20	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Yes, Council						
21	Member Ignizio from Staten Island.						
22	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Yeah if I						
23	may somewhat defend the DOE; I'll be critical when						
24	it's warranted and I'll, you know, be not when						
25	it's not. What occurs in some areas in my						

District that I've been made aware of is large book rooms, the size of almost a quarter if you will of this area, which is no longer used for storage, which the racks have been taken out and they've, you know, painted or made it an area where you can give instruction where it is a one on one, more quiet setting.

Perhaps in cases like that is what
-if I'm not putting words in your mouth, it is

maybe appropriate to have a more private one on

one environment whereby you can do the

instruction. I just think that to give, you know,

an example of the other side of the coin which has

occurred where sometimes that is appropriate and

sometimes that is a space which has been

retrofitted.

It was previously known as a book room or a closet and is no longer being utilized as such, perhaps services can be provided in an area like that. I think that's what's being said. I agree with you if you say kids should be learning--no. Of course not.

If it's a closet like you and I have at home although my wife has a very large

2.0

2.3

closet but that I have at home, no, certainly it's
not appropriate. But in an area that I'm
discussing which is a couple of hundred square
feet for a book room, perhaps to not utilize that
space and to utilize it to better serve the needs
of a child, I'd be happy to at least listen to
that.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Thank you.

Deputy Chancellor let me thank you and your staff for coming in and answering our questions. We look forward to the follow-up. We hope that the Department of Education will change their mind about Intro 155.

I think the more information that we have, the more transparent we are, the more we are in agreement as to the utilization and capacity, the clearer it is for a person to understand what you're saying to be the truth, the better off we will be overall.

I think clearly, not relating to DOE, but when the City of New York can spend almost \$750 million on a time and attendance computerized system, I would think that the Department of Education which is more than one-

2	third of the entire City's budget would want to						
3	know exactly how ever space in the system is being						
4	utilized in order to ensure that our children						
5	receive the best education under the conditions of						
6	small class size, of qualified teacher in the						
7	classroom, and all of the materials that they need						
8	in order to receive that enriched education.						
9	I know you would agree with that.						
10	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: We look						
11	forward to those conversations.						
12	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Thank you						
13	very much.						
14	DEPUTY CHANCELLOR GRIMM: Thank						
15	you.						
16	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Okay. For						
17	the record, we received testimony for the Council						
18	of Supervisors and Administrators. For the						
19	record, we received testimony [off mic] this is						
20	the CSA is in support of Intro number 155.						
21	Advocates for Children [off mic] in support of the						
22	Transformation Zone for Low Performing Schools.						
23	For the record, from Lenore Brown						
24	in support of Resolution of 156 and Resolution 157						
25	on the School Transformation Zone and Expanded						

1	COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION 131							
2	Learning Time and also to change the Blue Book.							
3	For the record, testimony of							
4	Victoria Valencia in support of Resolution 156 and							
5	157.							
6	For the record, a [off mic] Cynthia							
7	Williams, a Parent Leader in the New York City							
8	Coalition for Educational Justice and a mom of six							
9	who all attend public schools, in support of							
10	Resolutions 156 and 157.							
11	For the record, from Julia Boyd, a							
12	parent from Boys and Girls High School in							
13	Brooklyn, [off mic] in support of the							
14	Transformation Zone.							
15	For the record, from Shareen							
16	Carrington, a PA President at Maxwell High School,							
17	in support of the creation of the School							
18	Transformation Zone for Low Performing Schools.							
19	For the record, from Kenneth Moore,							
20	PA President from Robison High School, in support							
21	of creating a School Transformation Zone.							
22	For the record from Latoya Anthony,							
23	PA Member from Sheep's Head Bay High School in							
24	Brooklyn, in support of the expansion of the							
25	school days for students and School Transformation							

2.0

2.3

_
l Zone.

For the record, [off mic] testimony						
from Esperanza Vasquez, a parent of a New						
Settlement Department in the Coalition for						
Education Justice, in support of Resolutions 156						
and 157.						

With that we'd like to hear from

George Sweeting the Assistant Director for the New

York City Independent Budget Office and from Erin

McGill, representative of Manhattan Borough

President Scott Stringer.

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Mr. Sweeting, would you please state your name and title and you may begin your testimony.

MR. GEORGE SWEETING: Good

afternoon. I'm George Sweeting, Deputy Director

of the New York City Independent Budget Office.

And I'm joined here this afternoon by Sarita

Subramanian who is our Education Capital Analyst.

Good afternoon Chairman Jackson,
members of the Committee. Thank you for the
opportunity to testify about Intro 155 which would
overhaul the Department of Education's enrollment

capacity utilization report which is often
referred to as the ECU Report and for those of us
with long histories in this field, sometimes as
the Blue Book in honor of the cover on the old
hardcopy version.

In my testimony I'll discuss some benefits that would result from the enactment of the Intro but also mention some concerns and some suggestions for additional items to consider for the enhanced report. These include more information on the type of school, the physical capacity of school buildings and the specific grades served in a school.

Requiring the DOE to provide timely and scheduled releases of the annual Blue Book makes sense. Although in recent years the DOE has done a better job in releasing the report early in the subsequent school year. For example the report for 2008-2009 school year was released in September 2009. There have been times when the report was delayed, particularly in years when a new 5-year Education Capital Plan was under development. Legislating an annual publication date should avoid such problems in the future.

fall.

In addition to ensuring that

capacity and enrollment data are available when

reviewing the 5-year Capital Plan and the

subsequent annual amendments, having this

information routinely available for guides and

school choice websites helps to inform families'

school application decisions for the following

Intro 155's goal of improving the quantity and quality of the information included in the annual ECU report is also important.

Council Members and their staff along with IBO and other policy researchers routinely encounter limitations and inconsistencies in the data when using trying to use the Blue Book. Having a more comprehensive report would make it easier to analyze where school overcrowding is a problem and to help identify possible solutions.

However our review of Intro 155
found some potential problems and shortcomings in
the proposal which the Council might want to
consider as the Intro moves through the
legislative process. The core of Intro 155 is a
requirement that DOE report on space that had not

originally been used to house regular classrooms such as cluster rooms, specialty rooms, gymnasiums, auditoriums, libraries and lunchrooms that have been converted to classroom use.

The Intro would also require the DOE to provide detailed data on many other converted school spaces that might not be as pertinent to understanding capacity, including teacher lounges, locker rooms, rooms to provide special education related services and occupational or physical therapy rooms. Although it is generally better to have more detail to understand how programming at the school affects the use of school space, if the Blue Book becomes bogged down with too much detail it may be less useful.

Having noted the potential for data overload we nevertheless have suggestions for additional data items to consider adding to the report that IBO believes would enhance understanding of school and building capacity.

The existing report's capacity measures are heavily dependent on how a school is programmed.

Currently when looking at year to year changes in

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

capacity at school organizations, some of the observed changes are actually the result of changes in programming from one year to the next rather than changes in physical capacity.

For example, the Blue Book measure of capacity in an elementary school would increase from one year to the next if the principal had more fourth grade classes and fewer Kindergarten classes than the year before. Because the assumed class size for Kindergarten classrooms is 20 students whereas the assumed class size for fourth grade classrooms is 28 students, the Blue Book capacity measure would show an increase in capacity from the previous year although the number of classrooms did not change. To deal with this problem IBO suggests requiring an additional measure of capacity that is only dependent on the physical space available, such as the total number of classrooms.

When high schools utilize programming that is not typical such as longer school days or multiple sessions, it can also provide a misleading measure of capacity. The capacity measure does not take this programming

2.0

2.3

into account because it assumes the same level of efficient programming whereby regular classrooms are used 7 out of 8 periods a day or 87.5% of the time. Therefore the utilization rate may well be over 100% even though not all students are attending school at the same time.

Contrasting these schools with other schools that have similar utilization rates but no programmatic changes to remedy the overcrowding can result in an apples to oranges comparison. To avoid such confusion it would be helpful if the Blue book identified schools that use an alternative schedule for programming classes.

In addition the Blue Book currently identifies the building level but it would be useful to also know the organization or school level. Organization level is important in cases where organizations are placed in buildings whose level differs from its own level, such as when an elementary school is placed in a middle school building.

Furthermore with the recent trend away from the more traditional DOE nomenclature

for schools, it is much more difficult to separate schools by school type and grades provided. Since the Blue Book calculates capacity differently for schools depending on which grades they serve, it would useful to know the actual roster of grades and number of classrooms assigned to each grade for each school. At a minimum a more detailed school level identifier could be used such as the following: primary school; middle school; primary middle school combinations; high school; and middle school high school combinations.

charter schools collocated in DOE buildings clearly identified in the report. The charters should have an appropriate indicator of their status when reporting the capacity measures, the count of classrooms as suggested by IBO and when identifying which school organizations have access to gymnasium, lunchrooms and other facilities when they share a building.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify. And I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Thank you.

Let's	hear	from	the	Borough	President	' s
renres	70n+ 0+	- 1 110				

4 MS. ERIN MCGILL: Good afternoon.

My name is Erin McGill. I'm the Education Policy
Analyst at the Manhattan Borough President's
Office and will be delivering testimony on Borough
President Stringer's behalf today.

Good afternoon Chair Jackson and members of the Education Committee. Thank you for holding this important hearing on the Blue Book.

Two weeks ago I held a press conference to address the space crisis that some 43% of Manhattan's elementary and middle schools face as a result of chaotic DOE space planning policy and practices.

Over the course of the past 2 years my office has released 3 reports on the flawed methodology used to project school enrollment which has led to severe overcrowding in the public schools.

During this time I've also convened war rooms bringing together parents, the DOE, elected officials and others to collaborate and resolve challenges associated with overcrowding and space planning issues. My office, other elected officials, advocates, and school

2.0

2.3

communities have called for reform of the Blue Book for many years now.

We have heard today a number of times reference to the 2008 Class Size Matters studies in which half of all principals responded that the data that the DOE used to analyze utilization and capacity in their schools was inaccurate and underestimated overcrowding in their schools. Every week my office hears from parents whose children can no longer take a music class because the music room in their school has been converted into a classroom or have lost access to the science lab despite the fact that they must demonstrate proficiency in science to pass the State's Regent's test.

A fundamental problem with the

Department's estimation of space based on the Blue
Book is the inaccuracy that always seems to go in

one direction only. There exists a systemic bias
in favor of too little school space. Earlier this

month I sent a letter to Chancellor Klein

outlining a series of recommendations to improve

current DOE policies and practices that would curb

problems associated with overcrowding and

2.0

collocations.

My office found that 86 of the Borough's 199 elementary and middle schools face unnecessary challenges in providing students with a quality education because of the DOE's poor planning around overcrowding and collocation. A catalog of narratives we compiled detailing the broad range of challenges many school communities now face, evidence of a problem that we know is even more severe and widespread than we initially were able to capture. New school communities have reached out to my office subsequent to our releasing our findings to share their stories with us.

Poor planning based on flawed formulas and assumptions in the Blue Book and an utter failure to meaningfully engage and incorporate feedback from school communities around overcrowding and collocations have resulted in a heightened and unnecessary state of anxiety, confusion and chaos. At present the educational climate in New York City is largely and unnecessarily defined by uncertainty. Amending the Blue Book is a necessary and long overdue step

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to fixing the DOE's planning process and ensuring that there are enough seats for students in our public schools.

I commend Chairman Jackson and the City Council for introducing legislation that will bring us much closer to an accurate Blue Book. Some of the most important components of this legislation include but are certainly not limited to the following: a recognition of the critical need to reduce class size; an account of all students learning in trailers and annexes which should be included in the DOE's calculation of a school's total enrollment; and an account of and remediation plans for a loss of spaces dedicated to art, music, science, special education, and physical and occupational therapy. Long term capacity issues should not be resolved by turning cluster rooms into classrooms.

A final thought is about the importance of community input which is resounding strongly now in the face of the Supreme Court's recent decision to overturn the DOE's closure of 19 schools. Judge Lobis sent a clear message that the DOE must do a better job of listening to and

2.0

incorporating community feedback.

appropriate time to consider Resolutions
introduced by Education Chair Robert Jackson and
which stemmed from important work by parents at
the Coalition for Educational Justice to help low
performing schools by expanding the school day and
year and creating a school transformation for
those schools that require increased supports to
effectively serve their students.

As it true in the larger picture of educational reform in New York City and beyond, successful changes will not occur in a vacuum and most likely to occur when community voices play a meaningful role in decision-making processes.

Working towards a more accurate and functional Blue Book requires that the DOE collaborate in a more meaningful way with the people who work and learn in buildings where space, where significant space concerns are a daily reality.

The Department's larger goal of closing the achievement gap is undeniably tied to its ability to create and foster stable learning environments and provide all students with a well

rounded education.

3 CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Well Ms.

McGill and Mr. Sweeting, let me thank both of you for coming in. First Ms. McGill would you please communicate to Borough President Scott Stringer that we appreciate his leadership in doing these reports, in assigning you to this hearing to listen and to give his testimony.

And clearly in my opinion, even though he is my Borough President, it appears to me that he is the leader out of all of the five Borough Presidents in coming up with reports and trying to move forward in dealing with the overcrowdedness in our schools. And more specifically since the proposed 5-year Capital Plan does not include 1 seat in District 1, does not include 1 seat in District 3, does not include 1 seat in District 4, does not include 1 seat in District 4. So out of—it only includes seats in District 2. And as I said, District 2 needs seats.

So I agree with that determination.

But I totally disagree with the fact that the

Department of Education's 5-year Capital Plan does

2.0

not call for 1 additional seat, not even talking
about a school, in the rest of Manhattan. That is
insane. That is crazy. And in fact as I said if
I was in charge whoever came up with those
statistics should be fired. But I'm not in
charge. Not under Mayoral control. So let me
thank you for coming in representing our Borough
Dresident

And Mr. Sweeting on behalf of the City Council let me thank you for giving your opinion on behalf of the Independent Budget Office. And we would like to sit down with you to discuss some of the suggestions and thoughts that you and your staff had concerning Intro 155.

MR. SWEETING: I'd be happy to.

Very much. Thank you. And now we're going to hear from Leonie Haimson from Class Size Matters, Emily Horowitz from the Task Force on Overcrowding and Class Size Matters, David Bloomfield, from Brooklyn College, CUNY Graduate Center, the former president of the high school—are you still the president of the high school parent's association?

MR. DAVID BLOOMFIELD:

No, thank

2.0

2.3

god.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Okay, thank
god. And Doug Israel, the Center for Arts
Education. Doug, you're here? Come on Doug.

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Okay.

MS. LEONIE HAIMSON: Hello. My name is Leonie Haimson. I'm the Executive Director of Class Size Matters. Before I get to my testimony, as always, I'd like to respond to some of the things that have been said for the last few hours.

It's not exactly true they're not building any new seats in District 5. They are building new charter school seats with DOE money in District 5 for 2 charter school organizations. And despite what the Administration said, that they're getting a 25% subsidy for those seats from the charter school organizations, if they were building District seats, they would only be paying 50% because the State reimburses for District public schools and not charter schools which shows not only that they're willing to spend 50% more to build charter schools than District schools but

they are also willing to build them in areas which according to their own statistics the schools are currently underutilized.

And as to the issue of the science labs which we've heard a lot about, I know many schools that are losing their science labs faster than they're being built because of the overcrowding crisis and the collocations. In fact the American Sign Language school which has been promised to regain its science lab that it lost to the Quest to Learn School this year, has now been told that they will lose their science lab to the Clinton School which is moving in there. And that is not an unusual story. Every single day these collocations are causing schools to lose science labs.

So. I'm not going to go over all of this because some of it relates to our survey and Emily will go into more detail about our principals' survey. I just want to focus on the-thank you for the great attention you've given to this issue and the legislation on the books. We think it should have a couple of areas where it could be strengthened and I want to focus on those

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

areas.

First of all there is, right now, a school can have hundreds of students in an annex and in trailers and still be listed as underutilized. And that's because each of those annexes and trailers are considered to have their own separate capacity. What we would like the bill to do is not only report on how many students are in trailers but then assign those to the main building so that you can more readily see that those schools are over utilized. And all those kids also have tremendous impacts on the usage of the cafeteria, the gym and all that. So we really need to have those students assigned to the main building for the purposes of computing the utilization rate.

We also firmly believe that the turnaround document or the space assessment surveyor whatever you want to call it should not just be done by the principal in isolation but should be completed by the school leadership team in a walkthrough. And that the UFT chapter chair and the PA president and school leadership team should have to sign off on it as well.

This is done every year for the building condition assessment survey with the principal and the custodians and the SCA. And it's led to a much more detailed and effective way of dealing with school repairs. Space is just as important in our schools as school repairs. It needs to be done as a team and there needs to be a more thorough assessment done by the entire school community.

There needs to be a public appeals process. As you know over half of principals said that their utilization figures were incorrect and yet there was nothing they could do about it. We believe that there should be a public appeals process if the school community disagrees with the rating. It should go to the District leadership team and/or the CEC and that there should be some mediation of that and some discussion of why those figures are incorrect.

Right now the figure appears in the book. Nobody even knows whether the computation is done correctly because the formula is so arcane, no less whether the principal or other school administrator has entered into the survey

2.0

correctly as to what classroom space actually
a exists.

And finally we've been working for several years now and Emily will tell you more about that in our Manhattan Borough Task Force on School Overcrowding on trying to come up with a better school survey and formula. And though we've made some progress we still haven't really reached the end of this. And it's a very complicated issue, of course.

One of the problems with the formula which was not really touched on today is that the DOE assumes an average level of special ed kids in terms of the need for intervention rooms, not the actual number of special ed kids who need those services at each school level. So there has to be an adjustment for that.

There also has to be some way to require that sufficient cluster room and specialty rooms are built into the formula. Not just for elementary schools but also for middle school and high school. I wasn't really convinced by the answer of Liz Bergin. I don't think there's any allowance or requirement that middle schools and

high schools have any specialty or spaces at all in the formula. So you can be listed as underutilized and not have a science lab, not have an art room, not have a music room, not have a library. And that should not be allowed.

So finally we thank you very much for your attention. I'd like to make a couple of sentences just about the resolution on the Transformation Zone. I think it's a great concept. It certainly worked with Rudy Crew's Chancellor's Zone. However I think that the issue of class size should be more centrally emphasized in that Transformation Zone. Many if not all of our low performing schools have class sizes that are still way above the State average, way above what those students need.

And I've been told by teachers and others that simply extending the school day for kids who don't even show up for the classes that they're currently assigned to because they're so alienated and disengaged from the learning experience will not help those kids. You really need to transform the conditions of learning and that can only happen, they can only become

2.0

2.3

2	reengaged in that excitement of learning if you	L
3	provide them with smaller classes.	

So thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Well thank you. Next please, identify yourself and you may begin your testimony.

MS. EMILY HOROWITZ: Yes. My name is Emily Horowitz. And I'm a Professor of Sociology at St. Francis College and I'm also the Chair of the Manhattan Borough Task Force on Overcrowding Subcommittee to Reform the Blue Book. And I also want to deviate a little bit from my testimony. I'll hand it in to you. But I was really outraged by many of the comments made by Deputy Chancellor Grimm.

First of all she said, you know, she would love to meet with us. We never reached out to her. And that's why she didn't comment on our work. But actually publicly, many, many times I asked her to meet with me. I asked her to respond to my research and work. And in District 6 I was on the CEC and for 4 years we had hearings with her present where we presented evidence that District 6 was in fact overcrowded in spite of the

data in the Blue Book.

And we said can you respond to this. We gave her handouts. We gave her data. She said of course, I'll respond. I said can we have a deadline. She said within 4 weeks. Never received anything. So I think it's ironic and in very bad faith to say oh they never reached out to me. So I hope that she was—she's had a change of heart and she will meet with us to discuss these results.

She also said that our research is not grounded. I don't really know exactly what that means but it was grounded. It was grounded in her argument that well these are the tales from a few outraged principals and nutty parents and crazy activists. This isn't comprehensive. So we did a comprehensive survey of every single principal in the City. Half responded. We got very, very good data. This is totally grounded. This is not bad data. We didn't do fancy statistics. We simply reported quotes directly from principals. And we will give you a list of the principals that are willing to talk about their experiences.

And also finally about the closets, one of the members of the Committee said well, you know, a closet can be really nice. It can be a quarter of this room. At least in our research when we talk about therapy in closets, occupational therapy, speech therapy and quidance services in closets, we're reporting this only when we ask principals what are problems in your

I also wanted to just quote a couple of principals that we've interviewed. Specifically, one principal that we interviewed and we have tons and tons of evidence, obviously we don't have a lot of time, but just to give you one example, one principal that has a utilization rate this year of 67% that we interviewed in the past 4 weeks said that in this school that supposedly is 1/3 empty basically or with 1/3

extra room, kids are eating lunch in the

schools. And when they respond to that specific

closets that are not substandard they don't answer

question they say students are being taught in

closets that are substandard. When there are

the question that it's a problem. So it's not

2.0

auditorium.

There's a storage room that's used for dance movement classes and also meetings. The computer lab is in the process of being converted into a classroom. Occupational and physical therapy and speech therapy is actually conducted in the hallways. They don't even have closets in this school that the DOE says is at 67% capacity.

Another principal at a school at a 95% utilization rate, so that school is, you know, there's a little extra room. It's not overcrowded. They had a very bad situation where they received a technology grant worth millions of dollars. And they're running into big problems with their funder because they don't have a computer lab and they don't have technology. And the DOE says the school's fine. They don't need additional space. And this has to be factored into the legislation.

One point about the legislation that I want to make, there's many problems with this legislation but it's a very good step in the right direction. I hope that a committee is

formed with stakeholders to improve this

legislation that builds on the research done by

your office and your staff, people like Sarah

Margrave and Jan Atwell that have worked for years

trying to understand these issues and incorporates

these ideas.

But specifically I think the most important thing is that the survey results from the walkthroughs are posted on the internet. So if a parent or anyone at the school says hey this school—the DOE says it's at 67% capacity, let's go and look at the results. you don't need a 10,000 page report. You can still have a number for each school. You can still say this school is at 67% capacity.

However if you put all the results up you can see what each room is used for and people can see if there's errors. And if there's problems with the way things turn out. If there's a dance room in a closet it will show up in the survey results. So I think that's the most important thing that has to be added to the legislation. Thank you and I'll turn in much more that I had to say. Thank you.

2.0

2	CHAIRPERSON	JACKSON:	Next	please.
---	-------------	----------	------	---------

MR. BLOOMFIELD: Thank you. I kind of like the idea of the Blue Wiki instead of the Blue Book. My name is David Bloomfield. I'm a Professor of Education at the CUNY Graduate Center and at Brooklyn College where I head the Educational Leadership Program. And I am also a former president of the Citywide Council on High Schools.

As an educator and parent leader I want to express my support for Intro 155 and concentrate my remarks on Reso 157 to establish a School Transformation Zone to improve low performing schools and prevent school closings.

My support for the Transformation Zone is simple. It works. And wholesale closure of schools as recently practiced and evaluated in Chicago, doesn't.

In its 2004 report, <u>Virtual</u>

<u>District, Real Improvement</u>, the Institute for

Education and Social Policy then at New York

University concluded that the New York City

Chancellor's District upon which the current

proposal is based, showed significantly higher

2.0

2.3

fourth grade reading scores than a control group	р
of failing schools even after accounting for	
greater increases in resources, with reasoned	
speculation that the upward trend might have	
continued if not for elimination of the	
Chancellor's District by this Administration.	

In Miami Dade where Rudy Crew went after leaving New York City, his school improvement zones, similar to the Chancellor's District, raised student achievement in 39 of Manhattan's--I'm sorry, of Miami's most troubled schools. Even the Gates Foundation in its Turnaround Challenge report found that of all the strategies studied, including the New York Children's First Initiative had the greatest improvement in the Miami Improvement Zone.

In contrast the 2009 study, When

Schools Close, by the University of Chicago's

Consortium on Chicago School Research, shows that
a school closing strategy similar to Chancellor

Klein's showed little affect on academic
performance of displaced students.

The poor results of school closures have been confirmed by multiple studies in New

2.0

2.3

York including the New School report, <u>The New</u>
Marketplace, which detailed what it called
collateral damage of school closures on displaced
students especially those with disabilities and/or
limited English proficiency. And as researchers
Erin Palace and Jennifer Jennings have shown, the
new schools that replaced closed schools opened
with populations significantly more ready to
learn

The recent court decision in

Mulgrew v. Board of Education largely turned on
the City Department of Education's failure to
document either by negligence or intention, the
impact of closure on other schools, impacts that
would be avoided by a successful Transformation
Zone initiative.

In conclusion I urge you to pass

Reso 157. We need to reject the DOE's reliance on

empty if headline grabbing structural solutions

like wholesale school closings. A Transformation

Zone would not grab headlines, good teaching

rarely does. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Thank you. Next please.

2.0

2.3

2	MS. LENORE BROWN: Okay. Good
3	afternoon Chair Jackson and Council Members. My
4	name is Lenore Brown. I live in Cypress Hill
5	Brooklyn and I am a member of Cypress Hill
6	Advocate for Education and the New York Coalition
7	for Educational Justice. I am here today to
8	support Resolution 156 and 157. On the School
9	Transformation Zone and expanding learning time.
10	And also to change the Blue Book. Thank you
11	again.

These changes to the Blue Book law are very important to ensure a high quality education for all students. CEJ has fought for students at low performing schools to have full science labs as well as space for arts, music, gym and other enrichment classes. When the DOE inaccurately assess space they push too many students and too many schools into a building and students lose important services like these, like I just said.

This is happening in 302 which is my neighborhood school. And we really must put a stop to it. Schools--I get a little emotional about it because my son went there and my grandson

and they just came in overnight, not informing parents that, you know, we're going to put another school in this school. And this is going to happen in September so it's really like a done deal. And it really does affect the neighborhood.

Low performing schools have been left on their own for too long to struggle and fail. And we need a comprehensive initiative to work with them to build their capacity and raise achievement. Those are the schools that have negative impact on students and communities. Research has shows that as high need students are pushed from one overcrowded low performing school to another without the support to serve them it causes more and more schools to fail. And it's just ridiculous.

For example in 2004, 19 schools that the DOE is trying to close this year had a special education population of 7%. Today their special education population is 18%. And it's growing. And this is dangerous. It's horrible really. So it is many students needing extra support. It is no surprise that these schools are struggling. Instead of pushing these schools, we

should help them to improve.

There is a better way, however.

There are examples across the country and internationally of schools that have made huge increases in student achievement throughout.

Expanding school day and year for students, increased planning and professional development for teachers, rigorous enriched college and career preparation curriculum for all students, comprehensive integrated support services for students, parents and community included in decision-making. And that's a very important thing as well.

CEJ thinks we can resolve these problems by creating a School Transformation Zone led by an expert educator with experience with turning around schools. There is money to do this. 34 New York City schools will soon be receiving up to \$2 million from the State to either close down, convert into charters or make major reforms to turn themselves around. These schools could be part of the zone. And use this money to implement these reforms. The DOE also applied for Federal innovation funds, private

22

23

24

25

2	grants, and using the existing money to support
3	our schools in the zone.
4	The DOE is still findingthey're
5	finding money to support new initiatives. They
6	just announced that 81 schools will pilot
7	innovation strategies through the NYC-One Zone.
8	But of these 81 schools, only 13 low performing
9	schools, only 13. And only 1 is part of the 34
10	lowest achieving schools, only just 1. IS 302, my
11	neighborhood school has been very low performing
12	for many years. And 2 years ago it joined the
13	Middle School Initiative and the school has made
14	real, real progress. This shows that when schools
15	are well supported they can be turned about.
16	Please pass Resolution 156 and 157
17	and the law to change the Blue Book and thank you
18	very much for your support.
19	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Thank you.
20	Next please.

Next please.

MR. DOUG ISRAEL: [Off mic] Chairman Jackson and members of the Committee on Education... [On mic] On now? Thank you Chairman Jackson and members of the Committee on Education for the opportunity to testify. I'm Doug Israel,

2.0

Director of Research and Policy for the Center for Arts Education.

I'm going to hit on the highlights of my testimony. We're here in support of Introduction 155. Intro 155 is arts-friendly legislation. According to the Department of Education's Annual Arts in Schools Report the lack of available in-school art space was one of the top three challenges to implementing arts education in public schools. And regrettably there's evidence that this lack of dedicated arts space is growing.

According to the survey that was mentioned today conducted by Class Size Matters with Emily Horowitz and funded in part by the City Council, 25% of the principal reported losing art, music, dance, drama or foreign language space to general education classrooms during their tenure. And there are reports of the loss of cherished art spaces from schools across the City such as at PS 149 in Harlem where the school has had to sacrifice its music room to make space for two collocated schools. The school has an array of instruments including violins and keyboard and a

talented music teacher but it can no longer use
the instruments because there is no space to house
them or provide the instruction. The writing is
on the wall.

As in many ways this is the fate of arts education in public schools across the City.

Less space plus less money equals less access and less programming. Art spaces are vital to the mission of schools to provide students with quality instruction and they are often the lifeblood of schools across the City. These spaces need to be more thoroughly accounted for. They need to be protected, preserved and in many cases reclaimed and resurrected.

The True Book legislation being developed by the City Council represents a positive step to protect art spaces in public schools. Specifically the bill would require that schools actually provide detailed information on how cluster rooms are being used.

This would provide much needed transparency and give parents and decision-makers a better sense of the space needs of schools as well as the actual function of existing

2.0

2.3

classrooms. The lack of specificity that is inherent in the term cluster room does a disservice to the school and its students and makes those rooms more expendable as schools deal with overcrowding and collocation.

Reporting out the actual use,
whether it's an art room, a science room, or a
computer room is an important part of
transparency. And the second piece of it that
we're very encouraged by, it would require schools
to report on the number of rooms that have been
converted or repurposed and are no longer used for
their original function. This first-ever
reporting requirement will help capture critical
information about how schools use space and what
losses have occurred in the recent past due to
overcrowding or other factors.

Providing this detailed account of the loss of art spaces in public schools can help galvanize support for their protection and hopefully lead to the restoration of these spaces for their original intent where appropriate. We believe that these and other reporting requirements described in the bill will provide

greater transparency and can play a role in halting the loss of critical art spaces and have a positive impact on student learning in schools in all five Boroughs.

We're encouraged that attention is being paid to the importance of art space in public schools and we look forward to review of the final bill language. Thank you for your time and consideration of this testimony.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Well let me thank this panel for coming in and obviously we depend on all of you. When I say we, myself as the Chair of the Education Committee, the staff, all of the members of the City Council, because you are the ones that are, I guess, doing the tough work by staying on point of analyzing, responding, advocating on behalf of the children of New York City in the various fields in which you're doing.

So I thank all of you for coming in and especially you, Doug, for your support in trying to move the agenda. And obviously from historical perspective, you know, we've talked many times about art education and the need for

2.0

holistic education. And everyone up there knows how important that is so let me thank you for your leadership.

But also, and also Emily, you know, I think that I want to follow up to make sure that we communicate and Leonie, more specifically about schools where children are being taught in the hallways. I want to give them some actual citations. I want them to respond to it. I want them to sit down with you because they said that it was ungrounded and basically that the information that you have is not correct.

And the principals are saying, they're the ones who are responding. And as I said, you know, if you didn't believe it how come you didn't call them and say hey where did you get this information from. Because overall from a historical perspective I believe you guys rather than believe them.

So it's important to know that.

But, you know one thing? This struggle continues.

So. Let me thank all of you, David, and all of you for coming in. We have two more panels that I want to call up. But please continue to work with

2.0

2.3

2	us, communicate with us on trying to move Intro
3	155 and Resos 156 and 157 forward. Thank you very
4	much.

And next we're going to hear from the Reverend Joade Daur-Cardasis [phonetic] and Elliot Roseboro and Shino Tanikawa and Helen Rosenthal. Please come forward.

After this panel we have one additional panel. Okay. Okay so Reverend, why don't you begin please? Identify yourself, your title and you may begin your testimony.

REVEREND JOADE DAUR-CARDASIS: Good evening.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Good afternoon.

REVEREND DAUR-CARDASIS: Good
afternoon, going on evening. Thank you Chairman
Jackson and members of the Committee for holding
these hearings. I was--I'm not prepared with the
text of--because I wasn't sure if I was going to
stay for the hearing until somebody from the
Department of Ed, after I spoke outside said that
I might not want to stay for the hearing, it was
going to go on so long which just encouraged me to

2.0

stay.

I'm an Episcopal priest in the

Diocese of New York. I have a Parish in the

Bronx. And I am here today representing the Right

Reverend Mark Sisk who's the Diocesan Bishop as

well as the Right Reverend Catherine Roskam who is

Bishop Suffragan of the Episcopal Diocese of New

York.

I'm here because the Bishops and the Diocese have identified the need and taken the initiative to begin addressing the gaps in our children's educations through a program called All Our Children whereby parishes throughout the City are encouraged to partner with a local public school to provide after school arts, music and homework help to all students free of charge thanks to generous startup grants from Trinity Church, Wall Street. And our church has just begun working with them.

But I am also here as someone who has taught for many years exclusively in public schools. I taught everywhere from Scarsdale to Mt. Vernon High School and I taught here for five years in the City at IS 151 in the South Bronx as

2.0

well as PS/IS 73 in Brooklyn. I'm a fifth generation New Yorkers and I love our City and our children. And so I felt it was very important to speak up.

Having taught in the City's school system, I've experienced first hand what it is like to teach in a failing school. Day after day talented and dedicated teachers work hard to stimulate and engage the minds of children in this City in conditions that are demoralizing and numbing.

These teachers spend thousands of dollars of their own money buying items often as rudimentary as chalk and erasers, notebooks and pencils for their students as millions of dollars of texts and workbooks, some of which have only been used one years, some of which are not used at all languish in closets. In addition millions of dollars being spent in City money on test prep materials.

Teachers are forced to adhere to curriculum and practices that are literally wastes of time and draconian and they are not educationally sound as evidenced by the poor test

24

2	results. They are mandated to spend hours every
3	week teaching test prep, how to take a test, how
4	to fool the test, how to get around it, not how to
5	think deeply and to be creative.
6	In the school in which I taught in
7	Brooklyn several years ago, the faculty were
8	forced to teach math and only math from 8:45 in
9	the morning until the end of the day for 2 plus
10	months preceding the standardized math tests. We
11	taught nothing else. And we wonder why children
12	are absenting themselves from school.
13	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Did they all
14	get 100?
15	REVEREND DAUR-CARDASIS: No.
16	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Terrible.
17	Terrible both ways.
18	REVEREND DAUR-CARDASIS: When
19	teachers speak up to protest this type of so-
20	called teaching, they are cited by their
21	principals for insubordination and then letter
22	after letter is placed in their file. If their

25 Assaults go unreported in schools.

write you up for something.

pencils aren't straight on their desk they'll

We were told--actually I was in the room when I was teaching in the Bronx, by the dean, a whole group of us were told don't report if you're assaulted unless you're bleeding, have black and blue, are black and blued unless the EMTs come to pick you up because we're not going to be reporting it. The signs in the subways that crime is down like 38% in the schools is fabricated because principals are encouraged not to report suspensions.

The misleading and I'll refer again to the--I could go on and keep you here all evening but I won't. These are just a few examples that I have shared with you as causes why our schools are failing, contrary to the misleading ads we see in the subways which have been fabricated to convince everyone that things are going well.

I'd like to ask a question that we should consider and which I mentioned outside at the press conference. Why is that many altruistic, hardworking, young people coming from colleges, well educated, and who join the New York City Teaching Fellows program are dropping out

2.0

after six months and a huge percentage after one year? They're not receiving the supports that they need. One young woman who taught next door to me who was amazing was assaulted by a student. She was not supported by the administrator. And at the end of the year she was so disgusted she said she'd never go back into any education no matter where it was.

I support—we support the establishment of the School Transformation Zone as a first step in addressing the massive dysfunction of this school system. And as this zone develops and unfolds under the direction of an expert educator, and I emphasize the word educator, not politician, not anything else, an educator who's been recognized for their effectiveness, perhaps this Transformation Zone will serve as a role model to begin changing things in this educational program.

The program calls for involvement of parents and communities in the education of our children. We agree it is nothing less than a moral imperative that these children, our most precious gifts and greatest blessings, be provided

2.0

2.3

with nothing less than creative and enriched opportunities to grow and thrive in nurturing environments so that each one can achieve his or her fullest potential.

I sat here finally and listened to the silken dulcet tones of sophistry from the DOE and the administrators. I say to you Chairman, don't believe it. Do yourself a favor. Do the children a favor. Go to the schools but go unannounced. Go unannounced so that there is no time for principals to cook the books, to cover up what's really going on, to put on a show, and to move disruptive students out when they find that supervisory staff is coming.

out on last minute waste of time field trips just to get them out of the building until the end of the day. I've seen this happen when supervisory personnel from the DOE come and I've seen it when SIR [phonetic] supervisory personnel come, that students are pushed out of the school and sent on meaningless field trips just to get them out of the way so the schools look good.

I thank you for your time. I thank

2	you for what you're trying to do. And Iwe all
3	support you in the Diocese in any way we can.
4	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Thank you.
5	Just identify yourself for the record.
6	REVEREND DAUR-CARDASIS: Reverend
7	Joade Daur-Cardasis and I represent Bishop Mark
8	Sisk and Bishop Catherine Roskam for the Diocese
9	of New York, Episcopal.
10	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Thank you.
11	REVEREND DAUR-CARDASIS: Thank you.
12	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Next please.
13	MS. HELEN ROSENTHAL: Thank you
14	Councilman Jackson for introducing this very
15	important legislation and for your tireless
16	efforts chairing the Education Committee, nine
17	years, it's very impressive.
18	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: This is only
19	my fifth year. Eva Moskowitz chaired it four
20	years.
21	MS. ROSENTHAL: Five tireless
22	years. Thank you for your help doing that. My
23	name is Helen Rosenthal. As you know I'm the
24	former Chairperson of Community Board 7 in
25	Manhattan. It was very clear when I was Chair of

the Board that the most important issue in our neighborhood is overcrowding in the schools and shared space and utilization for District 3.

I'm in support of this bill for its effort to improve transparence on the critical issues of capacity utilization and enrollment and for the notion of working together with the SLT which I thought was a fine idea although the DOE doesn't seem to like it, CEC members, the DOE administration, school administration to identify the use of each room.

But I would suggest that you tweak the legislation just a little bit because the devil is always in the details as we all know.

And you really have to know the details in order to advance the ball with the Department of Education. We did this and I wrote about it in an article in the local West Side Spirit and that's what I included for my testimony. We went into the details working with the local CEC and that's in fact how we got the Department of Education to agree to a new school in our District. It's a 3-section school with 75 seats. It would not have happened had we just used the Blue Book.

Here's a couple of--let me give you an example. The Blue Book tells us and I looked at it really quickly, that's old data, so I'm not quite sure it's right, but for K through 5 at PS 191, which is located right behind Lincoln Center and across from Amsterdam Houses, you might see an unused capacity of 60 to 80 seats.

And the DOE would include that in its count and say oh, you know, you're not going to have overcrowding you have 80 seats available to you at PS 191. Well hang on a minute. A seat is not a seat. Those seats are spread out K through 5, of course; it's 5 to 7 kids from each classroom. So if when we do our projections and we see that there's going to be a need, a demand above and beyond what's there of in our situation we had projected a demand of 125 seats between 2 or three schools. And the DOE would say to us, using the Blue Book and they did this in September, you have plenty of room. Look you have 60 seats at PS 191.

Well PS 191 can't take 60 new
Kindergartners. If they were going to take 60 new
Kindergartners, they could place 10 of them maybe

in the 2 classes they have now. But they'd have to identify 2 brand new classrooms to identify—to accommodate those kids. And that's not just like a bubble class that goes up. Our projections show that this is going to happen annually for at least the next 3 years if you don't want to project out 5 years which means that it's not 2 classrooms that that school needs additionally, it's 6.

Because it's going to be those 2 grades are then going to--instead of 2 first grades the following year it's going to be 4 first grades because they're not just putting in--these target numbers, I don't know why they even use them when they say it's the target number of 20 kids in each Kindergarten classroom, they're assuming 25 when they do their numbers. Well 25 kids, if you have 25 kids in a class, you can't collapse them down the way that happens under a normal situation.

A sustainable school is going to have to have more classrooms if you're going to put in more kids in each Kindergarten class. So it's no longer going to be something like--and I'm making this up, a 5-section Kindergarten that by

the time you're in 5th grade it collapses down to 3
5th grade classes. That's not going to happen once
you start putting 25 kids in each of those
Kindergarten classes. And when new families are
moving in, it's no longer 20 or 25 kids in those
3rd grade or 4th grade classes, it's now up to the
full 28, 30, 34.

So collapsing isn't happening any more and it means that the schools themselves are not sustainable. So when the DOE says oh, you know, it's okay. One or two of the schools are at 120% capacity, you know, it's not because it's going to be at 120% the next year and the next year and the next year and the next year. And that's why you're having specialty classes or, you know, OT or Speech Therapy held in the hallway.

And one example by the way when the DOE asks for examples is PS 87 where parents are out of their minds knowing about their children's special ed classes happening or PT and OT happening in the hallways.

I'm going to wrap this up. I just want to give you a few facts. The first fact is in fact in District 3 we have the school with the

highest wait list, PS 87 with 111 kids. 111 zoned children who will not be able to go to their zoned school next year. Between PS 87 and 199 the number is 160 which if you think about it is a 7-section school, going by the DOE's realistic numbers of 25 kids per classroom. That means in 2 zones which are next door to each other, 87 and 199, we need a brand new 7-section school.

So the DOE did listen to us and in that article you'll see that they agreed to put in a new 3-section school which is not enough and it's crammed into a middle school building. So we're not particularly happy about that because where are these kids going to go after elementary school. My guess is middle school.

Lastly what we're going to end up having to do with that 160 kids is 75 will go into that new school. We will accommodate the remaining kids on the wait list in one of two ways. One is that at some of the zoned--some of the zones nearby there is a tiny bit of room.

So they're going to go up to the full complement of 25 kids per class in those schools and I'm talking about maybe 4 schools.

2	But once that happens we're still going to have
3	about 40 kids left over and those kids are going
4	to have to go tothose kids zoned for PS 87 or
5	199 are going to go to a school that is either
6	from 1 to 3 zones away from where they live.
7	That's the end of my testimony.
8	Thank you for all the work that you're doing.
9	CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Thank you.
10	Next please.
11	MS. SHINO TANIKAWA: Hi. My name
12	is Shino Tanikawa [phonetic]. I'm a parent with 2
13	children in the public school system. For the
14	purpose of full disclosure I will say that I am a
15	member of the Community Education Council District
16	2 but today I'm here to speak as a parent who has
17	seen children in very old buildings.
18	I am in support of Intro 155. I
19	think it's time that we really reform the Blue
20	Book because it ain't working. It's very clear.
21	However one thing that I'd like to see happen is
22	the more subtle nuances of building use.
23	Having a school in a 100-year old
2.4	building is a very different experience from a

school in a building that was built in the 1980s

or 1970s even. Our stairwells are very narrow.

Our cafeteria at PS 3, this is in Manhattan, the cafeteria is in the basement. It's a really dreadful space. Occupancy is rated at 175 people but even if you put Kindergartners in there, they're energetic, they're very full of life, you can not have 175 students down there, it's too many.

So those things really limit the number of students that can have lunch in the cafeteria, number of students who can be going up and down the stairs, and the number of bathrooms and locations of bathrooms. Those subtle things, that common infrastructure shared by the entire school, they make a huge impact on the life of students every day. But those things are not considered in calculating the capacity of the school.

As a concrete example this school year, because of overcrowding in the Village, PS 3 was asked to take in 2 extra Kindergarten sections. And we were reluctantly happy to accommodate the families in the zone who needed Kindergarten seats. So we opened up 2 new

Kindergarten classes.

enough for all the Kindergartners, so we had to do a little bit of creative scheduling. And right now, 2 classes out of 11 are having lunch in the classroom. They have what the teachers call precess which is recess before the real recess. So there is a scheduling complexity that's associated with this size of a particular infrastructure.

Stairwells being what it is, the yard being on the second floor, cafeteria being in the basement, we have to carefully schedule which classes go down which stairway in which direction and what time.

And those are all things that take a great deal of energy away from instruction from the administrators as well as teachers. So if there's any way moving forward, that we can consider the nuances of each building, how old is the building, how wide is the hallway? Where is the cafeteria? How big is the cafeteria? Where is the gym? What kind of gym is it? All those things really ought to be considered in determining how many students you can put in a

2.0

building.

It become even more important when you're trying to locate or collocate multiple schools. Because then you are talking about 2 school administrators trying to share very limited, very small spaces and having 4 stairwells, 2 schools, things get really messy.

So I'm not quite sure if you can develop a formula for something like this but to the extent possible I would like to see us moving forward considering every little detail of each building in its own right.

And one more thing that I have to say, it's not really related to the Blue Book but District 2 just recently went through rezoning in Lower Manhattan which still resulted in overcrowding because we knew rezoning wouldn't create new seats.

But the DOE seems to be making all enrollment planning decisions based on 25 students per class in Kindergarten. They keep telling us we have capacity. Well when you put 25 Kindergartners in each class, we might have capacity. But that is not the class size we're

2.0

2.3

trying to have	. Putting 25 ki	ids in each
Kindergarten c	lass is already	20% over what it
ought to be. A	And this has to	got stop.

So with that, thank you so much for all the work you do for us. We really appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Well thank you for coming in and sharing the details of your situation and of the District. And as you know the plan was for no more than 20 children in K to 3 and if they're planning for 25, then it goes against the goals that they've laid out and it goes against the State, you know, law, what have you. And we have to fight them on this. Next please.

MR. ELLIOT SKIP ROSEBORO: Good evening. I'm Elliot Skip Roseboro [phonetic].

I'm with CEJ. First I'd like to thank the Chair and the Council for the ongoing discussions on this extremely important issue of school closings.

The closing down of 30 or more schools forces thousands of kids to go out of their neighborhoods and often out of their own Boroughs to receive education. I'm sorry let me

2.0

2.3

just start here.

The closing down of 30 or more schools forces thousands of kids to go out of their neighborhoods and often out of their Boroughs to receive an education and is an educator's nightmare. To then take away these children's Metro Cards on top of that is despicable. It is an unequivocal recipe for failure but by its very nature this ill thought out combination will create more lateness, truancy and less well rested children. It won't go—I won't go into the fact that this may be intentional, that it causes other schools to fail, that it opens up room for more charter schools and it gentrifies neighborhoods.

I do hope that I will be asked about the gentrification. Now as he's done over the last 9 years businessman Mayor Mike will allow you to go through your now normal complain and hearing cycles. He'll buy some people off and then he'll close down schools regardless of what the Council, kids, parents, and public thinks.

The future of our children and the City itself dictates that this is of emergency

importance. And not to be lost on what has become a normal routine of loss to the Mayor's will. The Mayor and others tout the sizable amount of educational money to cities that create more charter schools. Though President Obama's plan was well intentioned, it didn't allow for the self-interest, greed, devaluation of our children that often happens when huge sums of monies are up for the taking.

When control and access to such large sums of money and its inherent power meets up with the shortsighted and sometimes criminal minded public officials and vendors, our children's future can often be cast aside. Of course this is in exception to our fine City Council Members. However some of our officials and vendors are no different than other special interest groups, using this for self-gain and little actual regard for our children and their future.

The educational funds possibly lost would pale hugely to the 2 or more generations of District school kids lost in the shuffle and closings which while trying to create a mere 4% to

6% of charter schools. Wouldn't it make much more sense to negotiate and show the Obama

Administration that these same monies allocated to proven programs such as proposed by CEJ, the Coalition for Educational Justice, would have a much broader and deeper effect on the entire school system than what is planned to affect less than 7% or 8%.

After spending the past 8 years and hundreds of millions of dollars to create 3% of charter schools, shouldn't the resounding question be what the hell happened to the other 97% of our children? In those 97% of schools, why are teachers still buying pencils, paper, pens, blackboard tools out of their meager salaries? Why are we continuing to lose art, music, labs and other enrichment programs rather than expanding them?

The bottom line is why is a much larger population of schools being punished with closings and losses of services while others are prospering. These closings alone hurt our children, their future and our neighborhoods. We are here to make all schools good schools and that

starts by keeping them open and allowing our children the choice, convenience and resources of being educated in their own neighborhoods.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Well let me thank all three of you for coming in. I don't know if you sat through the entire hearing to hear the Department of Education's response to our inquiries and questions. And my dumbfoundedness for not understanding their so-called clear explanations as to the class size goals and objective and other questions we put forward to them. And as I said if I was in charge some heads would roll.

But let me just thank you. And I want all of you to continue to stay engaged in order to help us collectively, in order to, hum, I guess communicate to our Mayoral control leaders that what they're doing as far as the 5-year Capital Plan, what they're doing as far as the utilization and capacity for their Blue Book is not really where it should be at. Okay? So please stay engaged. Okay, thank you.

MR. ROSEBORO: If I can, just two sentences here. I want to say that the system as

2.0

2.3

it's set up now will gentrify our neighborhoods.
It is on track. And whether it's intentional or
not, this is what's going to happen under this
process as it is and we need to look at that as
well.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Thank you.

Our last panel, Ann, where are you, come on down.

Public school parent advocate and Mary Spiegel,

are you here Mary? Is Mary here? She left. And

what about Tricia Joyce, are you here? Is there

anyone else here to testify? Ann you're the last

but not least. So just identify yourself and you

may begin your testimony.

MS. ANN KJELLBERG: I'm Ann
Kjellberg of the Public School Parent Advocacy
Committee, a loose consortium of public school
parents from around the City working for common
goals. I want to thank the Chairman for once
again staying with us and listening to the public
and expressing my ardent wish that someday,
someone from the DOE would elect to do the same.

I testified before this body in hearings in 2008 on the 2010-2014 Capital Plan about the inadequacy of provision of seats for

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

2 middle school.

3 CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: Um-hum.

4 MS. KJELLBERG: I attach that

5 testimony here today. In that testimony I pointed

6 out that Blue Book formulae are clearly inadequate

7 to measure overcrowding in our middle schools.

8 Many of our middle schools are identified as under

9 enrolled while they have class sizes in excess of

10 | Contract for Excellence commitments.

I cited the example of Barouche Middle School which was identified by Deputy Chancellor Grimm in City Council testimony as under enrolled, the same year they converted their library, their auditorium and a teacher room to classroom space in order to drive the class size from 33 to 36 down to 28 to 30, a vivid example of the deformities introduced by the DOE's method of calculating enrollment.

The Blue Book measure of

"programming efficiency" for calculating middle

school enrollments encourages the cannibalization

of facilities for arts and sciences or school

overcrowding to preserve them. It obscures the

different needs of different schools. The Clinton

2.0

2.3

School for Artists and Writers, for example, has no art room, and the differing existing conditions in different schools.

The DOE argues that the popularity of successful programs results in overcrowding of those schools but they are responsible for controlling enrollment in schools of choice and they should be trying to duplicate successful programs rather than force more students into them. Faulty mechanisms for measuring enrollment obscure their failure to provide a sufficient number of adequate middle school programs to meet the City's academic needs.

middle schools attended by most of the graduating students from my child's elementary school. All but 1 had average class sizes this year in excess of 30 even though only 2 were listed in the Blue Book with utilization at above 100%. 8 of them had seen their utilizations increase over the Blue Book of 2006-2007 in spite of massive infusions of class size reduction funds into the system as a whole and DOE arguments that middle school enrollment is declining.

not identifying the real needs. Another chronic problem with Blue Book in particular impact on middle school is its failure to recognize the inherent differences among buildings, a problem that also plagues elementary schools which are often not built for the sort of learning mandated by today's curriculum.

You can fit a lot more students in a room when you put each one at a desk facing forward like an airline passenger and don't move them all day as was done in earlier generations of pedagogy. Middle school rooms now crammed into the attics of elementary schools aggravate this problem by squeezing large children into spaces built for small children.

A City Council Task Force and several highly persuasive reports from the Annenberg Institute confirm what we already know: that our middle school students are exceptionally academically, socially and psychologically vulnerable. The chronic underperformance of our high school students is a further measure.

Numbers in the Blue Book that cloak

the deterioration of middle school facilities and students' access to supportive adults are not mere statistics, they are calls to action. The upshot is that the DOE has institutionally no motivation to accurately assess its facility needs.

Independent analysis is required to develop adequate measures. I applaud the Council's intention to require the Blue Book to conform to

the Contract for Excellence class size minimum.

But I call on the Council further to develop a rigorous process with real input from the people who know for appraising the real situations in our schools. Building adequate facilities for teaching and learning is a fundamental responsibility for the system and it can't be done when we only look through rose colored glasses and the fox dictates the needs of the chicken coop [laughing]. Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: And let me thank you for staying the course and as I said to the other panelists, we need you, because sometimes we feel frustrated in that our oversight hearings and our advocacy is not making a

you.

difference. But I think that we are making a				
difference. And together we shall prevail to				
ensure that our children receive the type of				
quality education they rightfully deserve. And				
that we as a City spend our money appropriately				
instead of spending money, \$1 billion on building				
out a prison in the Bronx and the Brooklyn House				
of Detention in Downtown Brooklyn over a year ago				
I had asked them to spend the money on building				
schools. And obviously that's not a decision				
within the Department of Education but clearly				
that's a decision of the Mayor as the chief				
executive of the Executive Department.				

So Ann, thank you--

MS. KJELLBERG: [Interposing] Thank

CHAIRPERSON JACKSON: --for staying the course and coming in and giving testimony on this very important issue. Also let me just finally thank the staff of the Education Committee and the City Council for everything they have done to help me and the other members of the City Council to prepare for this hearing today on Intro number 155 and Resolutions 156 and 157.

2	Our Counsel to our Committee is
3	Aysha Schaumberg, our Policy Analyst Jan Atwell,
4	and Joan Pavone and Regina Peredo Ryan our Finance
5	Policy Analyst and Shirley Lamongee, our
6	Communications person and Nathan Toth our
7	Assistant Director for our Capital Division.
8	Without them I don't know what I would do.
9	And of course my staff that works
10	here at City Hall, Joanna Garcia and Beth Shuler
11	and my Chief of Staff, Sara Margrave. And with
12	that ladies and gentlemen, let me thank you all
13	for coming. We look forward to working with you
14	down the road. It is now 4:33 and this hearing on
15	Intro 155 and Resolutions 156 and 157 is hereby
16	adjourned.
17	[Gavel banging]
18	[END 1002.MP3]

CERTIFICATE

I, Laura L. Springate certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

Lama L. Springate

Signature ____Laura L. Springate_____

Date _____May 9, 2010____